## BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN	THE	MAT	'TER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF:	)		
s.	DHAV	WAN	and	Α.	DHAV	WAN ,		)	OTA NO.	21017112
					Αr	opellant	.s.	)		
					1	- F 0 = 1 0 1 1 1		)		

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, September 19, 2023

Reported by:

CHRISTINA RODRIGUEZ Hearing Reporter

Job No.: 43767 OTA

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF:
6	S. DHAWAN and A. DHAWAN, ) OTA NO. 21017112
7	Appellants. )
8	·
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS,
17	commencing at 9:44 a.m. and concluding at
18	11:07 a.m. on Tuesday, September 19, 2023,
19	reported by Christina L. Rodriguez, Hearing
20	Reporter.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Administrative Law Judge:	JOSHUA LAMBERT TOMMY LEUNG
4		ANDREA LONG
5		
6	For the Appellant:	S. DHAWAN
7		
8	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD
9 L0		PAMELA BERTANI JASON RILEY
11		
L2		
13		
L4		
15		
L6		
L7		
L8		
L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		
23		
I		

1	INDEX	
2		
3	EXHIBITS	
4	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-2 were receive Lambert's minutes and orders at page 6	d in Judge
5	(Department's Exhibits A-S were receiv	
6	Lambert's minutes and orders at page 6	
7		
8		
9		
10	PRESENTATION	
11		PAGE
12	By Mr. Dhawan	7
13	By Ms. Bertani	15
14		
15	CLOSING STATEMENT	
16		PAGE
17	By Ms. Bertani	40
18	By Mr. Dhawan	43
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	California; Tuesday, September 19, 2023
2	9:44 a.m.
3	
4	
5	JUDGE LAMBERT: We are now on the record in
6	the Office of Tax Appeals oral hearing for the Appeal of
7	Sanjay and Anjali Dhawan. Case number 21017112. The
8	date is September 19th, 2023, and the time is 9:44 a.m.
9	My name is Josh Lambert, and I am the lead
LO	Administrative Law Judge for this hearing. And my
11	co-pellant's today are Judge Tommy Leung and Judge
L2	Andrea Long.
13	FTB, can you please introduce yourselves, for
L4	the record.
15	MS. BERTANI: Good morning. My name it Pam
L6	Bertani, and I am here representing the Franchise Tax
L7	Board Respondent in this matter.
18	MR. RILEY: Jason Riley. Also representing
L9	Franchise Tax Board.
20	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you.
21	And for the Appellants, can you please
22	introduce yourself, for the record.
23	MR. DHAWAN: Sanjay Dhawan. Taxpayer.
24	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you all for attending.
25	As agreed to by the parties, the issue is

1	whether the stock options and restricted stock units are
2	ordinary income or capital gain income. And this
3	applies the issue applies to 2015 through 2017.
4	And to be provided Exhibits A through S; and
5	Appellants provided Exhibits 1 and 2. There are no
6	objections and that evidence is now on the record.
7	Mr. Dhawan, we'll give you the opportunity to
8	explain your position for 30 minutes, and I can swear
9	you in also right now as so you could also testify as
10	a witness.
11	Can you please raise your right-hand.
12	
13	S. DHAWAN,
14	produced as a witness, and having been first duly sworn
15	by The Administrative Law Judge, was examined and
16	testified as follows:
17	
18	MR. DHAWAN: Yes, I do.
19	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thanks. So now you have 30
20	minutes, and you can
21	Oh, FTB had a question.
22	MS. BERTANI: Yeah. I just want a
23	clarification. So it was our understanding that OTA
24	has jurisdiction over tax year 2015, but not 2016 and
25	2017 because the Franchise Tax Board has not issued a

notice of action for '16 and '17. Only 2015.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Yeah. I remember reading that from the briefing and because our regulations say we can determine jurisdiction I think -- and it was brief by FTB on the jurisdiction issue. If you could mention that during your presentation, and then we can make a ruling on the issue of jurisdiction also.

MS. BERTANI: Thank you.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Thanks.

Okay and Mr. Dhawan, you can proceed. You have 30 minutes.

2.4

## PRESENTATION

MR. DHAWAN: Sure. Thank you.

Good morning Judges. Good morning FTB colleagues. So my name is Sanjay Dhawan. I'm an engineer by education, and I called San Francisco, Bay Area, as my home starting 1989 to come and build my technology vision. Since 1996, I have started in successfully build six different companies of various sizes.

The Wi-Fi that you use today was invented by me, and the very first Wi-Fi systems on this planet were built by me. I made technology contributions. I made many technology contributions, and I feel very honored

1 to be part of the Bay Area technology ecosystem.

Including -- some of you probably use CD that was licensed by Apple from my last company.

I share this because, you know, America has been great in platform for me, and I'm honored and thankful to the country for what it has offered to me. Of all people, I'm very happy to pay my fair share of taxes as that is my way of giving back to the country that has been so good to me.

The discussion today is more about the principle behind the transaction and the related taxes from it. It's really not about 100k for me personally, it's about sort of the principle of how, you know, taxation should be handled. You know, I say this because in my last tax filing -- and I paid 22 million in Federal and State taxes.

This was last -- last tax filing that I did.

And over the last so many years, I paid, you know, tens of millions in taxes, and I always said it's an honor to pay my fair share of taxes because, you know, it is my way of giving back to the country that has been so good to me and my family.

So let me go into some of the facts as I want to, you know, present to all of you. In August of 2020, I joined Symphony Services as it's CEO to transform and

build that company. This company was a major lost making-company, and I turned it around in it's strategy and financial's.

This company later merged with Teleca, a Swedish company, and became simply Teleca in 2012. And then in January of 2015, it was announced that Symphony Teleca is being acquired by Harman, which was a public -- publicly listed company on Nasdaq.

As part of this transaction, the following steps happened: There was a Share Purchase Agreement that was signed and executed in January of 2015. I have provided the copy of that agreement. Please note, it's a "Share Purchase Agreement."

The acquiring company, Harman, is buying the shares of my company, which I was CEO of -- called Symphony Teleca. This transaction-close happened in April of 2015. So it took them about three months from the day that the transaction was announced, in January of 2015 to April of 2015, to complete the transaction.

During this period, from January to April of 2015, all of, you know, Symphony Teleca -- options, shares, RSU's, et cetera -- what executed invested for inclusion in the transaction.

The Merger Agreement, the Share Purchase Agreement, calls out a for a multi-step process for

employees like me, and the consideration was given to all of the employees over the three-year period -- 2015, 2016, and 2017.

Basically, my -- my vested shares from my options and RSU's were purchased over a three-year period. This was done to make sure that the CEO and the management team and the employees stayed with the new company and increase the retention rate.

So while the other shareholders were paid immediately, the employees, CEO management team, and employees were paid overtime because the buying company wanted to make sure that, you know, they use the payment as a mechanism for retention of us in the -- in the new company that they were acquiring.

The Sale Purchase Consideration was reported to all employees, including myself, via Harman payroll. This was the biggest mistake. And this is the mistake, basically, that I made to -- to agree for this operation clause in the Share Purchase Agreement. So let me explain why, first, the buyer wanted to pay through the payroll.

The buyer, in this case, was a public company called Harman. We had 8,500 employees. We had almost operations in 21 countries. And the buyer, you know, forced this clause to pay the consideration of share

purchases through the payroll because they wanted to, you know, make it simpler and easier for them because they had to make these payments to thousands of employees, including myself, as the CEO of the company.

And because of that, they forced this clause in the Share Purchase Agreement and I, you know, to this day, sort of regret as the CEO. I could have put my foot down and said, "No. I don't want to agree to this." But I did agree to it, and it was part of the -- part of the Share Purchase Agreement.

This is the real cause of all confusion. The gains from the sale are the gains from the sale of stock. It's -- there's no other gains. There's, you know, basically, like -- like I said, the agreement is called a Shared Purchase Agreement. And basically, the acquiring company is acquiring the shares of my company.

And in reality, it should have been reported through a 1099; miscellaneous income; or some other way. Instead, you know, Harman was, you know, reporting it through the payroll. In -- to make -- to make matters more complicated, in 2016, Harman, the public company quote, unquote by Samsung.

And now, you know, sort of the reporting of, you know, the payrolls and, you know, the company that has 350,000 employees worldwide becomes, you know, sort

of, you know, way, way, too complicated to sort of, you know, get every single thing, you know, right from a reporting standpoint.

Since I was employee number one and the CEO of the company, the reporting through the Harman payroll applied to all of us, including me. Basically, the purchase price minus the share cost was calculated per employee, and this along was paid with a payroll of Harman.

This is why, you know, the -- one of the most important sort of documents that I have submitted to FTB and to the Judges here are the documents coming from Harman payroll. If you look at that document, it really clearly says the, you know, my normal income which is my base salary. It lists my bonus income, which is the normal ordinary income that I earn every year based on bonus.

But then it also lists, very clearly, the income that is coming from the sale of these shares under the Sale Purchase Agreement. And I've, you know, given the documents for 2015, 2016, and 2017.

And this income, the separation of the income

-- ordinary income, which is from my normal job for, you
know, which is the base salary and the bonus and the
separate income where it lists the income coming from

the purchase of these shares from the transaction.

You know, when I -- I want to quote an IRS -- IRS publication, topic number 409. Which says that, you know, everything you own and use for personal investment purpose, is a capital asset. Excludes income. Examples include a home, personal-used items like household furnishes, and stocks or bonds held as investments.

When you sell a capital asset, the difference between the adjusted bases in the asset in the amount you realize from the sale, is a capital gain or capital loss. In this case, you know, the income that we're discussing here, is the income that was generated by the Share Purchase Agreement. Nothing else. That is what it was.

Since all the shares were own-invested between January and April of 2015, this is the period when we first announced and signed the Share Purchase Agreement, and the period when the actual transaction-close happens. The treatment of the gain loss from these shares must be handled as a short or long-term capital gains.

If the reporting of the income was done properly by the buyer, meaning, you know, not through the payroll, but -- but through the normal, you know, 1099 process, we wouldn't be sitting here. We wouldn't

be having this discussion at all because, you know, but it happens all the time.

2.4

If you look at the 1099 I received from my last public company, Cerence -- as I do my taxes for 2022 -- has the same 1099, you know, which is with regards to the Share Purchase Agreement that I'm including in my 2022 taxes.

The 2015 taxes treated the transaction income as short-come capital gains since I held the shares for less than one year.

And my 2016 and 2017 taxes treated the transaction income as long-term capital gains. Although for California State -- for FTB, there is really no difference in the tax rate for short or long-terms. It's really immaterial whether it's a short-term or a long-term capital gains.

So in summary, the shares were invested and acquired in January through April of 2015, and the consideration for the sale of these shares took place in 2015, '16, and '17 and has a treatment should be short or long-term capital gains.

Since this transaction is about a company purchasing the assets of another company through a Share Purchase Agreement, I just simply cannot understand why there is this debate that this shares, which are being

1	purchased, are not capital assets.
2	That's all I have to say. Thank you.
3	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Dhawan.
4	Ms. Bertani, do you have any questions for
5	Mr. Dhawan?
6	MS. BERTANI: Not at this time, Judge. Thank
7	you.
8	JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thanks.
9	I'll turn to the panel and see if they have
LO	any questions.
11	Judge Leung, did you have any questions?
L2	JUDGE LEUNG: Thank you. By this time, maybe
13	afterwards, I'll have questions. Thank you.
L4	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thanks.
15	And Judge Long, do you have any questions?
16	JUDGE LONG: I do not I do not have any
L7	questions, at this time, thank you.
18	JUDGE LAMBERT: And this is Judge Lambert. I
L9	have no questions, at this time, but maybe after FTB's
20	presentation. So we can move on to FTB's presentation
21	which is set for about 60 minutes.
22	Ms. Bertani you can proceed. Thanks.
23	
24	PRESENTATION
25	MS. BERTANI: Thank you.

This case involves Appellants' re-characterization of ordinary income as capital gains income for tax year 2015.

2.4

Respondent has brief the issue of jurisdiction in response to OTA's request for additional briefing, and maintains that the issue on appeal is limited to tax year 2015. As respondent has not issued a notice of action or any other actionable document for tax years 2016 and 2017.

Mr. Dhawan's 2015 form W-2 from employer

Symphony Teleca Services, which is at Respondent's

Exhibit D, page 6, reports over \$6,000,000 dollars in wages, tips, and other compensation which Appellants reported a state wages on their 2015 California Tax

Return.

