EXHIBIT 127

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

193

data to train -- all the data needed to train an LLM or the market for lyrics to train an LLM does not exist.

So in that sense insofar as that market does not exist and the effect of the use has no effect on a -- on a nonexisting market, any downstream consequences would also not occur because this market, to start off with, does not exist in some ways.

Q Yeah, as we have discussed, you concluded that single-purpose LLMs' licenses for Plaintiffs' copyrighted works doesn't affect the market for general-purpose LLMs' use of the copyrighted works.

What about the reverse of that? Do you think general-purpose LLMs' use of copyrighted works as training data has any effect on single-purpose LLMs' markets?

A I didn't hear the first part of your question. It was not loud enough. Can you repeat that?

Q Sure.

A Repeat the whole question, please.

Q Yeah, sure.

We discussed earlier your opinion that the license to single-purpose LLMs have reached for use

194

of Plaintiffs' copyrighted works doesn't affect any market for general-purpose LLMs' use of the same works. And I'm asking you about the reverse.

Do you think general-purpose LLMs' use of Plaintiffs' copyrighted works has any effect on the market for use by single-purpose LLMs?

A No, I do not.

Q Why not?

A I talk about this in -- in my reply report in paragraph 24 where, again, the economics of markets for nonrivalrous goods like licenses to IP, supply constraints are irrelevant. Right. So if one consumer consumes in one market, there's no less to consume in the other market because the marginal cost of reproduction is zero. So that creates one degree of separation between the two markets.

So if I'm a publisher of an eBook, I can produce another copy at not cost. There's no fixed supply of eBooks. As a result, selling to one buyer did not impose any opportunity costs in terms of foregoing sales for another buyer.

In such situations, prices are driven by individual buyer's willingness to pay rather than marginal production cost. So licenses of data will look at how much each buyer values the data when

195

setting prices. So as I talked about before, the ways in which Klay and Udio approach their consumers, the kind of product and services that they offer as a single-purpose AI is completely distinct than what a general purpose-AI system offers.

And so for that reason, the prices of the licenses will also be independent, and I don't expect the reverse, as you called it, to occur.

Q So you don't think there's any chance that -- that the next round of licensing negotiations between -- between Plaintiffs and a single-purpose LLM like Udio or Klay, the single-purpose LLM would say, you know: Well, Anthropic uses the -- uses this data for free; why should we have to pay for it?

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Objection --

A I'm --

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: -- asked and answered.

A -- I'm not -- I'm not able to speculate on what any future licensor will tell Anthropic or any other -- any other person in such a negotiation.

Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) You don't think Anthropic's use of Plaintiffs' copyrighted works a

196

without license would have any effect on those negotiations?

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Objection, asked and answered.

A Again, I'm not here to speculate how any future negotiations would go.

Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) You agree that you can use Claude to write lyrics, right?

A I believe the Claude system can be used to write original lyrics, although regurgitation of preexisting lyrics is not something you can use it for.

Q And you can prompt Claude to write lyrics in a certain style or on a specific theme and it will produce lyrics in accordance with that prompt, right?

A I believe that's right.

Q Okay. You also agree that generative -- generative AI technology like Claude is continuing to improve?

A I don't have an opinion on that one way or the other. Again, "performance, improvements," these are very difficult terms to define.

Q Would you agree that generative AI models continue to get more powerful?

197

A I have the same opinion. "Powerful" is not well defined, so I don't know how these things are changing over time.
Q If you go to the Zoom, you'll see the next exhibit, which I'll designate as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 317.
(Exhibit 317 was marked for identification and is attached to the transcript.)
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Please let me know when you have that open.
A The first page came up.
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: You said 317?
ATTORNEY MILLER: Yeah.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Do you -- and what I have designated as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 317 appears to be an article titled "Machines of Loving Grace."
Do you see that?
A I do.
Q Have you read this article before?
A I have not.
Q Do you see at the top of the page it indicates that the article is written by Dario Amodei?
A I do.
Q Are you familiar with Dario Amodei?

