```
1
    SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
    COUNTY OF NEW YORK:
                           TRIAL TERM PART 49
 2
                                             -- - X
    STATE OF NEW YORK, et al,
 3
                       Petitioners,
 4
 5
             - against -
 6
    DIRECT REVENUE, LLC, et al,
 7
                       Respondents.
 8
    Index Number: 401325/06
 9
                       60 Centre Street
                       New York, New York
10
                       October 20, 2006
11
    BEFORE:
12
            HONORABLE HERMAN CAHN, Justice.
13
14
    APPEARANCES:
15
       STATE OF NEW YORK
       OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
16
       ELIOT SPITZER
       Attorneys for Petitioner
17
       120 Broadway
       New York, N.Y. 10027-0332
18
       BY:
             JANE M. AZIA, ESO.
            And
19
       McCARTER & ENGLISH
       Attorneys for Petitioners
20
       100 Mulberry Street
       Newark, New Jersey 07102-4056
21
       BY:
            SCOTT S. CHRISTIE, ESQ.
22
       GOODWIN PROCTER, LLP
       Attorneys for Respondents Abral,
       Kaufman, R. Hood and A. Murray
23
       Exchange Place
24
       Boston, Mass. 02109
             DAVID J. GOLDSTONE, ESQ.
25
```

Appearances

DAVIS & GILBERT, LLP Attorneys for Respondent Direct Revenue, LLC 1740 Broadway New York, N.Y. 10019 BY: NEAL H. KLAUSNER, ESQ.

EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF & ABADY, LLP Attorneys for the Respondent Direct Revenue, LLC 75 Rockefeller Plaza New York, N.Y. 10019 BY: ANDREW G. CELLI, JR, ESQ.

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

THEODORE LUKEW

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, I note that the motion that I'm hearing now is basically motion number 003, which is a motion to dismiss.

Notwithstanding that, I would like in order to have the matter a little bit more rationally presented, I would like the Plaintiff in this case, State of New York, to argue first basically to tell me on the record exactly what the petition or what the proceeding is about.

MR. CHRISTIE: Yes, your Honor. Sure.

The Respondents' entire business is a creation and distribution of these incredibly abusive spyware programs. Once you get on the program, it will track every web site that the user uses, everything you type on the computer, typed on the web, and based on the information, the program will generate a stream of paths, and any time you are on line any time you turn the computer on, it will keep track of what you are doing on line.

These programs hide. They are

hidden in secret files from the user and evade any formal way in a conventional matter to delete the software, and it will reinstall itself against your wishes.

This software also provides

Respondents permanent access to your

computer. Any time they want access to your

computer in the future, they will be able to

do that.

Using this permanent software, they also will install other spyware programs.

They will install pop-ups in addition to their own programs. They will also install programs that redirect your web searches away from your chosen default search engine to Direct Revenues search engine.

THE COURT: How do I get Direct Revenue's spyware off of my computer?

MR. CHRISTIE: There are a couple of ways. One way is to farm it out to a third-party to do the dirty work for them.

Another thing they do, they will promise consumers other programs, other free programs, they will, on their own web sites, add advertisements on the web. They will

promise free games or screen savers, just download them for free. These programs are Trojan horses. They advertise a program, they decide they want a screen saver, Direct Revenue will install that screen saver and also install, secretly installed spyware programs.

Now they have the opportunity in describing the screen saver and games to say, we are giving you this software, in exchange for that you will also get this program so the consumer can make informed decisions whether to do that or not. Their advertisements for their screen savers, and games are Trojan horse programs that make no mention about the spyware program.

THE COURT: I presume Direct Revenue is not the only company or firm which does this kind of thing?

MR. CHRISTIE: There are a couple of other companies. There are a number of other companies in this area, a relatively new industry.

THE COURT: Okay. Has there been similar proceedings brought either in this

2.2

state or other states or Federal proceedings brought against other companies against Direct Revenue?

MR. CHRISTIE: A class action case against Direct survived the motion to dismiss in the State of Illinois. That case was eventually settled.

This office brought a case against a spyware company, Intermittent Media. That settled for \$8.25 million. The FTC has brought a number of actions like our action against a number of spyware companies for the same precise packages alleged in this action. They were settled.

THE COURT: In connection with these cases which were settled, both here and in the State of New York and the FTC case, was there a stipulation requiring the Respondents not to do certain things and to do certain things?

MR. CHRISTIE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do I have those stipulations submitted?

MR. CHRISTIE: I believe a couple of them are referenced to in our papers. They are only referenced and available on line.

Our office will be able to collect them.

THE COURT: Would you?