After adjustments, Appellants reported \$5,997,117 dollars of taxable income. Re-characterized \$5,717,899 dollars as other income. And on Appellant's Schedule D to their 2015 form 1040, Appellants reported a \$5,717,899 dollar short-term capital gain; offset by an \$831,384 dollar long-term capital loss.

Resulting in a \$4,886,515 dollar capital gain which Appellants reported on their 2015 California Tax Return at Respondent's Exhibit D, page 5.

As reflected in the 2015 notice of Proposed

Assessment, Respondent's Exhibit I, page 1, Respondent proposed to disallow their reported capital gain and re-characterized the reported other income as ordinary income, resulting in an \$828,384 dollar increase in Appellant's 2015 taxable income.

2.4

And therein lies the issue on appeal: Whether Appellants reported income received from the disposition of stock options and restricted stock units constitutes ordinary income or capital gains income.

Respondent respectfully submits that

Appellants receive this income in connection with

Mr. Dhawan's performance of services as an employee of

Symphony, and subsequently Harman.

Because the options and RSU vesting was expressly conditioned on two key conditions: Number one, Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with his employer through the vesting period; and number two, the company's achievement of specific performance related goals set forth in Mr. Dhawan's Symphony Employment Agreement.

And it's this linkage of Appellant's stock options and RSU compensation to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment and the company's achievement of specific performance related goals that establishes the corresponding compensation paid on vesting was intended

as compensation for Mr. Dhawan's services during this specified vesting period, and therefore constitutes ordinary income, and not capital gain income.

In fact, the record will show that on several occasions, Appellants expressly conceded to respond in his determination in this regard and agreed that Appellant's 2015 options and RSU income constitutes ordinary income.

Respondent's Exhibit Q, page 1, comprises an exert from Appellant's May 9, 2021, Reply Brief in which Mr. Dhawan states quote:

"I have agreed that the 2015 taxes should not include the reclassification of ordinary income as capital gain because the transaction was done in 2015, and the stocks were brought and sold in the same month and held for less than a year."

Closed quote.

2.4

Respondent's Exhibit Q, page 3, also comprises an exert from Appellant's May 2021 Reply Brief in which Mr. Dhawan states, quote:

"I agree with the determination for tax year 2015. All the RSU's and stock options were exercised and owned by me upon execution of the Merger Agreement in 2015. The merger consideration that was paid to me in 2015 can be treated as ordinary income, and I agree

1 with it."
2

2.4

Closed quote.

Respondent's Exhibit Q, page 8, comprises another exert from the 2021 Reply Brief. The statement of facts in which Appellant states quote:

"I am okay with not classify -- reclassifying the 2015 income and agree with the FTB's proposal."

Closed quote.

The last two documents were also produced in conjunction with Appellant's 2021 opening brief.

For the first time in the appeal record, after offering these express concessions in October 2021, Appellants asserted that Mr. Dhawan's 2015 stock options and RSU income should no longer be characterized as ordinary income, but rather as the sale of a capital asset.

Now, Appellants characterize the 2015's options and RSU income as an asset sale, and not ordinary income.

Appellant's reasoning in this regard is proffer in Respondent's Exhibit R, page 1, in which Appellants contend the only reason that Appellants previously agreed with Respondent's 2015 determination is that the California Tax Code treats short-term and long-term capital gains the same, and Appellant contends they've

provided proof that the W-2 income was a combination of Mr. Dhawan's normal salary and bonus and stock sale income.

Hence, Appellants cannot agree with the 2015 tax adjustments proposed by Respondent. However, the earning statements and employer payroll records that Appellants proffer as evidence at Appellant's Exhibit 2, pages 1 through 6, do not constitute a legal basis for characterizing Appellant's options and RSU income as capital gain's income.

The correct legal standard for making this determination is set forth in IRS C, section 83A, in corresponding case law. Appellants proffer no legal precedent or evidence sufficient to substantiate it's characterization of the 2015 options and RSU income as capital gains income.

As the evidence of record will demonstrate, particularly based on Mr. Dhawan's Employment Agreement with Symphony and the 2015 Merger Agreement itself, Mr. Dhawan's entitlement to stock options and RSU income is inextricably in contractually linked to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with Symphony, and subsequently Harman, and the company's achievement of specific performance related goals which establishes that corresponding income was intended as compensation for

services, and therefore constitutes ordinary income.

Internal Revenue Code, section 83A, which is incorporated in the California Law by Revenue and Taxation Code, section 17081, governs the taxation of property such as Appellant's stock options and restricted stock units that's transfer -- transferred in connection with the performance of services.

Under section 83A, gross income for tax purposes includes income from such property in the first year in which the rights of the person having the beneficial interest in the property are transferable or a not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture, whichever occurs earlier.

A substantial risk of forfeiture exist where the rights of a person in property are conditioned directly or indirectly upon the future performance of substantial services by an individual. The rights of a person in property are transferable only if the rights in such property of any transferee are not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture.

In the Appeal of Stabell, a presidential OTA opinion, OTA analyze whether Appellant in that case established error in Respondent's determination that a portion of Appellant's gross income from the vesting of long-term incentive plan, or LTI mirror shares,

constituted California's source income. And in doing so, OTA analyzed IRC, section 83A.

2.4

In that case, through his employment, Mr.

Stabell was awarded LTI mirror shares and the award

letter -- the corresponding award letter explained the

LTI award investing. Expressly stating that the vesting

of the LTI shares was subject to two conditions: Number

one, Appellant's continued employment with the employer

through vesting; and number two, the company's

achievement of specific performance related goals.

Citing IRC's, section 83A, and the express vesting conditions stated in the award letter, OTA addressed the substantial risk of forfeiture and performance of services statutory requirements.

With respect to the substantial risk of forfeiture component, OTA found that Appellant's LTI mirror shares remain subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture until the stated vesting dates because the mirror share value payments on the vesting dates were specifically conditioned on Appellant's continued employment and the timely achievement of the designated performance related goals.

Thus, Appellant's LTI compensation remains subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture until the specified vesting dates, and the income resulting from

the LTI vesting was properly recognized as income when the shares vested and Appellant was paid for his shares by his employer.

With respect to the property transfer in conjunction with services component, the OTA found, quote:

2.4

"The vesting of the mirror shares was specifically related to -- to and made contingent upon Appellant's continued employment with the group on the vesting dates any achievement of specific performance related goals."

The linking of the mirror shares to

Appellant's continued employment with the group and the groups' achievement a specified performance related goals establishes that the LTI compensation paid on vesting was in fact intended as compensation for Appellant's services during the vesting period under the reasoning in LoBue, as it was intended to incentivize Appellant and secure better services for Appellant during the period.

Thus, the LTI compensation paid to Appellant in that case constitutes compensation for Appellant's services performed during the vesting period. OTA concluded that the LTI compensation constitutes gross income from services performed in part of California.

In it's Opening Brief, Supplemental Brief, and Reply Brief, Respondent discuss in detail Supreme Court Precedent and Commissioner v. LoBue; 9th Circuit Court of Appeal Precedent and Alvaz v. Commissioner; State Board of Equalization Precedent in Appeal of Parell; and the Tax Court's Opinion and Cosmin v. Commissioner; all of which affirm Respondent's determination that Appellant's stock options and RSU income, which is expressly linked to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment through vesting and the company's achievement of specific performance related goals, is intended as compensation for services, and therefore constitutes as ordinary income and not capital gains income.

With this Precedent in mind, I will now turn to the Evidentiary Record to establish that Appellant's stock options and RSU income was intended as compensation, and therefore constitutes ordinary income.

Two operative documents extensively govern the disposition of Mr. Dhawan's stock options and RSU income as a Symphony employee and subsequently Harman. Mr. Dhawan's 2010 Symphony Employment Agreement and the 2015 Merger Agreement itself.

With respect to the IRC, section 83A, substantial risk of element, Appellants confirm as Mr. Dhawan has on the record today, and also a

Respondent's Exhibit Q, page 3, that all the RSU's and options were exercised and owned by Appellants upon the execution of the 2015 Merger Agreement.

2.4

Disclosures scheduled 3.14 to the 2015 Merger Agreement, which is at Respondent's Exhibit S, page 11, also confirms that the stock options and RSU's vested in 2015 upon execution of the Merger Agreement subject to the terms and conditions of Mr. Dhawan's 2010 Symphony Employment Agreement.

The 2010 Symphony Employment Agreement conditions liquidity options vesting on: Number one, a change in control which here was the 2015 Harman merger; number two, Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company through the change and control; and three, the company's achievement of specific related goals.

RSU vesting is conditioned on Mr. Dhawan's continued employment through vesting; the company's achievement of designated performance related goals; and in connection with a change in control, Mr. Dhawan's entitled to receive full and immediate vesting with respect to this specified portions of the RSU's.

These documents establish that Mr. Dhawan's stock options and RSU's remain subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture until the stated vesting dates because the correspondent dates on vesting were

specifically conditioned on Mr. Dhawan's continued employment and the company's achievement of performance related goals.

2.2

Thus, Appellants' options and RSU income remains subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture until 2015 when the Merger Agreement was executed. An income resulting from the options and RSU's is properly recognized as income when the options and RSU's vested, and Appellants were correspondently paid by Mr. Dhawan's employer in 2015.

With respect to IRC, section 83A, the performance of services element, Mr. Dhawan's Symphony Employment Agreement and the Merger Agreement establishes that Appellants' options and RSU vesting is expressly linked to two key components:

Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company through vesting and the company's achievement of specific performance related goals, which according to your decision in Appeal of Stabell, renders corresponding income intended as compensation and consequently ordinary income, and not capital gains income.

Turning now to the 2010 Symphony Employment
Agreement, which is at Respondent's Exhibit O, pages 4
through 17. Paragraph four of the 2010 Symphony

Employment Agreement sets forth the requirements from Mr. Dhawan's eligibility to receive stock options and restricted stock units.

Paragraph four specifically states that in connection with Mr. Dhawan's employment with the company, Mr. Dhawan would be eligible to receive grants of equity awards in the form of stock options and restricted stock units based on the common stock of the company.

Under the paragraph 4A, sign-on option, which is at Respondent's Exhibit O, page 5, Mr. Dhawan will be granted an option for the purchase of \$1,250,000 shares of common stock with vesting expressly linked to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with Symphony through each applicable vesting date.

Under the paragraph 4B, liquidity option,
Respondent's Exhibit O, page 5, Mr. Dhawan will be
granted an option for the purchase of \$1,000,000 shares
of common stock.

Eligibility in vesting are linked to three elements: Number one, the change in control; number two, the achievement of share price hurdles in connection with the liquidity event as set forth in Exhibit C to the Symphony Employment Agreement; and expressly on Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with

Symphony through the liquidity event.

Under the paragraph 4C, restricted stock units provision, at Respondent's Exhibit 0, pages 5 and 6, Mr. Dhawan will be eligible to receive five annual grants of RSU's covering an aggregate of \$1,250,000 shares of common stock.

Vesting is subject to the company's achievement of performance related goals set forth in Exhibit B, to the Symphony Employment Agreement, to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company and in connection with the change in control, Mr. Dhawan will be entitled to receive full and immediate vesting with respect to the specified portion of RSU's.

According to this provision, if the applicable performance objectives for the physical year were not achieved, the award of RSU's would be forfeited and canceled without payment to Mr. Dhawan. Also, according to this provision, in the event of the termination of Mr. Dhawan's employment, any outstanding, unvested RSU's then held by Mr. Dhawan will be automatically forfeited and canceled as of the date of Mr. Dhawan's employment termination without payment to Mr. Dhawan.

Under the paragraph three, performance bonuses provision at Respondent's Exhibit O, page 5, commencing with physical year 2010, Mr. Dhawan was eligible to

receive an annual \$335,000 dollar performance bonus subject to a \$500,000 dollar maximum.

2.4

Eligibility for the performance bonus is linked to the company's achievement of target business plan and objectives based on performance objective set forth in Exhibit B to the Employment Agreement.

Exhibit B to the 2010 Symphony Employment

Agreement, at Respondent's Exhibit 0, pages 15 and 16,

sets forth the annual performance objectives applicable
to the vesting of shares represented by the RSU's.

Exhibit C, to the 2010 Symphony's Employment Agreement,

sets forth the liquidity option's price share hurdles.

Now, that's at Respondent's Exhibit 0, page 17.

So to recap, according to to the Symphony Employment Agreement, the paragraph 4A, sign-on option, is expressly contingent on Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company through each applicable vesting date.

The paragraph 4B, liquidity option, is expressly contingent on the company's achievement of share price hurdles in connection with the liquidity event as set forth in Exhibit C and to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company through the liquidity event.

