EXHIBIT 1

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
DEPOSITION of
ABHISHEK NAGARAJ, Ph.D.
San Francisco, California 94111
Wednesday, March 4, 2026

Reported Stenographically by:
MARY J. GOFF
CSR No. 13427
WA CSR No. 21030779
Job No. 620602
PAGES 1-291

2

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL--ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
VIDEOCONFERENCED and VIDEO-RECORDED DEPOSITION of ABHISHEK NAGARAJ, Ph.D., Volume I, taken on behalf of Plaintiff Music Publishers, Oppenheim + Zebrak, LLP, at WilmerHale, 50 California Street, Suite 3600, San Francisco, California 94111, beginning at 9:17 a.m. and ending at 6:52 p.m., on Wednesday, March 4, 2026, before MARY J. GOFF, California Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 13427 and WA CSR No. 21030779.

3

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff Publishers
Oppenheim + Zebrak, LLP
BY: COREY MILLER
BRET MATERA (remote DC)
Attorneys at Law
4530 Wisconsin Avenue
5th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20016
202-957-5043
corey@oandzlaw.com

For Defendant Anthropic PBC
WilmerHale
BY: ARI HOLTZBLATT
CHRISTINA LUO (remote)
LYDIA BAILEY
Attorney at Law
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20037
ari.holtzblatt@wilmerhale.com
202-663-6964

ALSO PRESENT: Liz Kim, in-house counsel Anthropic; Bram Isgur, Keystone; Shilpi Mukherjee, Keystone
Videographer: Philip Astor

4

INDEX

WITNESS		EXAMINATION
ABHISHEK NAGARAJ, Ph.D.		
Volume I		
	ATTORNEY MILLER	7, 287
	ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT	284

NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Exhibit 307	12-19-2025 Expert Report of Abhishek Nagaraj, Ph.D. B/W	6
Exhibit 308	1-23-2026 Expert Rebuttal Report of Abhishek Nagaraj, Ph.D. B/W	6
Exhibit 309	2-13-2026 Expert Reply Report of Abhishek Nagaraj, Ph.D. B/W	6
Exhibit 310	12-19-2025 Expert Report of Abhishek Nagaraj, Ph.D. color	41
Exhibit 311	1-23-2026 Expert Rebuttal Report Abhishek Nagaraj, Ph.D. color	41
Exhibit 312	2-13-2026 Expert Reply Report of Abhishek Nagaraj, Ph.D. color	41
Exhibit 313	GPT3, Language Models are Few-Shot Learners Pages 1-75	42

5

EXHIBITS CONTINUED: PAGE

Exhibit 314	2-2025 Brent Lutes Report Identifying the Economic Implications of AI for Copyright Policy Pages 1-66	106
Exhibit 315	NBER Working Paper 33598 Cloze Encounters: The Impact of Pirated Data Access on LLM Performance Pages 1-28	132
Exhibit 316	Spreadsheet Anthropic_0000228080	150
Exhibit 317	Dario Amodei Article, 10-2024 Machines of Loving Grace How AI Could Transform the World for the Better	197
Exhibit 318	Stanley Wu, et al., article Characterizing Detectability and Impact of AI-Generated Music on Streaming Platforms Pages 1-20	206

6

San Francisco, California 94111
Wednesday, March 4, 2026
9:17 a.m.

(Exhibit 307 was marked for identification and is attached to the transcript.)

(Exhibit 308 was marked for identification and is attached to the transcript.)

(Exhibit 309 was marked for identification and is attached to the transcript.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins Media Number 1 in the videotaped deposition of Abhishek Nagaraj, 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 March 4, 2026. The time on the video monitor is 9:17 a.m. The videographer today is Philip Astor, representing Planet Depos. This video deposition taking place at 50 California Street, Suite 3600, San Francisco, California.

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

ATTORNEY MILLER: Corey Miller from O + Z LLP on behalf of the Plaintiff Music Publishers. With me on the Zoom as well is my colleague, Bret Matera.

7

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Ari Holtzblatt from WilmerHale, representing Defendant Anthropic. With me is -- in the room is Lydia Bailey also from WilmerHale.

And I will -- just to put on the record now, I'll be designating the -- designate the transcript "Highly Confidential, Attorneys' Eyes Only."

ATTORNEY KIM: Also present is Liz Kim, in-house for Anthropic.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter today is Mary Goff, representing Planet Depos. The witness 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.

