25 27 1 1 to that, but I just wanted to make sure we're on the same page 2 ARBITRATOR GRISSOM: Oh. okav. 2 about any changes to the record that we already have. 3 MR. PELZ: -- so that you could -- you may not 3 Now, it sounds like the parties have pretty well 4 have yet had time to have read those. We would want to have stipulated that Mr. Fokas, again, is probably going to testify 5 called your attention to that testimony before some witnesses 5 at two intervals in the case. And so I feel like we have 6 would testify. We will surely try to keep that to a minimum. 6 covered everything that the parties have raised. 7 We maybe could try to do that at times if there's things at the 7 MS. NEISWENDER: I fear I have one question. 8 end of the day where there's a half-hour gap where we could 8 ARBITRATOR GRISSOM: Okav. 9 submit that same kind of information to you, I mean --9 MS. NEISWENDER: What is our timing for your --10 ARBITRATOR GRISSOM: Okav. 10 schedule of your day? It's an easy one. ARBITRATOR GRISSOM: Oh, okay. 11 11 MR. PELZ: -- before -- a time before a break or 12 something like that when we're waiting for a witness so that we 12 MS. NEISWENDER: Do you intend on holding the 13 don't otherwise take time that would be more productively used 13 hearing until 6 o'clock? What's the -- what's your preferred 14 14 with a witness. But we could anticipate instances where we start and stop times? 15 think it would be important for you to have heard specific 15 ARBITRATOR GRISSOM: Well, it seems to work to 16 16 start at 9:00 pretty well. If there's some day that we need to testimony before we offer the next witness. 17 ARBITRATOR GRISSOM: Okay, Well, if that is the 17 have an earlier start, that's okay. I have found, however, 18 18 case, you need to let me know because otherwise, when I -- when when we do that, that people run into different traffic 19 people say, here is some deposition testimony for you to read, 19 patterns between 8:00 and 8:30 than there are at 8:30 and 9:00, 20 sometimes I'm not going to have time to read that until the 2.0 and we don't end up starting at 8:30 anyway. I'm happy to 21 case -- you know, you-all are on your planes and gone. And I 21 accommodate you. You know, I can be here, but sometimes it 22 just -- I will treat that, I guess, as hearing time because 22 doesn't seem to do any good. But if that's what we need do, I 23 23 I'll be reading evidence at that point. If there's something want to accommodate you so we can get the case tried in an 24 that you need for me to read prior to an event that you know is 24 efficient way and to accommodate witnesses, if possible. And 25 coming. I would appreciate some warning on that just so that 25 we'll break, you know, a couple of short breaks mid-morning, 26 28 1 I -- I will try to find the time to read it if it's -- if it's 1 mid-afternoon, and possibly other very short breaks if needed. 2 not referred to in the hearing. I want to try to accommodate 2 We'll try to stop around noon for lunch, and 3 you, but I can't see around the corners like you-all know where 3 you-all can tell me if you need 45 minutes or an hour or 4 the corners are. So if you'll just give me a little warning, 4 whatever you need. You know, a normal lunch interval. We 5 and if it's not like a huge stack of pages or something for me 5 often work until 6:00, but there are some cases where somebody 6 to read after a long day -- you probably don't want me reading 6 can only be here that day and we need to go after that. And if it in that state anyway, but if you need me to read something 7 we need to do that, and we really need to, then we can, you prior to a -- another witness's testimony, just talk about it, 8 8 know, try ro do that. And we will do it for both sides. I 9 make it clear what the offer is for, and if there's some time 9 think everybody understands the cost of going late every day, 10 feature to that, and I will try to work with you. 10 because it makes everybody tired, maybe a little cranky and a 11 11 I think there's going to be some -- it sounds little bit less efficient in terms of how we get the testimony 12 12 like an agreed process for amending the designated testimony of 13 Mr. Meek, so I don't think we need to dwell on that. And also, 13 So that's the -- that's how -- my general 14 if there are exhibits that have already been tendered and that 14 guideline, but I understand every case has its own needs, and 15 are going to be amended with either wrong pages removed or 15 we'll try to accommodate those. 16 missing pages, if we can simply have a way of referring to that 16 MS. NEISWENDER: Okay. Thank you. 17 ARBITRATOR GRISSOM: Sure. At the risk of any 17 either -- if we're off the record, we need to clearly do it so 18 everybody can say amen to it. I would prefer, if possible, 18 further delay in the opening statements, is there anything else 19 that we do it tersely with a record notation so that everybody 19 y'all want to talk about? All right. Then we can move on to 20 at the end of the case knows that what is Exhibit 49 today will 20 the next stage and hear opening statements. 21 21 become a different 49 exhibit after that point. And when CLAIMANT'S OPENING STATEMENT 22 22 referring to it, we'll be referring to the amended one and we MR. PELZ: Good morning, again, Arbitrator 23 don't have to keep saying the amended 49. So we have a very 23 Grissom. 24 clear and clean record about what our exhibits are if they're 24 ARBITRATOR GRISSOM: Good morning. 25 going to be changed. All right? I know you all are accustomed 25 MR. PELZ: I'm Joel Pelz on behalf of Jenner &