The paragraph 4C, restricted stock units

grant, is expressly contingent on the achievement of the performance objective set forth in Exhibit B, to the Employee Agreement, and expressly contingent on Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company through vesting.

2.4

The paragraph three, performance bonus, is expressly contingent on the achievement of the performance objective set forth in Exhibit B, to the Symphony Employment Agreement, and on Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company through vesting.

This linkage of Mr. Dhawan's stock options and restricted stock units and performance bonus, the linkage of this compensation to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company through vesting and the company's achievement of specific performance related goals establishes that corresponding compensation paid to Appellants upon vesting, was explicitly intended as compensation for Mr. Dhawan's services through the vesting period.

The stock options, RSU's, and performance bonuses were intended to incentivize Mr. Dhawan's performance and secure optimal services from him during the course of his employment with Symphony.

Under IRC, section 83A, and corresponding case law, Mr. Dhawan's options, RSU, and bonus compensation

constitutes compensation for services, and therefore is properly characterized as ordinary income and not capital gains income.

2.4

And now turning to the 2015 Merger Agreement, which is at Respondent's Exhibit B, pages 1 through 33. The 2015 Merger Agreement makes clear that Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with Symphony, and subsequently Harman through the 2015 merger, was essential to the merger being consummated.

According to the 2015 Merger Agreement at Respondent's Exhibit B, page 2, were as concurrently with the execution of this agreement as a condition and inducement for Parent's willingness to enter into this agreement, Mr. Dhawan is entering into an Employment Agreement with Parent, which is Harman.

Pursuant to the Merger Agreement, Article 9, conditions of closing, paragraph 9.02H, the Employment Agreement with Sanjay Dhawan shall be in full force and effect, and Mr. Dhawan shall not have seized employment with Harman. That's at Respondent's Exhibit S, page 3.

Discloser's Schedule 3.14, to the 2015 Merger Agreement, which is at Respondent's Exhibit S, page 11, confirms the applicable vesting date as the merger date in 2015 and specifically links Mr. Dhawan's entitlement to options and RSU compensation to Mr. Dhawan's

continued employment with the company through vesting and the company's achievement of specific performance related goals.

2.4

Discloser's Schedule 3.14 states at

Respondent's Exhibit S, page 11, all of the options

listed in NX 3.05A accelerated vest upon a change in

control;

The restricted stock units listed in NX 3.05 that were granted in 2011 accelerate in vest upon a change in control;

And the RSU's listed in NX 3.05A that were granted in 2014 accelerated vest upon a change in control with respect to 50 percent of such restricted stock units.

Pursuant to Mr. Dhawan's liquidity option as defined in his Employment Agreement to purchase one million shares of the company's common stock, which was granted on October 21, 2010, a number of shares subject to such option will be eligible to vest. Subject to:

Number one, a timely change in control; number two, the achievement of specific performance related goals. And number three, to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment through the change and control.

Merger Agreement, NX 3.05A, list Mr. Dhawan's RSU's at Respondent's Exhibit P, pages 1 through 3. The

RSU's listed in NX 3.05A, also appeared to be listed in Merger Agreement's Schedule 1.03B. And Merger Agreement Schedule 1.03B is at Respondent's Exhibit S, page 7.

According to NX 3.05A, the number of RSU's listed extensively represent, quote:

2.4

"The number eligible to vest on the occurrence of either an IPO or a change of control if one of these events occurs within five years. Until the trigger, the shares aren't actually vested per eligible to vest upon the occurrence of the trigger."

And this next sentence is underlined.

This is not applicable for Sanjay Dhawan's RSU's as this is governed by his Employment Agreement separately. That's at Respondent's Exhibit P, page 3. Thus according to NX 3.05A, the disposition of Mr. Dhawan's RSU's is governed by his Employment Agreement.

And just to note, I mean, NX 3.05A does not specify which Employment Agreement is referenced here -- meaning the Symphony Employment Agreement or his subsequent Harman Employment Agreement -- but under either of the two, Mr. Dhawan's RSU's vest subject to his continued employment with the company and the company's achievement of specific performance related goals.

Under Merger Agreement, section 1.03A, that provision specifies the merger's effect on stock options. Which is at Respondent's Exhibit B, page 5.

To the extent that the Merger Agreement, section 1.03A, contemplates the disposition of Mr. Dhawan's liquidity options pursuant to the Symphony Employee Agreement recall that the liquidity options vested is linked to a change and control, Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company and the company's achievement of specific performance related goals.

Section 1.03B specifies the merger's effect on RSU's, which is at Respondent's Exhibit B, pages 5 and 6. Mr. Dhawan's entitlement to RSU compensation is linked again to his continued employment with the company.

In fact, if Mr. Dhawan terminated employment with Symphony or it's affiliates before applicable vesting dates set forth in Schedule 1.03B, set forth of the Merger Agreement, then Mr. Dhawan would forfeit a corresponding compensation.

That provision, section 1.03B, states that it being understood, that if the employment of the applicable restricted stockholder with Symphony Teleca Corporation and its affiliates terminates before a vesting dates set forth in Section 1.03B, the right to

the corresponding restricted consideration shall be forfeited any such consideration so forfeited, a forfeited amount.

2.4

So here again, under the 2015 Merger

Agreement, the linkage of Mr. Dhawan's options and RSU's
to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company,
through vesting and the company's achievement of
specific performance related goals, establishes that the
options and RSU compensation paid to Appellants upon
vesting was intended as compensation for Mr. Dhawan's
services during the applicable vesting periods under the
reasoning in Stabell, Alvaz, and LoBue; and such
compensation is properly characterized as ordinary
income and not capital gains income.

Under IRC, Section 83A, and corresponding case precedent -- particularly the Appeal of Stabell opinion -- Mr. Dhawan's 2010 Symphony Employment Agreement and the 2015 Merger Agreement expressly conditioned vesting, and Mr. Dhawan's entitlement to the stock options and RSU's conditions that on two key elements:

Number one, Mr. Dhawan's continued employment through vesting; and number two, the company's achievement of specific performance related goals.

Again, this linkage of the options and RSU compensation to continue employment and the achievement

1 of performance goals establishes that Appellant's 2 corresponding compensation was intended as compensation 3 for services performed during the vesting period as it 4 was intended to incentivize Mr. Dhawan and secure better 5 services from him during that period. Consequently, Appellant's options and RSU 6 compensation constitutes ordinary income and not capital 7 gains income. 8 9 This concludes my presentation. And I'm happy 10 to take questions. 11 Thank you, Ms. Bertani. JUDGE LAMBERT: 12 I'll turn to the panel to see if they have any 13 questions for either party. 14 Judge Leung, do you have any questions. 15 JUDGE LEUNG: Judge Lambert, not at this time. I'll wait towards the end. 16 Thank you. 17 JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thanks. 18 And Judge Long do you have any questions. 19 JUDGE LONG: This is Judge Long, I have no 20 questions. Thank you. 21 JUDGE LAMBERT: This is Judge Lambert. 22 I quess Mr. Dhawan I'll just -- and now that 23 FTB has given their arguments and their pointing to the 2.4 performance related goal aspects and the contract. Just

how would you respond to that -- those arguments.

25

MR. DHAWAN: Sure.

So firstly, there was -- I did not receive even a single dollar of consideration for Symphony Technology shares through any other means but through the three payrolls that I have submitted the details; 2015, 2016, and 2017.

All the vesting and all the clauses that, you know, FTB mentioned, they all seize to exist with the Merger Agreement.

So all the change and control, you know, performance options of my, you know, Symphony Teleca employment letter -- et cetera, et cetera -- all of that stuff seize to exist as the merger happened which was, as I mentioned, announced in January of 2015 and executed for a completion in April of 2015.

The only reason why -- only reason, and it is documented in the Merger Agreement, the only reason why thousands of employees were paid their merger consideration for purchasing their shares by the buyer through the payroll was to make it convenient so that these thousands of employees, including myself, who were based in 21 different countries.

And Harman felt that they want to make the payments through those, you know, through the payroll because all the countries have payrolls running and

doing payments. Otherwise becomes, you know, you know, highly cumbersome process.

I am not a tax lawyer. I, you know, when initially the FTB contacted me for the audit, they raised three issues in that audit. The first two issues FTB has considered and said, "Okay Sanjay, you've given us the documentation, and everything is all good."

The third matter, this is the only matter that has been opened, and in my earlier responses, you know, when I was basically, you know, I was trying to -- trying to close the matter.

And from a -- my understanding of the tax code for Franchise Tax Board for California, there is really no difference in the short-term, you know, capital gains verses -- verses ordinary income. And my thing is why are we fighting this. There is really no difference.

So lets close the -- close the matter. Having said that, the 100 percent of the income related to this transaction was paid through this payroll, and none was linked to, you know, performance or any other clauses.

There were new agreement that was put by the buyer, Harman, that, you know, FTB referenced. And the income for that, including the LTI reference that miss Pam was making was absolutely attached to my continued employment and performance.

Having said that, if you look at the payroll slips, I'm looking at 2016 one here -- I'm not able to find the 2015 one -- but, in the 2016 one, it clearly says STC is sub. There is a column here which basically says that, you know, of the \$8.4 million of total income in 2016, 7.067 came from the income from this Merger Agreement.

The Harman income; the Harman LTIP income; the Harman bonus income -- which is absolutely considered as, you know, as ordinary income -- was separate and was reported separately.

So coming back, you know, it's difficult for me to -- to understand why the income, which was reported by the buyer for their convenience through the payroll systems across the world, you know, I'm being forced to sort of, you know, treat it as order ordinary income.

It is the income for the purchase of my previous company. There were no other performance or other clauses that were associated with it because my Employment Agreement with Symphony Teleca seized to exist in April of 2015 once the Merger Agreement was completed.

And, in fact, if you look at, you know, there were different salaries, different bonus plans and all

1 that stuff; and the new bonus plan, new salary, got into 2 effect starting April of 2015. And the previous agreement sort of seized to exist. 3 4 So that's -- that's my explanation, Judge. 5 JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Dhawan. I will now move to closer marks with FTB. 6 7 you wanted to give closer marks and then I'll go back to Mr. Dhawan's for his closer marks. 8 9 So, Ms. Bertani, if you wanted to proceed with 10 that for five minutes. 11 12 CLOSING STATEMENT 13 MS. BERTANI: Thank you, Judge. Thank you, 14 Judge. 15 In closing, much like the Appellant's offer letter in your Appeal of Stabell opinion, here Mr. 16 17 Dhawan's Symphony Employment Agreement and the Merger Agreement, expressly link Appellant's stock options and 18 19 RSU's vesting to two specific conditions: 20 Number one, Mr. Dhawan's continued employment 21 with his employer through vesting; and number two, the 22 company's achievement of specific performance related 23 goals in a timely manner. 2.4 This linkage establishes that Appellant's

stock options and RSU compensation paid on vesting in

25

2015 was, in fact, intended as compensation for Mr.
Dhawan's services during the vesting period, and
therefore constitutes ordinary income and not capital
gains income.

2.4

Moreover, the evidence here in record in this case demonstrably establishes that Appellant's options and RSU income constitutes ordinary income and not capital gains income.

Number one, Mr. Dhawan's 2015 form W-2 issued by Symphony, expressly characterizes Mr. Dhawan's income; including the options and RSU income as state wages, tips, et cetera. That's Respondent's Exhibit D, page six.

Number two, Appellants reported the 2015 form W-2 income as state wages on line 12 of their 2015 California Tax Return. That's at Respondent's Exhibit D, page two.

Number three, Appellants expressly concede multiple times during the course of this appeal that Respondents correctly characterize Appellant's 2015 options and RSU income as ordinary income -- at Respondent's Exhibit Q, pages 1, 3, and 8.

The Employment Agreement expressly links

Appellant's options and RSU vesting and eligibility to

two key Appeal of Stabell conditions; establishing that

the corresponding income is intended as compensation.

2.4

Number one, Mr. Dhawan's continued employment with the company through vesting; and number two, the company's achievement of specific performance related goals. That's at Respondent's Exhibit O, pages 5 and 6.

And number five, the 2015 Merger Agreement expressly links Appellant's options and RSU income to the two Stabell conditions; establishing that corresponding income was intended as compensation of services, and therefore constitutes ordinary gross income.

And I will refer to Merger Agreement disclosure schedule 3.14, at Respondent's Exhibit S, page 11; Merger Agreement Annex 3.05A, which is at Respondent's Exhibit P, page 3; and Merger Agreement sections 1.03A and 1.03B, which is at Respondent's Exhibit B, pages 5 and 6.