ABHISHEK NAGARAJ, 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 MILLER:

Q Good morning, Professor Nagaraj.

8

A Good morning.

Q My name is Corey Miller, and I'll be taking your deposition today.

Have you ever been deposed before?

A I have not.

Q Okay. So then let me briefly explain how today is going to work. I'll be asking you a series of questions, and you'll be answering those questions in accordance with your oath as truthfully and honestly as you can.

From time to time your counsel may object to my questions. You still have to answer the questions, even if your counsel objects, unless he specifically instructs you not to answer.

Do you understand that?

A (No verbal response.)

Q We have the court reporter who is writing down everything we say today, and so for her benefit, it's important that you give verbal answers. Shakes of your head or nodding or "uh-huhs" or that kind of thing, doesn't produce a clear record of what your response was, so I'll please ask you to state your full answer.

For the court reporter's benefit, it's also important that we not speak over each other, so

45

Table 2.1 says "All models were trained for a total of 300 billion tokens."
Do you see that?
A I do see that.
Q Does this indicate to you that GPT-3 was trained on a dataset of 300 billion tokens?
A I need some time to review the context for that, so let me get back to you. Thank you for the time. I have had the chance to review the context.
Q Okay. I'll repeat my question.
A Yeah.
Q Does the statement in the caption to Table 2.1 that "All models were trained for a total of 300 billion tokens" indicate to you that GPT-3 was trained on a dataset of 300 billion tokens?
A It does, yes.
I will note, though, that a lot of the results in the -- in the rest of paper talk about "few-shot training," which often involves providing additional tokens in addition in the tokens that something is trained on.
So a lot of the performance results rest not just on -- on the pretraining, but also on the -- in-context learning. In fact, this whole paper is about how, when you add more tokens to the basic

46

model size, the performance can improve quite a bit.
Q And you earlier agreed that GPT-3 was a general-purpose LLM. So does this then indicate to you that it's possible to train a general-purpose LLM on a dataset of 300 billion tokens?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Objection -- I object. Mischaracterize prior testimony.
A The main thing that I find interesting from this paper is, firstly, that this model was indeed -- like, if you look at the "Limitation" sections, clearly to me seems to be very much a research model in the sense that it is not economically valuable.
There's a -- there's -- it basically struggles in many, many different things that modern-day LLMs are quite good at, and so I would think -- and as the history has borne out, the economic value of GPT-3 as a model for practical applications was very low.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) So I wasn't asking what you found interesting about the paper.
I was asking: Does the fact that GPT-3 was trained on 300 billion tokens indicate to you that it's possible to train a general-purpose LLM on 300 billion tokens?

47

A What it tells me is that when you take 300 billion tokens and add additional information such as in-context learning, then the model can kind of do okay on a -- on a -- few of -- a different variety of tasks. That's the main conclusion that I draw from this paper.
Q Could you turn to Footnote 53 in your opening report, please, which is on page 16?
A Yes, I'm there.
Q Okay. And do you see in the last sentence of Footnote 53, you state:
"Common Corpus, an open-license pretraining dataset contains roughly two trillion tokens"?
Do you see that?
A Yeah, the -- all of Footnote 53 says:
"The question of whether there's enough public domain data to train a general-purpose LLM with a technical and empirical one. But I have not seen any sources that indicate that public domain data would be sufficient. Common Corpus, an open-license pretraining

48

dataset contains roughly two trillion tokens."
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Okay. So Common Corpus then contains more than six times as many tokens as was used to train GPT-3, correct?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Object to form.
A Again, like I said, with GPT-3, it's hard to know the precise tokens important for the performance because a lot of the GPT-3 paper is about additional tokens can help improve performance.
So again, hard to make a comparison between those two in terms of exact proportions.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) You say that:
"The question of whether there's enough public domain data to train a general-purpose LLM is a technical and empirical one."
Do you see that?
A I do.
Q Have you done any technical or empirical analysis to determine whether there is enough public domain data to train a general-purpose LLM?
A I know that there are a variety of different efforts underway to use public domain data