198

A Yes. I believe he's the CEO of Anthropic.
Q Have you ever met him before?
A I have not.
Q And there's a date on the front page that indicates "October 2024."
Do you see that?
A I do.
Q Could you turn to page 5, please?
A Is that the page that begins with "issues aside"? The page numbers are hard to tell on this one.
Q I lost my place. Yes.
A Okay.
Q Actually, go -- go back to page 4. Do you see there's a header in the middle of the page that says "Basic Assumptions and Framework"?
A Yes.
Q And Dr. Amodei writes:
"To make this whole essay more precise and grounded, it's helpful to specify clearly what we mean by "powerful AI."
Do you see that?
A I do.
Q At the bottom of the page -- never mind.

199

Turn to page 5, please. And then the first full paragraph, you see Dr. Amodei writes:
"By powerful AI, I have in mind an AI model likely similar to today's LLMs in form, but it might be based on a different architecture, might involve several interacting, might be trained differently with the following properties."
Do you see that?
A I do.
Q And then there's several bullet points?
A Um-hum.
Q And the first bullet point is:
"In terms of pure intelligence, it is smarter than a Nobel Prize winner across most relevant deals -- biology, programming, math, engineering, writing, et cetera. This means it can prove unsolved mathematical theorems, write extremely good novels, write difficult code bases from scratch, et cetera."

200

Do you see that?
A I do.
Q Do you have an opinion on whether Dr. Amodei is correct, that "we are likely to achieve powerful AI"?
A I need to take a look at the context to answer that question, so give -- give me a minute. It's a long document. I have reviewed it up to that point. I might need to go back again to this.
So your question was again?
Q Do you have an opinion on whether Dr. Amodei is correct that "we are likely to achieve powerful AI"?
A No, I do not.
Q Do you have an opinion on whether Dr. Amodei is correct about "what the capabilities of powerful AI will be"?
A No, I do not.
Q Okay. So you don't dispute that -- where Dr. Amodei says that "a powerful AI will be smarter than a Nobel Prize winner across fields like writing," that the AI will have that capability, right?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Objection, mischaracterizes testimony.

201

A I said that I had no opinion on his opinion, so I never made a statement about what I think a powerful AI can or cannot do.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Well -- but you're not disputing what he says then, right?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Objection.
A No.
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Same objection.
A No. I said I have no opinion. That means I neither agree, nor disagree with what he's saying.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Do you think an AI -- a powerful AI will be able to write extremely good novels?
A I'm not sure. It -- it's possible that it could, could not. It's very unclear to know what the future of AI technology holds.
Just as a compliment to that answer, we talk a lot as an economist about AI's jagged intelligence, where it can do really great things on certain tasks and get other very simple things wrong. Things that a four-year-old can do and the AI model can't do, but it can maybe do good at a math contest.
And so one of the things I have learned in my experience is predicting the intelligence part of

202

AI in the future, but also how well it'll do on different tasks is a very complicated business.
Q Is it your opinion currently that consumers can dis -- let me -- withdrawn.
Is it your opinion that consumers currently can distinguish between human-created lyrics and AI-created lyrics?
A It is my opinion that -- is that in many cases consumers can indeed tell the difference between human-created and AI-created content.
Q Do you have an opinion on whether, as AI technology improves, consumers will continue to be able to tell the difference between human-created lyrics and AI-created lyrics?
A The question of whether consumers can tell the difference between human- and AI-created content depends not just on the capabilities of the AI, but also from other institutional mechanisms such as labeling, consumer education over time, et cetera. So I don't know how all of those things would evolve, and so it's hard for me to make a prediction.
Q Do you have any basis to believe that AI at some point will not be capable of creating lyrics that are indistinguishable from human-created