Appellants have proffered no evidence, statutory, or case law to prove that their stock options and RSU income constitutes capital gains income, and therefore have failed to overcome Respondent's presumptively correct determination in this regard. Respondent respectfully request that OTA sustain Respondent's determination in it's entirety.

Thank you.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Ms. Bertani.

And Mr. Dhawan, if you like to make your closing remarks now, for five minutes. Thanks.

## CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. DHAWAN: Sure. Thank you, Judge.

You know, I am -- I'm not a lawyer, as I said in my opening. I'm a engineer, you know, focused on, you know, building technology companies.

I think, in this case, the biggest -- the reason for the biggest confusion and the reason why we are all here is because four employees, including myself as a CEO of the company; the continued employees as part of the Merger Agreement, a determination was taken by the buyer that they would pay all considerations for the merger through the payroll.

That is the reason for this whole confusion. It should not have been reported through the merger proceed -- merger proceeds should not have been reported through payroll, and they did it for purely for their confusion. For their convenience. And that is what is causing all this confusion.

The -- once the Merger Agreement was signed and implemented, there was no performance. There was no vesting for the Symphony shares. There were all -- it

was all done. It was a Merger Agreement. From that point onwards, from April 2015 onwards, there were only payments against the Merger Agreement and a new Employment Agreement that was put in place.

2.4

This is the reason why I have tried my best to show to FTB and to this Court here. The split of the normal, continued income -- which is the ordinary income and the merger related income -- the merger related income is purely the sale of stock. The sale of stock.

That was vested under the change of control agreements, RSU, options, and all that stuff by April of 2015. After April of 2015, there is no Symphony Teleca. There is no vesting that survives this agreement.

And the only thing that happened was the payment associated with that agreement that was paid over the next, you know, three years in mostly 2015 and some in '16 and '17. And the payments are, basically, purchase of stock that Harman did from me.

That's it. Which is under this agreement. So my, you know, so I stand by the statement that I made earlier that not even a single dollar was paid to me outside of the Harman payroll. 100 percent of my merger related share sale to Harman happened through the payroll entrees.

There were no performance or anything else

associated with that part of the income. There was ATI and all that stuff, which is a new agreement -- and we're not discussing that. That is absolutely, you know, ordinary income, and I'm paying taxes on that.

So coming back, I am not trying to, you know, debate or save 100k in dispute here. As I mentioned earlier, I am very honored to be paying, you know, my fair share.

And hopefully, you know, many, many more in the coming years, you know, as I proceed with my -- at the current sixth company which, by the way, is also called Symphony. It's called Symphony AI. And, so, please root for us as my next company, as well.

But the, you know, in this particular case, it really comes back to the principle of how the Merger Agreement was implemented. And hence, you know, I stand by my request that the income that was associated with the purchase of my shares, by Harman, is a share of -- is a purchase of capital assets. And hence, it should be treated as capital gains or loses.

In this case, it was capital gains.

Thank you.

JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you Mr. Dhawan.

So I'm going to turn to the panel to see if there's any questions.

Judge Leung, do you have any questions?
JUDGE LEUNG: Yes, I do.
And I'm going to start with the transaction
itself.
Good morning, Mr. Dhawan. Thank you for your
contributions to I-T.
MR. DHAWAN: Good morning.
JUDGE LEUNG: Tell me what happened with your
Federal Return. Did you originally file this entire
round of wages and then later filed Amended Federal Tax
Return, or what happened there?
MR. DHAWAN: No. I have not filed any
amendment with Federal Return. I filed both Federal and
California Return with the same same principle. And
there has been no (inaudible).
JUDGE LEUNG: So you treated the entire
Federal Income Tax as wages, not as capital gain?
MR. DHAWAN: No. It's as capital gains for
2015 and 2016. Same treatment as with the California.
JUDGE LEUNG: Okay.
Franchise Tax Board, do you have any any
response to that as there is a Federal IRC section the
IRS has not touched? Mr. Dhawan's treatment of these
options as basically borrowing income capital gains

25

income.

MS. BERTANI: My only response, Judge, would be that based on the applicable case law and IRC, section 83A, the disposition of Mr. Dhawan's RSU's and stock options were based on the terms and conditions set forth in the Symphony Employment Agreement.

2.4

Even though that agreement may have gone away after the 2015 merger, the fact to the matter is that the options and RSU's were granted based on the conditions in that agreement. And those two conditions are that, basically, that he remain an employee through vesting, and that the company achieves specific performance related goals under the applicable case law.

That establishes that that compensation is intended as compensation for services through the vesting period, and therefore is ordinary income under IRC, section 83A.

JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. Lets -- lets go to the substance of the options and RSU's.

Mr. Dhawan, I imagine you as CEO of Symphony, a hand in creating that stock option we're in. So tell me, what were the stock options and RSU's for? Were you -- were you contemplating that when these things vested, you would be allowed to buy Symphony stock?

Or were you allowed to -- or you were actually given Symphony stock? Or you were given an option to

buy that stock. What happened at vesting?

MR. DHAWAN: So I was not fully involved,
Judge, for creating the plans. It was, as I said, I
joined the company in 2010 as a CEO replacing other CEO,
and some of these plans were put in place before me
because the company was in operations I think at least
six, seven years before I came in as the CEO.

Secondly, you know, the options and RSU's which were -- which were given for the four years that I was working there, you know, we didn't, you know, there were vesting happening because some of it was time vesting; some of it was performance vesting, but none of it was exercised until the actual merger implementation started.

So I didn't own any shares in the company. I had rights to buy the shares, but I did not own any shares, and that was true for most of the employees as well. Because unless you know that there is a, you know, those shares are worth something, you don't really exercise those shares.

When the merger discussions and the actual agreement was signed in January of 2015, there were professional law firms who basically took over the implementation. On our site was a law firm called Orrick, who was the firm which was implementing this

Merger Agreement.

And they basically went through the cap table and went through, again, all the calculations of, you know, the vestings and who owned what shares because there were many other investors, and it was almost a billion dollar transaction.

And so there were, you know, all of that was implemented by professional lawyers and tax firms, basically.

And the place where, like, I keep repeating, where, you know, I have huge regrets -- is to agree to -- that all these, you know, few thousand employees -- and they have merger consideration to be paid through the payroll because that is where this, sort of, you know, cause in on this confusion.

JUDGE LEUNG: We're going back to the -- you were vested in some of these option but didn't exercise. Did the options give you an exercised priced? Were you, like, okay, if you wanted to exercise it, you would be allowed to buy the stock at --

MR. DHAWAN: -- yeah.

JUDGE LEUNG: -- two thousand share, or a buck fifty a share, or a discount. What exactly was the -- the exercise? What number -- what was the value of that exercise? How much would you buy that stock for?

1 Yeah, it's there in the Merger MR. DHAWAN: 2 Agreement. What rings a bell is dollar fourteen, or 3 something like that, Judge. I'm trying to find the --4 the exact number here. 5 So I owned 2.476 million options. 6 price was dollar forty-one. And --7 So you --JUDGE LEUNG: MR. DHAWAN: -- and 2.95 million RSU's. 8 JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. 9 10 MR. DHAWAN: The way the Merger Agreement was 11 implemented, Judge, was that we never paid, you know, It was naked out of the gains. 12 the actual cash. 13 JUDGE LEUNG: I understand. I'm trying to see 14 whether there -- I'm trying to break down the Merger 15 Agreement; which they did everything in one big payment. That is correct. 16 MR. DHAWAN: 17 JUDGE LEUNG: To see what part of payment was 18 for your compensation and whether part of payment was 19 for the sale of stock. That's where I'm going. 20 I want to know whether there is a differential 21 between the strike price for your exercise of the 22 options, which assuming there was no Harman in the 23 picture, that you could've -- you could've paid for that 2.4 stock verses what a -- a party was trying to purchase

Symphony. The Symphony SCA would paid -- you know,

25

1	pay.
2	So you would have part compensation and part
3	capital gain.
4	MR. DHAWAN: The price average my average
5	price was dollar forty-one, and it's documented in the
6	Merger Agreement.
7	JUDGE LEUNG: And at the time the merger, what
8	did Harman how much per share did Harman pays for
9	each share of Symphony?
10	MR. DHAWAN: Oh, I don't remember that. It's
11	there in the document. I don't remember that.
12	JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. Franchise Tax
13	Go ahead, Mr. Dhawan.
14	MR. DHAWAN: You know, recollection is five or
15	six dollars, but that's pure speaking from memory. I'm
16	not subject the Merger Agreement.
17	JUDGE LEUNG: Okay.
18	Ms. Bertani, do you have any insight of this?
19	Am I going off the rails again? Or is there is there
20	a compensation portion of this transaction and a
21	separate bartering transaction, or are you supposed to
22	or mixed together.
23	MS. BERTANI: No. There is no separate
24	bartering transaction. There is no arm's length
25	transaction here. This is this is stock this is

compensation in the forms of stock options and restricted stock units. But there was no arm's length transaction which would obviate application of IRC, section 83A.

2.4

The Franchise Tax Board's opinion, or position, is that the linkage of these options, no matter what the price, no matter what was paid, they were expressly linked in the Employment Agreement and the Merger Agreement to the two expressed conditions.

In other words, if Mr. Dhawan had discontinued his employment with Symphony before vesting, or if the company had failed to achieve specific performance related goals by the designated date, eligibility to these shares would be terminated. Would be canceled. Would be forfeited.

So there is no separation between a compensation side and a bartering side. There is no bartering. The agreement makes it very clear. You have to stay employed with the company, and the company has to perform.

In fact, Mr. Dhawan testified earlier that, you know, the merger compensation was actually an inducement to retain employees which further establish -- establishes that the compensation was paid to incentivize certain employees, especially Mr. Dhawan to

stay with the company through the merger events.

2.4

So under both the 2010 Merger Agreement with Symphony -- I'm sorry, the 2010 Employment Agreement with Symphony and the 2015 Merger Agreement.

The linkage of these options, no matter what they cost or what was paid, the bottom line is, there would have been nothing to be compensated for in January of 2015 had the options and RSU's not been granted under the 2010 Symphony Employment Agreement and accelerated and extinguished in January of 2015.

The linkage of those options and RSU's to Mr. Dhawan's continued employment to incentivize better service out of him clearly establishes that this compensation is intended as compensation for services, and therefore according to the Appeals of Stabell and Internal Revenue Code, section 83A, that is compensation for services.

It's ordinary gross income. There's no precedent of record to establish any of these RSU's or stock options as capital gains or capital assets.

JUDGE LEUNG: Now you -- you mentioned in your presentation that the -- I think you said it was Exhibit D, W-2 statement, was issued by Symphony.

MS. BERTANI: Yes.

JUDGE LEUNG: And not Harman.

1 Yes. The W-2 statement was MS. BERTANT: 2 issued by Symphony Teleca for 2015. Yes, for 2015. And 3 that is at Exhibit D, page 6. 4 JUDGE LEUNG: Even though Harman was the 5 payer, it shows up on Symphony's W-2. 6 MS. BERTANI: Correct. 7 JUDGE LEUNG: How does that happen? That would be a corporate 8 MS. BERTANI: 9 question. I'm not exactly sure on how that could 10 happen, but I guess in the course of the merger, 11 Mr. Dhawan has stated several times that he regrets 12 having Harman do the accounting and issue the checks and 13 it's caused confusion. 14 And while that may be the case, the W-2 was 15 issued by Symphony, and the Merger Agreement was structured as it was structured. 16 And I understand that Mr. Dhawan said that he 17 18 regrets those clauses, but as Judge Lambert said in the 19 Appeal of Omar, while a taxpayers free to organize it's 20 affairs as it chooses; nevertheless, once having done 21 so, it must accept the tax consequences of its choice, 22 whether contemplated or not. And perhaps that is what 23 might be the issue in this case.

how that happened. But the fact to the matter is, that

To answer your question, I'm not exactly sure

2.4

25

1 Symphony did issue the W-2. it did happen. 2 compensation, according to Mr. Dhawan's based on his 3 agreement, the 2010 Symphony Employment Agreement. 4 There was no other agreement with Symphony after the 2010 agreement. After Symphony and Symphony 5 Teleca -- or Symphony Teleca was merged in 2012, I 6 believe. 7 The 2010 Symphony Agreement remains the 8 operative agreement for his term of employment with 9 Symphony. 10 JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. 11 And lets turn to jurisdiction issue. 12 Exhibits, I believe, J and K contained notices of 13 overassessment. 14 MS. BERTANT: Correct. 15 JUDGE LEUNG: For 2016, 2017. Respectfully. Tell us about those notices. What are their 16 17 purposes? 18 MS. BERTANI: The only purpose of the notice is of overassessment in the exhibits is that to the 19 20 extent that the notice of overassessment indicates the 21 specific amount on each notice, that amount will be 22 applied to the Appellant's outstanding 2015 tax amount 2.3 due. So the notices of overassessment will be 2.4

applied to decrease the Appellant's 2015 tax due.