31

32

JENNER & BLOCK LLP vs. PARALLEL NETWORKS, ET AL. 29 1 Block. 1 2 2 My opening statement this morning is going to 3 be, I think, remarkably sort of low tech, at least by today's 3 the -- both of those cases. There has been a recovery of standards. What I do have is two handouts that I would give to 5 you and give to Mr. Alibhai. I have a second copy I could give 5 6 to Mr. Lowenstein. What we have is one PowerPoint presentation 6 and one timeline. I did provide the timeline because I recall 7 8 8 on one of the motions you asked us specifically to submit 9 timelines, and I generally find them a very helpful tool and I 9 10 believe it might be helpful to you. The timeline has dates of 10 11 11 when certain events occurred that are going to be relevant to 12 the proceeding, and it also identifies the exhibit number that 12 13 we believe will support the statement that that event occurred 13 14 14 on that day. I do not intend to address everything that's on 15 that timeline this morning, but hopefully if we put in the 15 16 evidence that we believe we will put in, all of the items on 16 17 this timeline will be addressed during the course of the 17 18 presentation -- not this presentation but the presentation of 18 19 19 evidence. 2.0 I'm guided in making this opening statement by 20 21 what you said at the very beginning of your introduction that 21 22 this is the evidentiary hearing. You have received extensive 22 23 23 briefs submitted by the parties, talking about the law. We 24 understand that you probably read those briefs, maybe at least 24 25 once, maybe a couple of times, and you've read some of those 25 30 1 cases. Many of the issues in those briefs were also raised to 1 2 2 you in motions that you heard during the course of the process 3 getting us to this hearing. So I do not intend to spend any 3 4 significant amount of time talking about those cases or those 4 5 5

there was -- if there was a recovery in the QuinStreet or the Oracle cases. And as we now know, there has been a recovery in

850,000 in the QuinStreet case. There's been a recovery

already of 16-and-a-half million in the Oracle case. And there

is the potential opportunity for another 13 million in the

Oracle case, at least according to testimony as it's been received so far in the depositions; and that we will ask you to

make some fair allocation of that money to the lawyers who

spent their time -- the law firm that spent 25,000 hours of

time in reliance on the terms of the contract that had been proposed by Parallel Networks.

We believe that anything other than enforcing the contract, the contract that was proposed by Mr. Fokas who's here today, was sent by Mr. Fokas to Jenner & Block saying this is the contract that he wanted, it was the one that he told us -- the provisions he told us he wanted, it had the termination terms that he said he wanted, it had the compensation terms that he said he wanted. And we ask simply at the end of the day to enforce the contract.

Second guiding principle we suggest that you should use is look at what parties are saying now and what they said before we started litigation. It's easy to change your memory, your thoughts, your positions, after the fight starts, But one thing doesn't change. The contemporaneous documents

issues that you've already had exposure to. What I hope to address is the testimony, the evidence, what people -- the

documents and what people will say, at least what we anticipate

8 they will say in the course of this hearing.

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In hearing the evidence and in looking at the exhibits, we respectfully suggest that we -- at the end of the day, we'd like you to consider and do three things. First, we want you to enter an award that is fair and just. We believe that's in the spirit of the case, it's in the spirit of the contract, it's in the spirit of the arbitration clause that's in the contract which says that the matter was supposed to go to arbitration and not go to litigation if the parties had a dispute. We will at the end of the day ask you to be what we think is fair and just, not only to Jenner & Block, but also to Parallel Networks.

We suggest that the dollar amounts that you award to Jenner & Block are solely in your discretion, but we will present expert testimony that provides you with options with respect to dollar amounts to award Jenner & Block that are clearly within what the parties anticipated would be the division of monies to both the client and to the lawyers if

don't change. What the parties told each other in 2008 and

2009 as reflected in the documents that they wrote and

exchanged between each other doesn't change. We believe you

will find that one party here has taken a consistent position

with respect to the key issues. That party is Jenner & Block.

One party has taken a consistently opposite position in

litigation from what it said at the time of the events in 2008

and 2009. That party is Parallel Networks. 8

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also ask that you carefully review the contemporaneous documents. When you evaluate the testimony and the party positions, look at those documents because there's one thing that doesn't change. Those documents were there. They can't change the print on those documents of what they said and what the parties told each other at the time in 2008 and 2009. We ask you to consider not only what the parties did and said, but what they didn't do and what they didn't say at that time as opposed to today

Now, I've identified what I call six key questions. We can quibble there may be some more. There's probably a lot of other things, but the six key questions, and you've seen these types of things -- go to the second page of the PowerPoint. So you've seen these issues argued to you already at some length in the papers that you've received. There is a question of the assertion of whether or not the contingent fee agreement that was proposed by Parallel Networks