203

lyrics?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Objection to that very confusing question.
A I basically said I have no opinion or I don't want to speculate about whether AI technology would go and its implications for different types of tasks, including writing lyrics.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) If you don't make any assessment or projection of AI's future capabilities with regard to lyrics, how can you be sure that AI-created lyrics won't displace or dilute the market for human-created lyrics in the future?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Object to form.
A The main opinion on this topic that I express in my rebuttal report is that as far as I can tell, there's no evidence as of the present that AI-generated works have diluted or disrupted the market for music.
And conceptually or theoretically going forward, there are many different possibilities, including one where the market for music is much larger and more profitable than before the advent of AI, and so my main opinion in this regard is one of uncertainty where both the market expansion, as well as -- the market expansion logic that I outline in

204

my rebuttal report could apply, as well as ones where AI-generated music can be distinguished from non-AI-generated music and consumers can actually tell the difference.
Q Can you turn to your rebuttal report, please? Turn to paragraph 23.
A Yes.
Q And in paragraphs 23 and 24, you discuss the Chakrabarty paper, right?
A Correct.
Q I and apologize if I'm not pronouncing that name correctly. And the title of that paper is "Readers Prefer Outputs of AI Trained on Copyrighted Books Over Expert Human Writers," correct?
A Correct.
Q And you point out in paragraph 23 that:
"It was only after the large language models had been fine-tuned on the works of specific authors did experts decide that the AI-generated text was a better stylist mimic," correct?
A Correct.
Q But the lay readers showed no preference for the human-created works even before the model

213

Q You understand that writing lyrics can be a separate job from composing music, right?
A I do know that there are people who specialize in writing lyrics for -- for -- as a -- as a profession, yes.
Q And if Claude is used to write lyrics, it's capable of completely replacing the individual who had previously written the lyrics, right?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Object to form.
A That doesn't necessarily follow. Just because Claude can produce lyrics, it says nothing about to what extent it may or may not replace somebody whose job it is to write lyrics.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Do you think it's likely that Claude could -- Claude -- do you think it's likely that Claude will be capable of replacing professional lyricists?
A Can you repeat that question?
Q Do you think it's likely that Claude will be capable of replacing professional lyricists?
A I don't want to offer an opinion on an analysis that I did not conduct. I didn't conduct an analysis empirically on Claude and its impacts on replacing professional lyricists, especially in the future as this technology and the profession more

214

generally will continue to evolve.
Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Spotify doesn't currently label all AI-created works as such, does it?
A I don't remember the exact details now, but I believe Spotify has some efforts underway, but it does not -- it does not label AI-generated content on lyrics in a widespread way.
Q Okay. And Deezer does label AI-generated content, or at least it attempts to, right?
A I believe Deezer offers a product and a service, but it aims to label AI-generated content as such, yes.
Q Well, when Deezer's service labels an AI-generated content as such, it doesn't tell you which AI was used to create the -- the music and lyrics in the AI-generated recording, right?
A I did not review Deezer's and how this works. In fact, when I tried to dig deeper, there was no information on Deezer methodology or how it label s AI that I could find, so I can't comment on that -- on that point.
Q There's no way to go on Spotify or Deezer and identify all of the tracks available on those platforms that include lyrics written with Claude,

215

is there?
A The platforms that -- one of the things I know from my research on use of technology in -- in music creation, it's always been very hard to understand precisely what technologies are used in the production of any content.
In my own research I studied digital music production. It's very hard to know if a particular song was recorded in analog studio or using digital -- digital technology.
And AI is just another technology in the mix of -- that is used in combination potentially with -- with other technologies, so it's not possible to -- in a reliable way to know what technologies are used in the production of content in general, and that includes AI.
Q In paragraph 30 of your rebuttal report, you note that:
"Deezer determined that AI-generated songs account for .5 percent of streams."
Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q So that's a nonzero amount, right?
A Correct.