25

1	JUDGE LEUNG: So should Franchise Tax Board
2	prevail, that amount would be applied 2016, 2017, over a
3	success as would be applied to his 2015 tax year?
4	MS. BERTANI: Correct.
5	Oops, sorry about that.
6	JUDGE LEUNG: What would happen if should the
7	Taxpayer prevail? What would happen to those transfers?
8	MS. BERTANI: So if the Franchise Tax Board's
9	determination was not sustained, I would think that the
10	Franchise Tax Board would need to reassess it's
11	determination. So there could be some changes,
12	obviously. But we would have to reassess our
13	determination based on your ruling.
14	JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. I guess he would
15	hypothetically get another shot at filing a claim
16	filing claims for that year, or that year will stay open
17	for that type of adjustment to be made.
18	JUDGE LAMBERT: Yeah. I think that's why in
19	OTA regulations through 104G I think it's G now. It
20	used to be E but, like, OTA doesn't specifically it
21	doesn't have jurisdiction over a notice of proposed
22	overassessment.
23	JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. Thank you.
24	Thank you, Mr. Dhawan.
25	Thank you, Franchise Tax Board.

1	MS. BERTANI: Thank you.
2	MR. DHAWAN: Thank you.
3	JUDGE LEUNG: And Judge Lambert.
4	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you.
5	Thank you, Judge Leung.
6	And Judge Long, do you have any questions?
7	JUDGE LONG: This is Judge Long. I do not
8	have any questions. Thank you.
9	JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you.
10	And this is Judge Lambert, and if there's
11	nothing further, I'll conclude the hearing. And I want
12	to thank both parties for appearing today. We will
13	issue a rendered opinion within 100 days.
14	And the record is now close.
15	Thank you.
16	MS. BERTANI: Thank you.
17	MR. DHAWAN: Thank you.
18	(Proceedings concluded at 11:07 a.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## 1 HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, Christina L. Rodriguez, Hearing Reporter in 3 4 and for the State of California, do hereby certify: 5 That the foregoing transcript of proceedings 6 was taken before me at the time and place set forth, 7 that the testimony and proceedings were reported stenographically by me and later transcribed by 8 computer-aided transcription under my direction and 9 10 supervision, that the foregoing is a true record of the 11 testimony and proceedings taken at that time. 12 I further certify that I am in no way interested in the outcome of said action. 13 I have hereunto subscribed my name this 11th 14 15 day of October, 2023. 16 17 18 19 Hearing Reporter 20

23

21

2.2

24

25

CHRISTINA RODRIGUEZ

Index: \$1,000,000..a.m.

	<b>11:07</b> 2:18 57:18	<b>2015's</b> 19:17	<b>4C</b> 28:2 29:25
Ψ	<b>12</b> 41:15	<b>2016</b> 6:24 10:3 11:21 12:21 14:11	5
<b>\$1,000,000</b> 27:18	<b>15</b> 4:13 29:8	16:9 37:6 39:2,3,6	
<b>\$1,250,000</b> 27:12	<b>16</b> 7:1 14:20 29:8	46:19 55:15 56:2	<b>5</b> 16:24 27:11,17
28:5	44:17	<b>2017</b> 6:3,25 10:3	28:3,24 34:3,12
<b>\$335,000</b> 29:1	<b>17</b> 7:1 14:20 26:25	12:21 14:11 16:9	42:5,17
<b>\$4,886,515</b> 16:22	29:13 44:17	37:6 55:15 56:2	<b>50</b> 32:13
<b>\$5,717,899</b> 16:18,	<b>17081</b> 21:4	<b>2020</b> 8:24	
<b>20</b>	<b>19</b> 2:18 5:1	<b>2021</b> 18:10,19	6
<b>\$5,997,117</b> 16:17	<b>1989</b> 7:18	19:4,10,12	<b>6</b> 4.4 C 4 C.4 O 20.0
	<b>1996</b> 7:19	<b>2022</b> 14:5,7	<b>6</b> 4:4,6 16:12 20:8 28:3 34:13 42:5,
<b>\$500,000</b> 29:2		<b>2023</b> 2:18 5:1,8	17 54:3
<b>\$6,000,000</b> 16:12	<b>19th</b> 5:8	<b>21</b> 10:24 32:18	<b>60</b> 15:21
<b>\$8.4</b> 39:5		37:22	
<b>\$828,384</b> 17:4	2	<b>21017112</b> 2:6 5:7	7
<b>\$831,384</b> 16:21	<b>2</b> 6:5 20:7 31:11	<b>22</b> 8:15	
	<b>2.476</b> 50:5	22 0.13	<b>7</b> 4:12 33:3
0	<b>2.95</b> 50:8	3	<b>7.067</b> 39:6
<b>0</b> 28:3 29:8,13	<b>2010</b> 24:21 25:8, 10 26:23,25 28:25	<b>3</b> 18:18 25:1 31:20	8
	29:7,11 32:18	32:25 33:14 41:22 42:15	<b>8</b> 19:3 41:22
1	35:17 48:4 53:2,3,	-	
<b>1</b> 6:5 17:1 18:9	9 55:3,5,7	<b>3.05</b> 32:8	<b>8,500</b> 10:23
19:21 20:8 31:5	<b>2011</b> 32:9	<b>3.05A</b> 32:6,11,24	<b>83A</b> 20:12 21:2,8
32:25 41:22	<b>2012</b> 9:5 55:6	33:1,4,15,18 42:14	22:2,11 24:23 26:11 30:24 35:15
<b>1-2</b> 4:4	<b>2014</b> 32:12	<b>3.14</b> 25:4 31:21	47:3,16 52:4
<b>1.03A</b> 34:1,5	<b>2015</b> 6:3,24 7:1	32:4 42:13	53:16
42:16	9:6,11,17,19,21	<b>30</b> 6:8,19 7:11	
<b>1.03B</b> 33:2,3	10:2 12:21 13:16		9
34:11,18,21,25	14:8,18,20 16:3,7, 10,14,19,23,25	<b>33</b> 31:5	_
42:16	17:5 18:7,12,14,	<b>350,000</b> 11:25	<b>9</b> 18:10 31:16
<b>100</b> 38:18 44:22	22,24,25 19:7,13,		<b>9.02H</b> 31:17
57:13	23 20:4,15,19	4	<b>9:44</b> 2:17 5:2,8
<b>100k</b> 8:12 45:6	24:21 25:3,4,7,12 26:6,10 31:4,6,8,	<b>4</b> 26:24	<b>9th</b> 24:3
<b>1040</b> 16:19	10,21,24 35:4,18		
<b>104G</b> 56:19	37:6,14,15 39:3,	<b>40</b> 4:17	Α
<b>1099</b> 11:18 13:25	22 40:2 41:1,9,14, 15,20 42:6 44:2,	<b>409</b> 13:3	
14:3,5	12,16 46:19 47:7	<b>43</b> 4:18	<b>A-S</b> 4:5
<b>11</b> 25:5 31:22 32:5	48:22 53:4,8,10	<b>4A</b> 27:10 29:15	<b>a.m.</b> 2:17,18 5:2,8
42:14	54:2 55:22,25	<b>4B</b> 27:16 29:19	57:18
	56:3	TD 21.10 23.13	

Index: absolutely..awards

absolutely 38:24 agree 10:18 11:8, analyze 21:22 applicable 27:15 39:9 45:3 9 18:21,25 19:7 28:14 29:9,17 analyzed 22:2 31:23 33:12 20:4 49:11 accelerate 32:9 **Andrea** 3:4 5:12 34:17,23 35:11 agreed 5:25 18:6, accelerated 32:6, 47:2,12 12 19:23 Anjali 5:7 12 53:9 application 52:3 agreement 9:10, **Annex** 42:14 accept 54:21 12,13,24,25 10:19 applied 12:6 announced 9:6, 55:22,25 56:2,3 accounting 11:6,10,14,15 18 13:17 37:14 12:20 13:13,17 54:12 applies 6:3 14:6,24 17:20 annual 28:4 29:1. achieve 52:12 18:23 20:18,19 **April** 9:17,19,20 achieved 28:16 24:21,22 25:3,5,7, 13:16 14:18 37:15 appeal 2:5 5:6 9,10 26:6,13,24 39:22 40:2 44:2, achievement 16:6 17:6 19:11 27:1,24 28:9 29:6, 11,12 21:21 24:4,5 17:18,23 20:23 8,11,15 30:3,9 Area 7:18 8:1 22:10,21 23:10,14 26:19 35:16 40:16 31:4,6,10,12,14, 24:10 25:15,18 41:19,25 54:19 15,16,18,22 arguments 26:2,17 27:22 32:16,24 33:2,13, 36:23,25 **Appeals** 2:1 5:6 28:8 29:4,20 30:1, 17,19,20,21 34:1, 53:15 arm's 51:24 52:2 7,15 32:2,21 4,7,19 35:5,17,18 33:24 34:10 35:7, **APPEARANCES** 37:9,17 38:21 Article 31:16 23.25 40:22 42:4 3:1 39:7,21,22 40:3, aspects 36:24 17,18 41:23 42:6, achieves 47:11 appeared 33:1 12,14,15 43:14,23 asserted 19:13 acquired 9:7 appearing 57:12 44:1,3,4,13,15,19 14:18 **Assessment** 45:2,16 47:5,6,9 Appellant 3:6 17:1 48:22 49:1 50:2, acquiring 9:14 19:5,25 21:22 10,15 51:6,16 10:14 11:16 23:2,19,21 **asset** 13:5,8,9 52:8,9,18 53:2,3, 19:16,18 action 7:1 16:8 appellant's 4:4 4,9 54:15 55:3,4, assets 14:23 15:1 16:18 17:5,21 5,7,8 actionable 16:8 18:7,10,19 19:10, 45:19 53:20 Agreement's actual 13:18 20 20:7,9 21:5,24 assuming 50:22 33:2 48:13,21 50:12 22:8,16,20,23 23:9,13,17,22 **ATI** 45:1 agreements additional 16:5 24:8,15 36:1,6 44:11 attached 38:24 addressed 22:13 40:15,18,24 41:6, **ahead** 51:13 20,24 42:7 55:22, attending 5:24 adjusted 13:9 25 **Al** 45:12 **audit** 38:4,5 adjustment Appellants 2:7 allowed 47:23,24 56:17 August 8:24 5:21 6:5 16:13,16, 49:20 adjustments 19,23 17:7,11 automatically Alvaz 24:4 35:12 18:5 19:13,17,21, 16:16 20:5 28:20 22 20:4,7,13 Amended 46:10 Administrative **average** 50:5 51:4 24:24 25:2 26:9 3:3 5:10 6:15 amendment 30:17 35:9 41:14, award 22:4,5,6,12 46:13 18 42:18 affairs 54:20 28:16 America 8:4 Appellants' 16:1 affiliates 34:17,24 awarded 22:4 26:4,14 amount 13:9 35:3 affirm 24:7 awards 27:7 55:21,22 56:2 Apple 8:3 aggregate 28:5

В back 8:8,21 39:12 40:7 45:5,15 49:16 bartering 51:21, 24 52:17,18 base 12:15.24 **based** 12:16 20:18 27:8 29:5 37:22 47:2,4,8 55:2 56:13 **bases** 13:9 **basically** 10:4,18 11:14.15 12:6 38:10 39:4 44:17 46:24 47:10 48:23 49:2,9 **basis** 20:8 Bay 7:17 8:1 **bell** 50:2

beneficial 21:11

Bertani 3:9 4:13, 17 5:15,16 6:22 7:8 15:4,6,22,25 36:11 40:9,13 43:1 47:1 51:18, 23 53:24 54:1,6,8 55:14,18 56:4,8 57:1,16

big 50:15

biggest 10:17 43:10,11

billion 49:6

**Board** 3:8 5:17,19 6:25 24:5 38:13 46:21 56:1,10,25

Board's 52:5 56:8

**bonds** 13:7

**bonus** 12:15,17, 24 20:2 29:1,3 30:6,12,25 39:9, 25 40:1

**bonuses** 28:23 30:21

borrowing 46:24

bottom 53:6

break 50:14

briefing 7:3 16:5

brought 18:15

buck 49:22

**build** 7:18,20 9:1

building 43:9

**built** 7:24

business 29:4

**buy** 47:23 48:1,16 49:20,25

**buyer** 10:20,22,24 13:23 37:19 38:22 39:14 43:15

buying 9:14 10:11

C

calculated 12:7 calculations 49:3

**California** 2:2 3:8 5:1 14:13 16:14, 23 19:24 21:3 23:25 38:13 41:16 46:14.19

California's 22:1

**called** 7:17 9:15 10:23 11:15 45:12 48:24

calls 9:25

**canceled** 28:17, 21 52:14

cap 49:2

**capital** 6:2 13:5,8, 10,20 14:9,12,16, 21 15:1 16:2,20, 21,22 17:2,9 18:3, 14 19:15,25

20:10,16 24:13 26:21 31:3 35:14 36:7 38:14 41:3,8 42:20 45:19,20,21 46:17,18,24 51:3 53:20