133

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: How are you doing?
THE DEPONENT: I can keep going for a bit more.
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Okay.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Where is it? All right. The next exhibit should be in your -- in the chat. All right. And for the record, I'll designate this exhibit as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 315.
Do you have Exhibit 315 open in front of you?
A I do.
Q Do you recognize Exhibit 315?
A Yes, I believe this is "NBER Working Paper 33598 titled "Cloze Encounters: The Impact of Pirated Data Access on LLM Performance," dated March 2025."
Q And Cloze Encounters is spelled C-L-O-Z-E, right?
A Correct. C-L-O-Z-E, yes.
Q And that's a pun?
A No. Actually, it is a -- as it turns out, it's a psychology test that has always been spelled that way. I don't know why they chose the "Z" rather than the "S."
Q But using the name Cloze Encounters is

134

referencing --
A Yes. The whole thing is a pun because we are -- we are testing the idea of -- Cloze, exactly.
Q And you're a coauthor of this paper, right?
A I am.
Q And do you stand behind what's written in this paper?
A I do.
Q Can you turn to page 2, please?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: And is it page 2 in the PDF or page 2 as numbered?
ATTORNEY MILLER: That's a good question. I just have page 2 in my notes. So let me figure out where it is.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Ah, page 2 in the paper, not in the PDF.
At the bottom of the page, do you see the sentence that begins "From a theoretical point of view"?
A I do, yeah.
Q And the paper states:
"From a theoretical point of view, it is not clear how access to specific sources of copyrighted

135

content affects model performance."
Do you see that?
A Um-hum.
Q And then it continues:
"On one hand, it is reasonable to infer that any one source of content has very little bearing on performance because of the sheer volume and diversity of data used in training," correct?
A Correct.
Q And then I'm going to skip a sentence. The next sentence says:
"On the other hand, as evidenced by an active licensing market for such data, it is clear that training data and content are the lifeblood of generative AI foundation models and are, therefore, very valuable in determining model performance."
Do you see that?
A I see that sentence.
Q Do you agree that there's an active licensing market for training data for

136

general-purpose LLM models?
A Just give me a second to review the first two paragraphs, because I haven't read this in a while. Okay.
So just as context -- so this paper is not analyzing any -- any direct -- any questions directly as the results with this case, including it doesn't really analyze lyrics data, nor does it like at substitution or sort of cannibalization.
THE COURT STENOGRAPHER: Any sort of?
A Cannibalization. Sorry. An economics term.
But in the -- but it's trying to make sense of the emerging questions around copyright policy and intellectual property policy in this area.
And in paragraph 2 we talk about some of the ongoing lawsuits, as well as we give examples of publicly reported deals. I believe the whole paper has only examples of three deals. That -- those were all that we were aware of at that point, including one between Reddit and OpenAI. And -- and so throughout the paper we use this phrase of "licensing market" or "active licensing market" as a shorthand for these -- for these three deals that we

137

use to motivate why it is what we wrote in the paper.
And so in that sense what I mean here is that there do seem to be some deals -- in this case three deals -- for licensing data. And I believe the case records show there have been others as well, and so that's what this phrase is referring to.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) In this paper you develop a technique to test a model's ability to answer factual questions about a given book, correct?
A No. Actually, in this paper we look at the model's ability to regurgitate specific entities -- like, those are called named entities -- from -- from a given book.
So we will give it -- so if you go -- the best way to understand this is to look at -- is to look at Figure 1, which is on page 22 of the model. And so there we have an example line from "Lord of the Flies" that says the input is "stay gold, [MASK]" or a dash "stay gold" and the model is opposed to fill in the blank.
And so we look at the model's ability to fill in the blank correctly based on what is

138

actually in the -- in the book itself. This is a test of a broader phenomenon called memorization, which the ability of the model to regurgitate specific aspects of -- of any data that -- that it might have been exposed to.
Q And what did you -- withdrawn.
In this paper you conclude that direct access to the full text of a book significantly enhances performance on the name "cloze task," correct?
A Can you clarify where you're reading that from or where I say that?
Q So this is on page 4.
A And can you repeat the sentence?
Q Let me a step back.
The process you were just describing where you're testing the abilities -- the ability of the model to regurgitate specific names or -- or facts from the book, that's the name "cloze task," right?
A Correct.
Q And then the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 4 states:
"We find that direct access to the full text of a book, Books3, significantly enhances performance

139

on the name "cloze task"; is that correct?
A What we mean here is that it -- it increases its ability to answer or fill in the blank on the name "cloze task." So it says something about its ability to memorize that bit of -- of the full text.
Q If you turn to page 5, towards the bottom of the page in the last full paragraph, do you see there's a second sentence that begins "Second" and continue:
"Second, our results provide some real-world empirical estimates on the effect of training data on model performance which might be important for key economic calculations in this area."
Do you see that?
A I do see that sentence.
Q And then the next sentence says:
"For example, we can -- we can refute the claim that any single source has a negligible effect on model performance, even in large production models."