MR. CHRISTIE: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Having said that, who wants to argue the motion. ?

MR. GOLDSTONE: I'm happy, to your Honor. My name is David Goldstone.

THE COURT: Keep your voice up.

MR. GOLDSTONE: My name is David Goldstone. I'll speak today on behalf of all of the Respondents.

I'm also here today with Neal
Klausner of the Emery Celli law firm which has
represented Direct Revenue for a number of
years, including the company on its currently
consumer disclosure practices.

We are here today on a motion to dismiss. And, your Honor, I would like to give you a little background on Direct Revenue.

Direct Revenue is an Internet
advertisement business. It is essentially
like a publisher of a newspaper like the
Village Voice. The Village Voice gives away a
free newspaper with articles and information,

and is able to do that because it shows advertisements to consumers.

And that advertisement is part of the Village Voice's business. It's a business practice. It's very common, and particularly on the Internet. You can get a lot of -- you can read the New York Times for free on the Internet because they are showing you ads.

What Direct Revenue gives people for free is computer software programs. And its most popular computer software program they gave away for free is a program to let people use their computer as a telephone and make long distance calls, international calls for free.

And how Direct Revenue is able to give away software like that for free, the way it's able to do that, because it shows people ads. When Direct Revenue gives the service for free, it never took a dime. No allegation that a nickel was taken from any consumer.

Just like the Village Voice, take the freebie, you get the ads.

The AG clouded a couple of issues the way he described it. I want it to be

Ted Lukew, Official Court Reporter

absolutely clear to your Honor, the kind of consumer disclosure the AG is objecting to is historic. The practices described in the petition haven't been used in the company in over a year. The company, as your Honor recognizes, there's many companies in this industry presenting ads on the Internet.

THE COURT: Does the company, and this is one of the things that turn me, I sign up for or I buy from, I pick up a freebie from Direct Revenue. Besides showing me ads, does Direct Revenue also publish information about me or my use of my computer to other people?

MR. GOLDSTONE: No, your Honor. And another important --

THE COURT: That's what he said.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Your Honor, he uses the loaded term like spyware. In fact, was looking for spyware when the Attorney General conducted their investigation. Spyware like your Honor recognizes it, is software that collects information about you and uses it to publish to other people to get into your bank accounts, read your e-mail. Direct Revenue has no allegation --

THE COURT: You made it easy for

me. Because you compared it to the Village

Voice, it's a newspaper. I pick it up, and

whatever is in that paper that I pick up, I

have in my home, if I bring it into my home.

But whatever is in it, I keep out. Now the

same thing here. When I pick up your program,

I don't know, your freebie, what else am I

picking up?

MR. GOLDSTONE: When you, when you get the software program, you also get advertisements, and that you are clearly and conspicuously told -- first of all, you never get advertisements unless you get the freebie. And there is no allegation --

THE COURT: I'm picking up the freebie. You said the freebie is free telephone service.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Right.

THE COURT: Service similar to a telephone. So I get the freebie. I get ads?

MR. GOLDSTONE: Right.

THE COURT: Do you pick up information about my use of my computer?

MR. GOLDSTONE: Your Honor, the

allegations are that we're showing ads to the user, and that the ads were not disclosed in advance. And in fact that's why I brought the screen shots for your Honor. I can show your Honor the screen.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Your Honor, before you get anything, you are presented with a box that comes up on your screen, that comes up, and it is a clear choice for the consumer, yes or no. These are called buttons at the bottom of the box. If the person clicks no, they never get a single ad. That's undisputed. The box is labeled security.

This, by the way, is the Petitioner's own Exhibit that he submitted, Exhibit B-5. And just to blow it up so it will be easier for your Honor to read. It says --

THE COURT: Do you think it's easier for me to see? .

MR. GOLDSTONE: I'll read it.

"Do you want to install and run the latest version of flash talk."

That's the telephone.

" By clicking yes, you acknowledge that you have read and understood BetterInternet's customer policy agreement."

BetterInternet is the policy agreement, the terms of the agreement.

" And agree to be bound by its terms."

And a person who clicks -- you can see it in blue. And if you click on the blue, then this is the concurrent policy agreement that comes right up. And it says to the consumer, it mentions advertising, the second Paragraph. This is the first screen that comes up. The first screen that the user sees and says right here, in bold.

Section 2, functionality. Section 1 is acceptance of the agreement. Section 2 is functionality. And again, functionality.

This software delivers advertising as well as various promotional messages to your computer screen while you view Internet web pages.

Again, anybody who wants to click no doesn't get it. People have the opportunity at their leisure to read this. They don't --

Ted Lukew, Official Court Reporter

_

there's no pressure. They don't have to accept it right then.