**case** 5:7 10:22 13:11 16:1 20:13 21:22 22:3 23:22 30:24 35:15 41:6 42:19 43:10 45:14,21 47:2,12 54:14.23

**cash** 50:12

caused 54:13

causing 43:22

**CD** 8:2

**CEO** 8:25 9:15 10:6,10 11:4,7 12:4 43:13 47:19 48:4.7

Cerence 14:4

**cetera** 9:22 37:12 41:12

**change** 25:12,14, 19 27:21 28:11 32:6,10,12,20,23 33:7 34:8 37:10 44:10

characterization 20:15

**characterize** 19:17 41:20

**characterized** 19:14 31:2 35:13

characterizes 41:10

characterizing 20:9

**checks** 54:12

**choice** 54:21

chooses 54:20

Christina 2:19

Circuit 24:3

**Citing** 22:11

**claim** 56:15

**claims** 56:16

clarification 6:23

classify 19:6

**clause** 10:19,25 11:5

**clauses** 37:7 38:20 39:20 54:18

clear 31:6 52:18

**close** 38:11,17 57:14

**Closed** 18:17 19:2.8

**closer** 40:6,7,8

**closing** 4:15 31:17 40:12,15 43:3,5

co-pellant's 5:11

**code** 19:24 21:2,4 38:12 53:16

colleagues 7:16

column 39:4

combination 20:1

2:17 28:24

Commissioner 24:3,4,6

**common** 27:8,13, 19 28:6 32:17

**companies** 7:20 43:9

**company** 8:3 9:1, 4,5,8,14,15 10:8, 11,14,22 11:4,16, 21,24 12:5 14:4, 22,23 25:14 26:17 27:6,9 28:10 29:17,23 30:4,10,

14 32:1 33:23

34:9,15 35:6 concluded 23:24 consummated correct 20:11 39:19 42:3 43:13 57:18 31:9 42:22 50:16 54:6 45:11,13 47:11 55:14 56:4 concludes 36:9 contacted 38:4 48:4,6,15 52:12, correctly 41:20 19 53:1 concluding 2:17 contained 55:12 correspondent company's concurrently contemplated 25:25 17:18,23 20:23 31:11 54:22 22:9 24:10 25:15, correspondently condition 31:12 contemplates 17 26:2,17 28:7 26:9 34:5 29:4,20 30:15 conditioned Cosmin 24:6 32:2,17 33:24 17:15 21:15 22:20 contemplating 34:9 35:7,22 25:16 26:1 35:18 47:22 cost 12:7 53:6 40:22 42:4 contend 19:22 could've 50:23 conditions 17:15 compensated 22:7,12 25:8,11 countries 10:24 contends 19:25 53:7 31:17 35:20 40:19 37:22,25 41:25 42:8 47:4,9 contingent 23:8 compensation 52:9 29:16,20 30:1,3,7 country 8:6,8,21 16:13 17:22,25 18:1 20:25 22:23 confirm 24:24 continue 35:25 Court 24:2,3 44:6 23:15,16,21,22,24 confirms 25:6 Court's 24:6 continued 17:16, 24:12,17 26:20 31:23 22 20:22 22:8,20 30:13,16,18,25 covering 28:5 23:9,13 24:9 31:1,25 34:13,20 confusion 11:11 25:13,17 26:1,16 creating 47:20 35:9.10.13.25 43:11,17,21,22 27:14,25 28:10 48:3 36:2,7 40:25 41:1 49:15 54:13 29:16,23 30:4,10, 42:1,9 47:13,14 cumbersome conjunction 13 31:7 32:1,22 50:18 51:2.20 38:2 19:10 23:5 33:23 34:9,14 52:1,17,22,24 35:6,21 38:24 current 45:11 53:14,16 55:2 connection 40:20 42:2 43:13 17:11 21:7 25:19 complete 9:19 44:7 53:12 27:5.23 28:11 D completed 39:23 29:21 contract 36:24 **date** 5:8 27:15 completion consequences contractually 37:15 28:21 29:18 31:23 54:21 20:21 52:13 complicated consideration contributions dates 22:18,19,25 11:21 12:1 10:1,15,25 14:19 7:24,25 46:6 23:10 25:24,25 18:24 35:1,2 37:3, component control 25:12,14, 34:18,25 19 49:13 22:16 23:5 19 27:21 28:11 day 9:18 11:7 considerations 32:7,10,13,20,23 components 43:15 33:7 34:8 37:10 26:15 days 57:13 44:10 considered 38:6 debate 14:25 45:6 comprises 18:9, 39:9 convenience 18 19:3 decision 26:19 39:14 43:21 constitute 20:8 concede 41:18 decrease 55:25 convenient 37:20 constituted 22:1 conceded 18:5 defined 32:16 **copy** 9:12 constitutes 17:8 concessions demonstrably 18:2,7 21:1 23:22, corporate 54:8 19:12 41:6 24 24:12,17 31:1 Corporation conclude 57:11 36:7 41:3,7 42:10, demonstrate 34:24

20:17 differential 50:20 34:9,14,16,22 Ε 35:6,17,21,25 department's 4:5 difficult 39:12 37:12 38:25 39:21 designated 22:21 directly 21:16 40:17,20 41:23 earlier 21:13 38:9 25:18 52:13 42:2 44:4 47:5 44:21 45:7 52:21 disallow 17:2 52:8,11 53:3,9,12 detail 24:2 earn 12:16 Discloser's 55:3,8 details 37:5 31:21 32:4 earning 20:6 end 36:16 determination disclosure 42:13 easier 11:2 engineer 7:17 18:6,21 19:23 43:8 Disclosures 25:4 ecosystem 8:1 20:12 21:23 24:7 42:22,24 43:14 discontinued enter 31:13 education 7:17 56:9,11,13 52:10 entering 31:14 effect 31:19 34:2, determine 7:4 discount 49:23 11 40:2 **entire** 46:9,16 **Dhawan** 2:6 3:6 discuss 24:2 element 24:24 entirety 42:24 4:12,18 5:7,23 26:12 discussing 13:12 entitled 25:20 6:7,13,18 7:10,14, 45:3 elements 27:21 16 15:3,5 18:11, 28:12 35:20 20 24:25 27:6,11, discussion 8:10 entitlement 17 28:4,11,17,20, 14:1 eligibility 27:2,20 20:20 31:24 34:13 22,25 31:14,18,19 29:3 41:24 52:13 discussions 35:19 34:16,19 36:4,22 48:21 eligible 27:6 28:4, 37:1 40:5 43:2,6 entrees 44:24 25 32:19 33:6,9 45:23 46:5,7,12, disposition 17:7 **Equalization** 18 47:19 48:2 24:19 33:15 34:5 employed 52:19 24:5 49:21 50:1,8,10, 47:3 employee 12:4,8 16 51:4,10,13,14 equity 27:7 dispute 45:6 17:12 24:20 30:3 52:10,21,25 error 21:23 34:7 47:10 54:11,17 56:24 document 12:13 57:2,17 essential 31:8 16:8 51:11 employees 10:1, 2,7,10,11,16,23 **Dhawan's** 16:10 documentation establish 24:15 11:4,25 37:18,21 17:12,16,19,22 25:22 52:23 53:19 38:7 43:12,13 48:17 18:1 19:13 20:2, documented established 49:12 52:23,25 18,20,21 24:9,19, 37:17 51:5 21:23 21 25:8,13,16,19, employer 16:10 22 26:1,9,12,16 documents establishes 17:16 20:6 22:8 27:2,5,14,25 12:11,12,21 19:9 17:24 20:24 23:15 23:3 26:10 40:21 28:10,19,21 24:18 25:22 26:14 30:16 35:8 employment 29:16,22 30:4,9, 36:1 40:24 41:6 dollar 16:20,21,22 17:16,19,23 11,13,18,21,25 47:13 52:24 53:13 17:4 29:1,2 37:3 20:18,22 22:3,8, 31:6,24,25 32:15, 44:21 49:6 50:2.6 establishing 21 23:9,13 24:9, 22,24 33:12,16,22 41:25 42:8 51:5 21 25:9,10,13,17 34:6,8,13 35:5,6, 26:2,13,16,23 10,17,19,21 40:8, dollars 16:12,17, event 27:23 28:1, 27:1,5,14,24,25 17,20 41:2,9,10 18 51:15 18 29:22,24 28:9,10,19,21 42:2 46:23 47:3 due 55:23,25 events 33:8 53:1 29:6,7,11,15,17, 53:12 55:2 23 30:4,9,10,14, evidence 6:6 **duly** 6:14 difference 13:8 23 31:7,14,17,19 20:7,14,17 41:5 14:14 38:14,16 32:1,16,23 33:13, 42:18 16,19,20,21,23

Index: Evidentiary..happen

**Evidentiary** 35:18 40:18 **forfeited** 28:16,20 46:18,24 50:12 24:15 41:10,18,23 42:7 35:2,3 52:15 53:20 52:8 exact 50:4 forfeiture 21:12, generated 13:12 extensively 14,20 22:13,16, examined 6:15 **give** 6:7 40:7 24:18 33:5 18,24 25:24 26:5 49:18 Examples 13:5 extent 34:4 55:20 form 16:10,19 **giving** 8:8,21 Excludes 13:5 27:7 41:9,14 extinguished goal 36:24 **executed** 9:11,22 53:10 forms 52:1 26:6 37:15 goals 17:19,24 forty-one 50:6 20:24 22:10,22 F 51:5 execution 18:23 23:11,15 24:11 25:3,7 31:12 found 22:16 23:5 25:15,18 26:3,18 fact 18:4 23:16 exercise 48:20 28:8 30:16 32:3. fourteen 50:2 34:16 39:24 41:1 49:17,19,24,25 22 33:25 34:10 47:7 52:21 54:25 Franchise 3:8 35:8,23 36:1 50:21 40:23 42:5 47:12 5:16.19 6:25 facts 8:23 19:5 exercised 18:22 52:13 38:13 46:21 51:12 25:2 48:13 49:18 failed 42:21 52:12 52:5 56:1,8,10,25 **good** 5:15 7:15 exert 18:10,19 fair 8:7,20 45:8 Francisco 7:17 8:9,21 38:7 46:5,7 19:4 family 8:22 free 54:19 govern 24:18 **Exhibit** 16:12.24 Federal 8:16 46:9, **FTB** 5:13 6:21 7:5, governed 33:13, 17:1 18:9,18 19:3, 10,13,17,22 15 12:11 14:13 16 21 20:7 25:1,5 36:23 37:8 38:4,6, 26:24 27:11,17,24 feel 7:25 governs 21:4 22 40:6 44:6 28:3,9,24 29:6,7, **felt** 37:23 8,11,13,22 30:2,8 grant 30:1 FTB's 15:19,20 31:5,11,20,22 fifty 49:23 19:7 granted 27:12,18 32:5,25 33:3,14 32:9,12,18 47:8 fighting 38:16 34:3,12 41:12,16, full 25:20 28:12 53:8 22 42:5,13,15,17 31:18 file 46:9 53:22 54:3 grants 27:6 28:5 fully 48:2 filed 46:10,12,13 exhibits 4:4,5 6:4, great 8:5 furnishes 13:7 **filing** 8:15,17 5 55:12,19 gross 21:8,24 56:15,16 **future** 21:16 exist 21:14 37:8, 23:24 42:10 53:18 financial's 9:3 13 39:22 40:3 group 23:9,13 G find 39:3 50:3 **explain** 6:8 10:20 groups' 23:14 **firm** 48:24,25 explained 22:5 gain 6:2 13:10,19 **guess** 36:22 16:20,22 17:2 firms 48:23 49:8 explanation 40:4 54:10 56:14 18:3,14 46:17 firstly 37:2 explicitly 30:17 51:3 Н focused 43:8 **express** 19:12 gain's 20:10 22:11 foot 11:8 **gains** 11:12,13 hand 47:20 expressed 52:9 13:21 14:9,12,16, force 31:18 handled 8:14 21 16:2 17:9 expressly 17:15 forced 10:25 11:5 13:20 19:25 20:16 24:13 18:5 22:6 24:9 39:16 26:21 31:3 35:14 happen 54:7,10 26:15 27:13,25 36:8 38:14 41:4,8 55:1 56:6,7 forfeit 34:19 29:16,20 30:1,3,7 42:20 45:20,21

