EXHIBIT 2

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Plaintiffs:

OPPENHEIM AND ZEBRAK, LLP
By: **Mr. Matthew J. Oppenheim, Esq.**
Mr. Corey Miller, Esq.
4530 Wisconsin Ave., NW, 5th Flr.
Washington, DC 20016

OPPENHEIM AND ZEBRAK, LLP
By: **Mr. Timothy S. Chung, Esq.**
461 5th Ave., Ste. 19th Flr.
New York, NY 10017

For the Defendant:

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR, LLP
By: **Ms. Sonal N. Mehta, Esq.**
2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400
Palo Alto, CA 94306

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR, LLP
By: **Mr. Louis W. Tompros, Esq.**
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109

MS. MEHTA: Understood, Your Honor. So I think we understand the scope of this supplemental briefing that you've asked for on Tuesday. Both sides can respond to that. And then we also have, obviously, other motions that are coming in to Your Honor. And then I understand you to be saying that insofar as we are going to argue there is a broader waiver, that is a new motion that we should bring, if we're going to argue that. I'm not suggesting that I want to file that motion or that we've made that decision yet, because, obviously, we'll see -- we need to sort of see how the next few weeks play out. But I understand you're saying that's not to be addressed on Tuesday, and we won't address that on Tuesday.

THE COURT: Right. Or, I mean, if you're going to address it, I guess I'm wondering where should that go? What is the scope of that argument and where should that go? Should that go back to Judge van Keulen or should that be here?

MS. MEHTA: I think -- and the reason I'm hesitating a little bit, Your Honor, is I think there is two sides to that particular issue. There is a question of whether we want additional information on the basis of a waiver, or whether at this point in the process they simply should be precluded on -- from relying on things where they have made a decision to selectively waive. And that is why I'm suggesting that what might make sense is for Your Honor to rule on this particular issue that's before you, and we will consider the question of

whether we intend to argue for preclusion, as opposed to ask for more discovery.

You know, what we absolutely do not think is appropriate is for them to say, well, now we're going to have new expert reports and we're going to rely on a whole bunch of information, and that's a concern. So that's why I'm being thoughtful about how best to tee up the next phase of this to Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I will also be frank of, like, this motion has been pending. And so I also think to say, okay, going for the gusto, we're going to try to do preclusion seems a little much as well. But that's first hit on this.

Let's do it this way, because I do think it, actually, there is -- this is complicated. And I, as parties have noted -- and the proof is in the pudding from the number of motions before Judge van Keulen, which continue to now -- which continue now to these other issues. I'm going to order parties to meet and confer before Tuesday as well, because I could see a world where it is, okay, you get this account information but you can't use it for anything beyond X; or we're going to contain it this way; or can we address it this way, in terms of the selective waiver.

I mean, I'm just wondering if there are ways which parties can come up -- because I don't know what these records look like. I do not -- I probably will after Tuesday, but I --

and you're welcome to have exhibits, if necessary, for this, that would be helpful. Do not bury me in paper. But I'm wondering, in looking down -- because part of this is, you know, what is plaintiff going to assert and use to prove its case? And so there are choices which are being made. And I could see this being litigated different ways in terms of going into trial. So I just -- I'm urging parties to meet and confer to see whether or not there are creative solutions that could be reached in terms of line drawing. And so I am going to order you to meet and confer by Tuesday.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, we're happy to do that. I would just ask if there is any flexibility at all on the timing? The parties' Daubert briefing is also due on Tuesday, and we have a lot of work to get that all on file. So even a couple of days would be -- would make a big difference, I think, to both sides.

THE COURT: I'm open to that. So how about Thursday of next week, or Thursday or Friday?

MR. MILLER: We could do Friday. That would be fine, Your Honor.

MS. MEHTA: Any day next week is fine for us, Your Honor. Maybe not Monday, but Tuesday through Friday is fine.

THE COURT: So I'm also going to require that parties meet and confer regarding this, and also file a status report on their meet and confer. Because I do wonder whether or not

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