140

Do you see that?
A I see that, yes.
Q Is that an accurate statement?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Object to form.
A What do you mean by "is that an accurate statement"? Do you...
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Do you agree that this paper refutes the claim that "any single source has a negligible effect on model performance even in large production models"?
A I think we have to take into account that by "performance" here, we consistently mean the ability to fill in the blank on a name "cloze task." So on that narrow definition of "model performance" or "memorization," our results do point to the fact that any single source has a negligible effect.
So different -- so any particular source can affect the ability of the model on this -- on this one task even in large production models.
Just for context, we also say that "these effects are very variable both across models and across different types of data."
Q Have you tested model performance on the name "cloze task" with song lyrics?
A I have not.

237

the -- due to the increased efficiency or the decrease in cost, do you?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Same objection.
A So in paragraph 79 of that same section, I talk about AI, per se, and music, per se, where I say:
"In the area of music, there are also examples of AI tools being able to help compose entirely novel and previously nonexistent types of music."
And then I talk about the start-up Endel that provides its users with tools to "generate evolving soundscapes geared to working, meditation, and sleep, factoring in variables like weather, time of day, location, and even heart rate in order to tailor its audio streams."
So that is, I think, what you're talking about, but maybe I'm misunderstanding your question.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) The example you cite in paragraph 79 doesn't -- doesn't use Claude, does it?
A The example does not use Claude, but your question was about: Did I look at the impacts of AI in expanding demand?

238

And this certainly seems like an example that fits the bill.
Q And the example you cite in paragraph 79, do you know whether that example requires the inclusion of Plaintiffs' lyrics in its training data in order to achieve the effects you describe?
A The main thing I'm talking about here is an AI tool that can produce this kind of music. Again, there's no opinion here about what specific technology would be needed or what data would be needed to train that technology. That's not directly relevant to this particular opinion.
Q Okay. And in paragraph 75, you say that:
"Adding AI-generated lyrics to the market could have other added benefits like democratization and diversity."
Do you see that?
A I do.
Q For AI-generated lyrics to promote democratization and diversity, AI-generated lyrics would need to become popular and widely used, right?
A Not necessarily. There is -- in order to promote democratization and diversity, people who previously felt underserved by the current market would have to access or use AI-generated lyrics. There's no statement in here about the relative size of how big that effect has to be.

239

Q Well, if nobody is listening to songs with AI-generated lyrics, then AI-generated lyrics can't be promoting democratization or diversity, can they?
A I never said that nobody is listening to it. I just said that there are many people listening -- using AI-generated lyrics who previously did not. So it's a nonzero component, but that's not the same as saying it's the entire market.
Q Even if adding AI-generated lyrics to the market promoted democratization and diversity, does Claude's training data need to include the works-in-suit in order to realize those benefits of democratization and diversity?
A Again, I have answered that question. I can't say anything about what particular types of AI are relevant here or what -- kind of what training data is needed, because the relationship between the two is very hard for me to know.
Q Do you have any evidence that adding AI-generated lyrics to the market will promote democratization and diversity?

240

A This is precisely where our discussion of the underlying mechanisms becomes very important. What we have seen from the economic record with past technologies is that lowering the cost of production along a variety of different dimensions tends to advantage those who could not afford that before.
And so in some ways those mechanisms, I don't see why they wouldn't apply to AI-generated lyrics. And that's precisely the logic and the argument that I'm relying on in order to make that conclusion.
THE COURT STENOGRAPHER: Wait. What is that lowering? From the economic report with "plastic" is that lowering the cost of production?
THE DEPONENT: I don't know what it is.
A And those are precisely the costs.
THE DEPONENT: I'll go slower.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Even if AI increased the size of the market for lyrics, that doesn't necessarily benefit incumbents, does it?
A I think the opinion I'm offering is in contrast to some of Dr. Smith's arguments that there will necessarily be a decline in the demand for copyrighted works. And so the possibility that I'm offering in this section is that the market could

241

expand, and that could end up potentially benefiting the -- the Plaintiffs in this case.