Index: happened..Lambert

implementing happened 9:10, inextricably J 16 37:13 44:14,23 48:25 20:21 46:8.11 48:1 important 12:11 initially 38:4 54:25 **January** 9:6,11, inaudible 46:15 insight 51:18 18,20 13:16 14:18 happening 48:11 37:14 48:22 53:7, incentive 21:25 intended 17:25 happy 8:7 36:9 10 20:25 23:16,18 incentivize 23:18 **Harman** 9:7,14 24:11,16 26:20 **Jason** 3:10 5:18 30:21 36:4 52:25 10:16,23 11:19,21 30:17,21 35:10 53:12 job 12:23 36:2,4 41:1 42:1,9 12:5,9,13 17:13 20:23 24:20 25:12 include 13:6 47:14 53:14 joined 8:25 48:4 31:8.15.20 33:21 18:13 interest 21:11 Josh 5:9 37:23 38:22 39:8, includes 21:9 9 44:18,22,23 Internal 21:2 JOSHUA 3:3 45:18 50:22 51:8 including 8:2 53:16 **Judge** 3:3 4:4,5 53:25 54:4,12 10:16 11:4 12:6 introduce 5:13,22 5:5,10,11,20,24 14:7 37:21 38:23 hearing 2:19 5:6, 6:15,19 7:2,9 41:11 43:12 invented 7:22 10 57:11 15:3,6,8,11,12,14, inclusion 9:23 invested 9:22 15,16,18 36:11, **held** 13:7 14:9 14:17 14,15,17,18,19,21 18:16 28:20 income 6:2 11:18 40:4,5,13,14 43:1, 12:14,15,16,19, investing 22:6 highly 38:2 6 45:23 46:1,2,8, 22,23,25 13:5,11, investment 13:4 16,20 47:1,17 home 7:18 13:6 12,22 14:8,12 48:3 49:16,22 16:2,3,17,18 17:3, investments **honor** 8:19 50:3,7,9,11,13,17 4,5,7,9,11 18:3,7, 13:7 51:7,12,17 53:21, honored 7:25 8:5 8,13,25 19:7,14, investors 49:5 25 54:4,7,18 45:7 15,18,19 20:1,3,9, 55:10,15 56:1,6, 10,15,16,20,25 involved 48:2 household 13:6 14,18,23 57:3,4,5, 21:1,8,9,24 22:1, involves 16:1 6,7,9,10 huge 49:11 25 23:1,25 24:8, 13,16,17,19 26:4, **IPO** 33:7 Judges 7:15 hurdles 27:22 7,8,20,21,22 31:2, 12:12 29:12,21 IRC 22:2 24:23 3 35:14 36:7.8 26:11 30:24 35:15 jurisdiction 6:24 hypothetically 38:15,18,23 39:5, 46:22 47:2,16 7:4,5,7 16:4 55:11 6,8,9,10,13,17,18 56:15 52:3 56:21 41:3,4,7,8,11,15, 21 42:1,7,9,11,20 IRC's 22:11 ı 44:7,8,9 45:1,4,17 Κ **IRS** 13:2,3 20:12 46:17,24,25 47:15 46:23 **I-T** 46:6 53:18 key 17:15 26:15 imagine 47:19 issue 5:25 6:3 7:5, incorporated 35:20 41:25 7 16:4,6 17:6 21:3 immaterial 14:15 54:12,23 55:1,11 L increase 10:8 57:13 immediately 17:4 10:10 issued 6:25 16:7 **Lambert** 3:3 5:5, indirectly 21:16 41:9 53:23 54:2, implementation 9,20,24 6:19 7:2,9 15 48:13,24 individual 21:17 15:3,8,14,18 **issues** 38:5 36:11,15,17,21 implemented inducement 40:5 43:1 45:23 43:24 45:16 49:8 31:13 52:23 **items** 13:6 54:18 56:18 57:3, 50:11

mistake 10:17 4,9,10 list 32:24 matter 2:5 5:17 38:8.11.17 47:7 Lambert's 4:4,6 listed 9:8 32:6,8, mixed 51:22 52:7 53:5 54:25 11 33:1,5 law 3:3 5:10 6:15 month 18:15 **matters** 11:20 20:13 21:3 30:25 lists 12:15,18,25 **months** 9:17 42:19 47:2,12 maximum 29:2 Lobue 23:18 24:3 48:23,24 morning 5:15 meaning 13:23 35:12 7:15 46:5,7 lawyer 38:3 43:7 33:20 **Long** 3:4 5:12 move 15:20 40:6 lawyers 49:8 15:15,16 36:18,19 means 37:4 57:6,7 multi-step 9:25 **lead** 5:9 mechanism long-term 13:20 10:13 multiple 41:19 legal 20:8,11,13 14:12,16,21 16:21 memory 51:15 length 51:24 52:2 19:24 21:25 Ν mention 7:5 long-terms 14:14 lets 38:17 47:17 55:11 mentioned 37:8, naked 50:12 longer 19:14 14 45:6 53:21 letter 22:5,12 Nasdaq 9:8 loses 45:20 37:12 40:16 merged 9:4 55:6 normal 12:14,16, loss 13:11,19 **Leung** 3:3 5:11 merger 9:24 23 13:24 20:2 16:21 15:11,12 36:14,15 18:23,24 20:19 44:7 46:1,2,8,16,20 **lost** 9:1 24:22 25:3,4,7,12 note 9:12 33:18 47:17 49:16,22 26:6,13 31:4,6,8, **LTI** 21:25 22:4,6,7, 50:7,9,13,17 51:7, 9,10,16,21,23 **notice** 7:1 16:7,25 16,23 23:1,15,21, 12,17 53:21,25 32:24 33:2 34:1,4, 55:18,20,21 56:21 24 38:23 54:4,7 55:10,15 19 35:4,18 37:9, **notices** 55:12,16, 56:1,6,14,23 57:3, **LTIP** 39:8 13,17,18 39:6,22 24 5 40:17 42:6,12,14, 15 43:14,16,18, **number** 5:7 12:4 licensed 8:3 M 19,23 44:1,3,8,22 13:3 17:15,17 lies 17:6 45:15 47:7 48:13, 22:7,9 25:11,13 made 7:24 10:18 21 49:1,13 50:1, 27:21 32:18,20,22 limited 16:6 23:8 44:20 56:17 10,14 51:6,7,16 33:4,6 35:21,22 link 40:18 52:9,22 53:1,2,4 maintains 16:6 40:20,21 41:9,14, 54:10,15 18 42:2,3,6 49:24 linkage 17:21 major 9:1 50:4 merger's 34:2,11 30:11,13 35:5,24 **make** 7:6 10:6,12 40:24 52:6 53:5. **NX** 32:6.8.11.24 million 8:15 32:17 11:2,3,20 37:20, 11 33:1,4,15,18 39:5 50:5.8 23 43:2 linked 20:21 24:9 millions 8:19 makes 31:6 52:18 26:15 27:13.20 0 mind 24:14 29:4 34:8,14 making 20:11 38:20 52:8 38:24 **minus** 12:7 objections 6:6 linking 23:12 makingminutes 4:4,6 objective 29:5 links 31:24 41:23 company 9:2 6:8,20 7:11 15:21 30:2,8 40:10 43:3 42:7 management objectives 28:15 10:7,10 liquidity 25:11 mirror 21:25 22:4, 29:5,9 17,19 23:7,12 27:16,23 28:1 **manner** 40:23 obviate 52:3 29:12,19,21,24 miscellaneous marks 40:6,7,8 occasions 18:5 32:15 34:6,7 11:18

occurrence 33:6, 40:18,25 41:6,11, 42:5,17 pays 51:8 21,24 42:7,19 people 8:7 **paid** 8:15,18 10:9, 44:11 46:24 47:4, occurs 21:13 33:8 11 12:8 17:25 8,18,21 48:8 **percent** 32:13 18:24 23:2.15.21 **October** 19:12 49:18 50:5,22 38:18 44:22 26:9 30:16 35:9 32:18 52:1,6 53:5,8,11, 37:18 38:19 40:25 perform 52:20 20 offer 40:15 44:15,21 49:13 performance oral 5:6 50:11,23,25 52:7, offered 8:6 17:12,18,24 20:24 24 53:6 order 39:16 21:7,16 22:10,14, offering 19:12 Pam 5:15 38:24 22 23:10,14 24:11 orders 4:4,6 Office 2:15:6 25:18 26:2,12,18 PAMELA 3:9 ordinary 6:2 28:8,15,23 29:1,3, offset 16:20 **panel** 15:9 36:12 5,9 30:2,6,8,12, 12:16,23 16:2 Omar 54:19 17:3,9 18:3,8,13, 45:24 15,20,22 32:2,21 25 19:15,19 21:1 33:24 34:10 35:8, paragraph 26:25 onwards 44:2 24:13,17 26:21 23 36:1,24 37:11 27:4,10,16 28:2, Oops 56:5 31:2 35:13 36:7 38:20,25 39:19 23 29:15,19,25 38:15 39:10,16 40:22 42:4 43:24 30:6 31:17 open 56:16 41:3,7,21 42:10 44:25 47:12 48:12 44:7 45:4 47:15 Parell 24:5 52:12 opened 38:9 53:18 **Parent** 31:15 performed 23:23, opening 19:10 organize 54:19 25 36:3 24:1 43:8 Parent's 31:13 originally 46:9 **period** 9:20 10:2,6 operation 10:18 part 8:1 9:9 11:9 13:16,18 17:17 **Orrick** 48:25 23:25 43:13 45:1 operations 10:24 18:2 23:17,20,23 50:17,18 51:2 48:6 **OTA** 2:6 6:23 30:19 36:3,5 41:2 47:15 21:21,22 22:2,12, parties 5:25 57:12 operative 24:18 16 23:5,23 42:23 55:8 periods 35:11 party 36:13 50:24 56:19,20 opinion 21:22 person 21:10,15, pay 8:7,20 10:20, **OTA's** 16:5 24:6 35:16 40:16 18 25 43:15 51:1 52:5 57:13 outstanding personal 13:4 payer 54:5 28:19 55:22 opportunity 6:7 paying 45:4,7 personal-used overassessment optimal 30:22 13:6 55:13,19,20,24 payment 10:12 option 27:10,12, 56:22 personally 8:12 28:17,22 44:15 16,18 29:15,19 50:15,17,18 overcome 42:21 **physical** 28:15,25 32:15.19 47:20.25 payments 11:3 49:17 overtime 10:11 picture 50:23 22:19 37:24 38:1 option's 29:12 own-invested **place** 14:19 44:4 44:3,17 13:15 48:5 49:10 options 6:1 9:21 payroll 10:16,21 10:5 17:8,14,22 owned 18:23 25:2 plan 21:25 29:5 11:1,20 12:5,8,13 18:7,22 19:13,18 49:4 50:5 13:24 20:6 37:20, 40:1 20:9,15,20 21:5 24 38:19 39:1,15 planet 7:23 24:8,16,19 25:2,6, 43:16,20 44:22,24 Ρ 11,23 26:4,7,8,14 49:14 plans 39:25 48:3, 27:2,7 30:11,20, 5 payrolls 11:24 25 31:25 32:5 pages 20:8 26:24 37:5,25 platform 8:5 34:3,6,7 35:5,9, 28:3 29:8 31:5