And there's a case in the Second
Division of Moore vs. Microsoft where there is
a case brought under the exact same
provisions, General Business Law 349, where
they accused Microsoft. Because Microsoft was
using a kind of contract. This is known in
the industry as a click-wrap agreement,
because you accept it by clicking. Millions
are using it every day. That why we have an
amicus in. Because that confirms click-wrap
is a standard way of doing business on the
Internet.

Your Honor, the requirements are that we clearly disclose.

THE COURT: Okay. But now what do I get? I click yes, yes, I read it, what do I get?

MR. GOLDSTONE: What you'll get are ads. This is what you get. You get software. This case isn't about software. This is what they object to. And every ad that was presented, again, your Honor, the Petitioner's own Exhibit, every ad has a red

section in the upper right hand corner.

Anyone who doesn't want an ad can just click
the X, immediately goes away.

Now if people, if people want to know, you see the poll in the upper right hand corner. It's hard to see. It's clear to you on the screen. It says -- that's one of the brand names that was used, like the moon, Jupiter and Pluto.

You see in the upper right hand corner, there's a question mark. So if you have a question, if you have a question, why am I getting this ad? If you forgot you clicked yes, you are unsure, you click on the question mark -- and, your Honor, just to be clear, this is not Petitioner's Exhibit. This is what came up. And I gave Petitioner a copy of this. If there is any dispute, I haven't heard it.

This is what came up. You click on that question mark. It says service in the upper right hand corner. It has the same logo, and specifically says, tell you why you are seeing the ad because you received software. Then it says if you do choose to

uninstall Ceres contextual advertising, software, it can be safely and completely removed by going to this web site. See www.mypctuneup.com to get the uninstall tool.

They say we should provide an electronic trash can to throw out the software. It is undisputed that Direct Revenue is providing a trash can.

And go back to the contract we were looking at before, your Honor. I showed you the first screen before. Now you scroll down with your computer on the second screen.

Talked about Section 2 with functionality.

Section 3 -- again, Petitioner's Exhibit.

Section 3, "uninstall and remove software."

It says in the contract you may uninstall the software at any time by visiting www.mypctuneup.com.

There's no dispute that Direct
Revenue installed a special web site it
provided software on that web site so the
software can be removed. There's no dispute
that that software worked.

Your Honor, the petitioner is saying that Direct Revenue should have provided an

electronic trash can. Your Honor, it did provide an electronic trash can.

THE COURT: You told me that.

But you see, in your whole argument, you avoided something that the Attorney General has said which is what I asked you about. Is there anything published about the user to anyone else?

MR. GOLDSTONE: Okay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there information the user selected, which is basically what the Attorney General is pointing to, which basically is what the Attorney General has alleged.

MR. GOLDSTONE: That allegation, notwithstanding what the assistant said earlier today, that allegation is found nowhere in the petition or the affirmation. There is no allegation of any of that information.

MR. CHRISTIE: Our complaint is tracking information about ads. The ads software itself watches everything you do.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. If he indeed, or if Direct Revenue offered me

something, I'm the user, offers me something, but if you want, if you want to pick it up and you use it, we're going to show you ads.

We'll keep showing you ads until you tell us to stop by pushing on these things, what is wrong with that?

MR. CHRISTIE: If they did that clearly and conspicuously, we probably will not have a problem with the majority of their practice. But they don't say to consumers we're going to give you future flash talk in exchange for that, we'll give you spyware. They don't show it conspicuously at the same time. They show an ad and no mention of the spyware at all in the licensing agreement.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. You called it spyware. And then when your adversary says wait a minute, none of this is alleged in their papers.

Forget spyware. It's not spyware unless you tell me different.

MR. CHRISTIE: The term, FTC describes spyware is a program on your computer without you knowing about it, or software that gets in your computer and tracks

information about you back to someone else.

THE COURT: Counsel has said, and please correct me and correct him if what he is saying is not so. You said you do not allege that anything that Direct Revenue has done, publishes or broadcasts anything about the user, on the user's computer.

MR. CHRISTIE: That's not what we are alleging.

THE COURT: The only thing that you are alleging is that they are now furnishing ads.

MR. CHRISTIE: That's right. They are watching you.

THE COURT: And your only real complaint is that the ads ought to be, or somewhere there ought to be some information or something that is more readable or more visible to a consumer to be able to turn that off.

MR. CHRISTIE: Not knowing about it in the first place, up front, conspicuously what the terms of the transaction are. It's bedrock principal the terms of the transaction should be disclosed conspicuously. You cannot

bury the terms of the transaction in a license fee.