A good example of that mechanism is our previous discussion on gatekeepers. So we have a bigger pool of artists to choose from when it comes to promoting -- promoting music more generally in the market. And so the -- my opinion here is that these impacts on market expansion have the potential or the possibility of benefiting Plaintiffs in that way.

Q But in order to know the effect that an increase in the size of the market has on incumbents, you would need to know how the gains from the market increase are distributed, wouldn't you?

A There are a number of factors that would in -- be in affect the equillibrium of how this shakes out. And so the -- how these things happen in the future is kind of very hard to say. It depends on, again, market responses, institutional responses, so I don't really want to speculate about how this will go.

My goal here is to point out the potential theoretical channels, as well as what we know from past work.

242

Q Could you turn to page 43 of your rebuttal opinion?

A Yes.

Q And do you see that there's a Subheader D on that page?

A Um-hum.

Q And that header says "IP Rights Protect Transformative, New Ideas and Plaintiffs' Expanded View of IP Threatens Innovation in the Music Industry."

Do you see that?

A I do.

Q What is the relevance of your argument that "Plaintiffs' expanded view of IP rights threatens innovation in the music industry" to the effect of Anthropic's use of Plaintiffs' works on the potential market for or value of Plaintiffs' copyrighted works?

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Object to form insofar as it calls for a legal conclusion.

ATTORNEY MILLER: Well --

A Can you repeat the question, please?

Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Yes.

What is the relevance of your argument that "Plaintiffs's expanded view of IP threatens

243

innovation in the music industry" to the effect of Anthropic's use of Plaintiffs' works upon the potential part -- market for or value of Plaintiffs' copyrighted works?

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Same objection.

A In the original report I did not discuss effects of the Plaintiffs through the creation of original lyrics or this discussion of market dilution. But Dr. Smith's report had a substantive discussion of those channels. And so the main reason in which I -- I grappled with these issues wasn't rebutting his opinion that this whole question was relevant, the question of market dilution.

And then this particular section was intended as a recalibration of the debate around the reasons why this entire channel was not something that I thought was central and still don't think is central in -- in this case because the goal of IP rights, as I said here, is to promote the progress -- the progress of science and the useful arts by granting creators limited rights over their creations.

So as an economist what you really want to see is because these goods are nonrivalrous, you

244

want them to be created, but you want them to diffuse freely. The problem with that status quo is that in such market, no one would create the products in the first place.

And so IP rights are seen as a quid pro quo where you want to balance how strong or wide those follow-on rights are with the incentives for creation. And so therefore, I thought it is important in this discussion on market dilution to set the context that IP rights are about limited rights for certain use cases.

And this idea that others can build on them freely is -- is baked into the design of intellectual property. In fact, that's the whole goal.

Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Do you see it as -- your role as an expert in this case to tell the court and the jury what the appropriate scope of copyright protection is?

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Object to form.

A I see my role as an economist to look at the effect of the use upon the potential market for or the value of the copyrighted work. And in making the determination I have to have a framework to think about the relevant markets and an

289

I, ABHISHEK NAGARAJ, Ph.D., do hereby declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the foregoing transcript; that I have made any corrections as appear noted, in ink, initialed by me, or attached hereto; that my testimony as contained herein, as corrected, is true and correct.

EXECUTED this_____ day of_____, 20____, at_____, _____.
(City) (State)

_____
ABHISHEK NAGARAJ, Ph.D.

290

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 9th day of March, 2026.

Mary J. Goff
_____
MARY J. GOFF

291

ERRATA SHEET
PLANET DEPOS
451 Hungerford Drive, Suite 400
Rockville, Maryland 20850
888-433-3767
CASE: Concord v. Anthropic

PAGE	LINE	FROM	TO

_____
ABHISHEK NAGARAJ, Ph.D.
Subscribed and sworn to before me
this _____ day of _____, 2026.
_____
Notary Public

ERRATA TO THE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT OF
Dr. Abhishek Nagaraj
TAKEN ON **March 4, 2026**

I have reviewed the transcript of my testimony of **March 4, 2026**, and hereby make the following changes in form and/or substance:

PAGE	LINE(S)	CHANGE	REASON FOR CHANGE
29	09	"works-in-suite" to "works-in-suit"	Transcription error
45	20	"in addition in" to "in addition to"	Transcription error
47	20	"with" to "is"	Transcription error
48	10	"about additional" to "about how additional"	Transcription error
49	16	"get the public" to "get with public"	Transcription error
51	17	"on the citation" to "on this citation"	Transcription error
53	03-04	"computer core for inference costs" to "compute required for inference costs"	Transcription error
57	06	"vast array data need to train" to "vast array of data needed to train"	Transcription error
59	12	"LLM" to "large language model"	Transcription error
61	03	"others where which" to "others for which"	Transcription error
62	07	"for ballpark" to "for the ballpark"	Transcription error
63	21	"cost, time, and energy" to "cost and time and energy"	Transcription error
65	03	"competition is much more" to "competition is a much more"	Transcription error
68	18	"Right. So then" to "Which, then"	Transcription error
68	20	"per pay" to "per day"	Transcription error
84	11	"contract" to "contracts"	Transcription error
84	11-12	"and individual artists" to "and the individual artist"	Transcription error

ERRATA TO THE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT OF
Dr. Abhishek Nagaraj
TAKEN ON **March 4, 2026**

I have reviewed the transcript of my testimony of **March 4, 2026**, and hereby make the following changes in form and/or substance:

PAGE	LINE(S)	CHANGE	REASON FOR CHANGE
90	08	"that are martial" to "that I marshaled"	Transcription error
95	24	"I have done" to "I've not done"	Transcription error
97	01	"But I" to "But it"	Transcription error
97	18	"Anthropic on" to "Anthropic is on"	Transcription error
99	04	"coming to back" to "coming back"	Transcription error
111	01	"point," to "point to,"	Transcription error
117	11	"point of rating" to "point of writing"	Transcription error
124	01	"Publisher's" to "Publishers'"	Grammatical clarification
127	23	"Works-in-suite" to "works-in-suit"	Transcription error
128	08	"counsel's analysis" to "counts as analysis"	Transcription error
137	23	"opposed to" to "supposed to"	Transcription error
140	13	"name 'cloze task.'" to "'name cloze' task."	Grammatical clarification
140	24	"name 'cloze task'" to "'name cloze' task"	Grammatical clarification
141	09	"name 'cloze task'" to "'name cloze' task"	Grammatical clarification
144	13	"and are" to "and who are"	Transcription error
144	21	"some the legal" to "some of the legal"	Transcription error
146	21	"at the name 'cloze' paper" to "at the 'name cloze' paper"	Grammatical clarification
150	23-24	"talked. About before." To "talked about before."	Grammatical clarification

ERRATA TO THE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT OF
Dr. Abhishek Nagaraj
TAKEN ON **March 4, 2026**

I have reviewed the transcript of my testimony of **March 4, 2026**, and hereby make the following changes in form and/or substance:

PAGE	LINE(S)	CHANGE	REASON FOR CHANGE
170	23	"training a use case" to "training use cases"	Transcription error
172	19	"so without with a" to "so without a"	Transcription error
173	10	"public new" to "public news"	Transcription error
194	18	"at not cost" to "at no cost"	Transcription error
201	17	"compliment" to "complement"	Spelling clarification
206	12	"outside" to "outsized"	Transcription error
224	25	"for OpenAI" to "for AI"	Transcription error
243	12	"wasn't rebutting" to "was in rebutting"	Transcription error
244	03	"such market" to "such a market"	Transcription error
262	12	"adverse interests" to "diverse interests	Transcription error
268	07	"activity traffic" to "affect traffic"	Transcription error
269	25	"rule of the data" to "row of the data"	Transcription error
270	23	"Works-in-suite" to "works-in-suit"	Transcription error
270	25	"works-in-suite" to "works-in-suit"	Transcription error
278	25	"cofound" to "confound"	Transcription error
279	17-18	"is to have to a view" to "is to have a view"	Transcription error

ERRATA TO THE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT OF
Dr. Abhishek Nagaraj
TAKEN ON **March 4, 2026**

I have reviewed the transcript of my testimony of **March 4, 2026**, and hereby make the following changes in form and/or substance:

I, **ABHISHEK NAGARAJ,** read the foregoing deposition and hereby state that the foregoing is true and correct, except as noted herein.



04/08/2026

Abhishek Nagaraj Date