216

Q Do you think that percentage is likely to increase in the future?
A I don't want to speculate on what's likely to happen in the future partially because I'm not exactly sure how Deezer's algorithm works and how it will continue to work in the future under different circumstances.
So this number depends not just on the use of AI in different parts of the market, but also on the algorithms used and people's responses to the use of those algorithms. So it's very hard for me to speculate on what will happen to that number.
Q If the use of Claude to write lyrics becomes widespread and pervasive, would that have any adverse impact on the potential market for Plaintiffs' lyrics?
ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Object to form.
A Not necessarily. Because as I outline in my report, a lot of the use cases of Claude to light -- write lyrics involve noncommercial users, includes personal use, and broadly account as market expansion.
And so there's certainly a possibility that a majority of the original lyrics created with Claude would be completely parallel or independent

217

of the existing industry, and so in that sense would have no effect on it.

Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) Leaving aside the noncommercial uses, if the use of Claude to write lyrics for commercial uses became widespread and pervasive, do you think that would have any adverse impact on the market for Plaintiffs' lyrics?

A The same logic applies. Because, again, there's a certain set of commercial use cases today, but those commercial use cases could expand greatly in a world where AI is able to produce lyrics, so it's entirely possible that there are lots of new commercial use cases that emerge without affecting the current industry or the preexisting market for Plaintiffs' lyrics.

Q What would those new use cases be?

A So for example, in -- in my classroom, I have a bunch of students who have very particular experiences or backgrounds, and I could imagine creating -- creating music tailored to improve the educational experience. No lyricist out there is providing that music right now, but I could imagine there's a service that provides that kind of experience for educators.

So there's many, many applications that we

218

can't even think about today where music could be created and could add to consumer welfare in a world where AI makes it cheaper to produce lyrics, especially ones that are hyperpersonalized.

Those markets right now are not catered to to by -- especially the -- the Plaintiffs' lyrics, for example.

Q Starting at paragraph 50 in your rebuttal report, you say that:

"AI is just as likely to benefit players in the music industry."

Do you see that?

A I do.

Q And you point -- and you cite as examples, Universal Music Publishing's agreements with Udio and Klay; is that right?

A Is there a paragraph you have in mind where I say that? Because in Section 2B, I'm not sure I say that between Points 50 and 58.

Q Okay. We can skip that. In this section you discuss "labor market impacts of AI," correct?

A Correct.

Q And in paragraph 56, you cite a study examining the influence AI had on the labor market

219

from 2010 to 2023, correct?

A Yes.

Q That study is -- the time period at issue in that study predates the introduction of Claude, doesn't it?

A It certainly predates most of the time that Claude was -- was active. I don't remember precisely the cutoff date for that study versus the introduction of Claude.

Q And would you agree that there have been significant advances in the capabilities of LLMs since 2023?

A LLMs --

ATTORNEY HOLTZBLATT: Object to form.

A -- certainly have -- have become more popular since 2023. And I will point out that this study in -- in Point 56 is just one of many, many, many studies in the section that talk about the labor market impacts of AI. And many of the other studies that I cite do include generative AI, including AI that was developed after 2023.

So you're right that this particular study is -- predates the -- the current generation of generative AI models, but the entire conclusion is based on a number of other studies where that's

220

taken into account.

Q (BY ATTORNEY MILLER) All right. Let's discuss that. In paragraph 57, you cite a study about "customer support agents," correct?

A Correct. The study is "Generative AI at Work."

Q And then one about "software developers"?

A Correct.

Q And one about "midlevel writing tasks"?

A Correct. That's the Noy Zhang study.

Q None of those studies are about -- or focused on writing song lyrics, do they?

A None of the studies are about song lyrics, per se, but the Noy Zhang study has a very close occupation. It has writing tasks, and it has tasks involving writing advertising copy, I believe.

So they do look at writing -- insofar as songwriting is an example of writing -- is the closest task in this -- this literature to lyrics, per se.

Q Do you think an analysis or a study about the effect of AI on writing advertising copy has relevance to the likely effects of AI on songwriters?

A As an economist, I have to pay attention

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