THE COURT: What about the example of the newspaper, the Village Voice?

MR. CHRISTIE: You take the Village Voice, you don't like it, you can throw it away.

THE COURT: You click on this, you don't like it, you punch "X".

MR. CHRISTIE: Consumers are not going to remember Paragraph 4 of a license agreement they may have or may not clicked on. There's no other way to get rid of it. The various majority of users get rid of software, they go to the ad remove file which software provides. Nearly every software you click on it, and it's gone. That's not what they did. They were removed. They found that too many people were removing their software removed it and got rid of it. They invented pot.

THE COURT: I asked the Attorney
General before if there were other
proceedings. And he said there were some
proceedings in front of the Federal, FTC I

Ted Lukew, Official Court Reporter

think it was, here in New York, which was settled. Were you involved in that?

MR. GOLDSTONE: No, I was not. We haven't handled any of those proceedings.

THE COURT: Are you familiar with any of those?

MR. GOLDSTONE: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: What were the terms that were agreed upon?

MR. GOLDSTONE: Your Honor, most significantly, in a case called advertising.com, a case was settled with the FTC with no damages whatsoever.

THE COURT: I know. But did the Respondents agree to do anything, make any changes?

MR. CHRISTIE: Yes, your Honor. The Respondents agreed to stop distributing advertising software without disclosing it in the advertising licensing agreement is one of the ways they distribute it.

THE COURT: Let him finish. The Respondent agreed to do anything else.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Your Honor, I'm not actually familiar with the details of the

II .

injunctive relief. All these cases proceeded by settlement.

THE COURT: I would like you to get me a copy of all those stipulations of the settlement agreement.

MR. CHRISTIE: Absolutely.

THE COURT: With a copy to your adversary.

When he gets it, I presume he will have it and present it to me within the next week or so. If you want to comment on it in a brief letter, you may.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Just to be clear, you are looking for the government enforcement proceedings.

THE COURT: The government enforcement proceedings and the State of New York case.

MR. CHRISTIE: The enforcement proceedings by us, there is also a class action case against Direct Revenue.

THE COURT: I wasn't asking about the class action. I was asking about the FTC case.

MR. CHRISTIE: Yes, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Three of us.

MR. CHRISTIE: That's right.

THE COURT: Those three I wanted.

And I want whatever done in New York State.

MR. CHRISTIE: Absolutely.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Just to be clear, as I mentioned earlier, the practice is that we culled from the Petitioner's Exhibit all previous practices that are over a year old. And the company's current practices are not being disputed in this case.

THE COURT: Fine. So tell me what is the company's current practices.

MR. GOLDSTONE: The current practices are much more accessive consumer disclosure which the Petitioner has no dispute with.

THE COURT: Is that so?

MR. CHRISTIE: I have not reviewed in detail their current disclosures.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm a consumer. Today I put on my PC. I'm asked to agree to the telephone service, whatever. I click on whatever I'm supposed to click on. How do I get off of it?

MR. GOLDSTONE: How do you?

THE COURT: Get off.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Well, this web site

- -

THE COURT: I am talking about today.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Click on that web site, again as I mentioned, every single ad that comes up --

THE COURT: But that's what you said it was a year ago. I'm asking what's today.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Oh, today.

Today the company still has a question mark. Still the company's firm practice. And in addition to that, the Petitioner mentioned a removed functionality. The company added that functionality.

THE COURT: Where is functionality found?

MR. GOLDSTONE: If you click on this "start" button, a menu pops up. And then there is a menu that says "control settings."

And then you click on control settings. And then another box pops up. And the company's view is the question mark was the simplest way

of disclosure. Petitioner has had a different view. But that doesn't make it a deceptive practice.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. Have you reviewed their current practice?

 $\label{eq:mr.christie:} \mbox{MR. CHRISTIE: I have not, your}$ Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We're going to take this as a, I'm going take this as a submission.

In the next week or so when you are getting me those other materials, why don't you also review their current practices. And in the letter in which you are going to submit, send me a submission. You will also send me a letter or brief on their current -- maybe their current practices are such that you are satisfied with.

MR. CHRISTIE: Once with their current practices they continued to show ads effective a year ago. A year ago they did not get disclosure of their program. Once it gets installed, it's installed. They did not notify them after the fact.

THE COURT: Why don't you look at it

and then tell me. Thank you. Thank you.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Your Honor, we are happy to go into just a couple other matters.

THE COURT: I said thank you. We are finished. That's a polite way of saying thank you.

Someone order this. Okay.

* * *

I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in this matter.

- Thrown her

Theodore Lukew

Official Court Reporter