32:25 34:12 41:22

19,24 36:6 37:11

Index: point..rendered

reclassification **point** 44:2 proffered 42:18 Q 18:13 pointing 36:23 proof 20:1 reclassifying portion 21:24 properly 13:23 question 6:21 19:6 28:13 51:20 23:1 26:7 31:2 54:9,24 35:13 recognized 23:1 portions 25:21 questions 15:4, 26:8 property 21:5,9, 10,11,13,15,17,19 position 6:8 52:6 recollection 11,15,18,19 23:4 36:10,13,14,18,20 51:14 precedent 20:14 45:25 46:1 57:6,8 proposal 19:7 24:3,4,5,14 35:16 record 5:5,14,22 quote 11:22 13:2 53:19 proposed 16:25 6:6 18:4 19:11 18:11,17,20 19:2, 17:2 20:5 56:21 20:17 24:15.25 present 8:24 5,8 23:6 33:5 **prove** 42:19 41:5 53:19 57:14 presentation provided 6:4,5 records 20:6 4:10 7:6,13 15:20, R 24 36:9 53:22 9:12 20:1 refer 42:12 **rails** 51:19 presidential provision 28:3, reference 38:23 21:21 14,18,24 34:2,21 raise 6:11 referenced 33:19 presumptively **public** 9:7 10:22 raised 38:5 38:22 42:22 11:21 14:4 rate 10:8 14:14 reflected 16:25 prevail 56:2,7 publication 13:3 reregard 18:6 19:20 previous 39:19 publicly 9:8 characterization 42:22 40:2 16.2 purchase 9:10, regret 11:7 previously 19:22 13,24 10:15,19 re-characterized 11:6,10,15 12:7, regrets 49:11 16:17 17:3 **price** 12:7 27:22 20 13:1,13,17 54:11,18 29:12,21 50:6,21 14:6,24 27:12,18 reading 7:2 51:4,5 52:7 regulations 7:3 32:16 39:18 44:18 real 11:11 56:19 **priced** 49:18 45:18,19 50:24 reality 11:17 related 8:11 purchased 10:5 principle 8:11,13 17:18,24 20:24 45:15 46:14 15:1 realize 13:10 22:10,22 23:8,11, purchases 11:1 proceed 7:10 reason 19:22 14 24:11 25:15,18 26:3,18 28:8 15:22 40:9 43:19 37:16,17 43:11,17 purchasing 45:10 44:5 30:15 32:3,21 14:23 37:19 33:24 34:10 35:8, reasoning 19:20 proceedings **pure** 51:15 23 36:24 38:18 2:16 57:18 23:18 35:12 40:22 42:4 44:8, purely 43:20 44:9 reassess 56:10, 23 47:12 52:13 proceeds 43:19 purpose 13:5 12 **remain** 22:17 process 9:25 55:18 25:23 47:10 13:25 38:2 recall 34:7 purposes 21:9 remains 22:23 produced 6:14 recap 29:14 55:17 26:5 55:7 19:9 receive 17:11 pursuant 31:16 remarks 43:3 professional 25:20 27:2,6 28:4, 32:15 34:6 48:23 49:8 12 29:1 37:2 remember 7:2 put 11:7 38:21 51:10,11 proffer 19:20 received 4:4,5 44:4 48:5 20:7,13 14:3 17:7 rendered 57:13

renders 26:19 13,15,16,21,24 16,19 29:10 30:20 sentence 33:11 32:11,25 33:1,4, repeating 49:10 Respondents separate 12:25 13,16,22 34:12 41:20 39:10 51:21,23 replacing 48:4 35:5,20 40:19 response 16:5 47:3,8,18,21 48:8 separately 33:14 **Reply** 18:10,19 46:22 47:1 50:8 53:8,11,19 39:11 19:4 24:2 responses 38:9 ruling 7:7 56:13 separation 12:22 reported 2:19 52:16 restricted 6:1 running 37:25 10:15 11:17 September 2:18 16:14,16,19,23 17:8 21:6 27:3,8 28:2 29:25 30:12 17:2,3,7 39:11,14 5:1,8 S 41:14 43:18,19 32:8,13 34:23 service 53:13 35:1 52:2 Reporter 2:20 salaries 39:25 services 8:25 resulting 16:22 reporting 11:19, 16:11 17:12 18:1 salary 12:15,24 17:4 22:25 26:7 23 12:3,5 13:22 21:1,7,17 22:14 20:2 40:1 retain 52:23 23:5,17,19,23,25 reports 16:12 **sale** 10:15 11:12 24:12 26:12 **retention** 10:8,13 12:19.20 13:10 represent 33:5 30:18,22 31:1 14:19 19:15,18 **Return** 16:15,24 35:11 36:3,5 41:2 represented 20:2 44:9,23 42:10 47:14 41:16 46:9,11,13, 29:10 50:19 53:14,17 representing Samsung 11:22 **Revenue** 21:2,3 **set** 15:21 17:19 5:16,18 53:16 20:12 27:23 28:8 San 7:17 request 16:5 29:5,22 30:2,8 right-hand 6:11 **Sanjay** 5:7,23 34:18,25 47:4 42:23 45:17 7:16 31:18 33:12 rights 21:10,15, sets 27:1 29:9,12 requirements 38:6 17,18 48:16 22:14 27:1 share 8:4,7,20 save 45:6 **Riley** 3:10 5:18 9:10,13,24 10:19, respect 22:15 **SCA** 50:25 25 11:6,10 12:7 23:4 24:23 25:21 rings 50:2 13:13,17 14:6,23 26:11 28:13 32:13 schedule 16:19 risk 21:12.14.20 22:19 27:22 31:21 32:4 33:2,3 respectfully 22:13,15,17,24 29:12.21 44:23 34:18 42:13 17:10 42:23 55:15 24:24 25:24 26:5 45:8,18 49:22,23 scheduled 25:4 51:8,9 respond 18:5 Rodriguez 2:19 36:25 section 20:12 **Shared** 11:15 **root** 45:13 21:2,4,8 22:2,11 respondent 3:8 shareholders **round** 46:10 24:23 26:11 30:24 5:17 16:4,7 17:1, 10:9 34:1,5,11,21,25 10 20:5 24:2 **RSU** 17:14,22 35:15 46:22 47:3, **shares** 9:15,22 42:23 18:7 19:14,18 16 52:4 53:16 10:4 11:16 12:19 20:9,15,20 24:8, Respondent's 13:1,15,20 14:9, 16,19 25:16 26:4, sections 42:16 16:11,24 17:1 17,19,25 21:25 14 30:25 31:25 18:9,18 19:3,21, **secure** 23:19 22:4,7,17 23:2,7, 34:13 35:9,24 23 21:23 24:7 30:22 36:4 12 27:12,18 28:6 36:6 40:25 41:7, 25:1,5 26:24 29:10 32:17,18 11,21,24 42:7,20 **seize** 37:8,13 27:11,17 28:3,24 33:9 37:4,19 44:11 29:8,13 31:5,11, **seized** 31:19 43:25 45:18 **RSU's** 9:22 10:5 20,22 32:5,25 39:21 40:3 48:15,16,17,19,20 33:3,14 34:3,12 18:22 25:1,6,21, 49:4 52:14

23 26:7,8 28:5,13,

41:12,16,22 42:5,

**sell** 13:8

**short** 13:20 14:14, Stabell 21:21 22:4 52:1,2 53:20 sustained 56:9 26:19 35:12,16 swear 6:8 stockholder 40:16 41:25 42:8 short-come 14:9 34:23 53:15 Swedish 9:5 short-term 14:15 stocks 13:7 18:15 **sworn** 6:14 **stand** 44:20 45:16 16:20 19:24 38:14 strategy 9:2 standard 20:11 Symphony 8:25 **shot** 56:15 **strike** 50:21 9:6,16,21 16:11 standpoint 12:3 show 18:4 44:6 17:13,19 20:19,22 structured 54:16 **start** 46:3 24:20,21 25:8,10 **shows** 54:5 stuff 37:13 40:1 26:12,23,25 started 7:19 side 52:17 44:11 45:2 27:14,24 28:1,9 48:14 29:7,14 30:9,23 **sign-on** 27:10 **subject** 21:12,19 31:7 33:20 34:6, **starting** 7:18 40:2 29:15 22:7,17,24 25:7, 17,23 35:17 37:3, 23 26:5 28:7 29:2 state 2:2 3:8 8:16 11 39:21 40:17 **signed** 9:11 13:17 14:13 16:14 24:4 32:18,19 33:22 43:23 48:22 41:10 43:25 44:12 41:11,15 51:16 45:12 47:5,19,23, simpler 11:2 **stated** 22:12,18 **submits** 17:10 25 50:25 51:9 25:24 54:11 52:11 53:3,4,9,23 **simply** 9:5 14:24 submitted 12:11 54:2,15 55:1,3,4, **single** 12:2 37:3 statement 4:15 37:5 5,6,7,9 44:21 19:4 40:12 43:5 subsequent Symphony's 44:20 53:23 54:1 **site** 48:24 33:21 29:11 54:5 statements 20:6 subsequently **sitting** 13:25 systems 7:23 **states** 18:11,20 17:13 20:22 24:20 39:15 sixth 45:11 19:5 27:4 32:4 31:7 34:21 **sizes** 7:21 substance 47:18 Т stating 22:6 **slips** 39:2 substantial statutory 22:14 21:12,14,17,20 **sold** 18:15 **table** 49:2 22:13,15,17,24 42:19 sort 8:13 11:7,23, target 29:4 24:24 25:23 26:5 stay 52:19 53:1 25 12:1,11 39:16 tax 2:1 3:8 5:6,16, substantiate 56:16 40:3 49:14 19 6:24,25 8:15, 20:14 stayed 10:7 source 22:1 17 14:14 16:3,6,8, success 56:3 14,23 18:21 19:24 **STC** 39:4 speaking 51:15 20:5 21:8 24:6 successfully **steps** 9:10 **specific** 17:18,23 38:3,12,13 41:16 7:20 46:10.17.21 49:8 20:23 22:10 23:10 **stock** 6:1 11:13 sufficient 20:14 24:11 25:15 26:18 51:12 52:5 54:21 17:8,21 18:22 30:15 32:2,21 55:22,25 56:1,3,8, 19:13 20:2,20 summary 14:17 10.25 33:24 34:10 35:8, 21:5,6 24:8,16,19 Supplemental 23 40:19,22 42:4 taxable 16:17 25:6,23 27:2,3,7, 47:11 52:12 55:21 24:1 8,13,19 28:2,6 17:5 29:25 30:11,12,20 specifically supposed 51:21 taxation 8:14 22:20 23:8 26:1 32:8,14,17 34:2 Supreme 24:2 21:4 35:19 40:18,25 27:4 31:24 56:20 42:19 44:9,18 survives 44:13 taxes 8:8,11,16, specifies 34:2,11 47:4,20,21,23,25 19,20 14:4,7,8,11 sustain 42:23 48:1 49:20,25 **split** 44:6 18:12 45:4 50:19,24 51:25

Taxpayer 5:23 **Tommy** 3:3 5:11 understand W 56:7 14:24 39:13 50:13 topic 13:3 54:17 taxpayers 54:19 total 39:5 **W-2** 16:10 20:1 understanding team 10:7,10 41:9,15 53:23 touched 46:23 6:23 38:12 54:1,5,14 55:1 technology 7:19, transaction 8:11 understood 24,25 8:1 37:4 wages 16:13,14 34:22 9:9,18,19,23 13:1 43:9 41:12,15 46:10,17 14:8,12,22 18:14 units 6:1 17:8 **Teleca** 9:4,5,7,16, 38:19 46:3 49:6 wait 36:16 21:6 27:3,8 28:2 51:20,21,24,25 21 16:11 34:23 29:25 30:12 32:8, wanted 10:12,20 37:11 39:21 44:12 52:3 14 52:2 11:1 40:7,9 49:19 54:2 55:6 transactionunquote 11:22 whichever 21:13 tens 8:18 close 9:16 13:18 unvested 28:19 Wi-fi 7:22.23 term 55:8 **TRANSCRIPT** 2:16 willingness terminated 34:16 ٧ 31:13 52:14 transfer 21:6 23:4 words 52:10 terminates 34:24 transferable **verses** 38:15 21:11,18 50:24 working 48:10 termination 28:18.22 transferee 21:19 vest 32:6,9,12,19 world 39:15 33:6,9,22 terms 25:8 47:4 transferred 21:6 worldwide 11:25 vested 10:4 23:2 testified 6:16 transfers 56:7 worth 48:19 25:6 26:8 33:9 52:21 transform 8:25 34:8 44:10 47:22 testify 6:9 49:17 Υ treat 39:16 thankful 8:6 vesting 17:14,17, treated 14:8,11 year 6:24 12:16 25 18:2 21:24 thing 12:2 38:15 18:25 45:20 46:16 14:10 16:3.7 22:6,9,12,18,19, 44:14 18:16,21 21:10 treatment 13:19 25 23:1,7,10,16, 28:15,25 56:3,16 things 47:22 14:20 46:19,23 17,23 24:10 25:11,16,17,20, years 8:18 16:8 thousand 49:12, treats 19:24 24,25 26:14,17 33:8 44:16 45:10 22 trigger 33:8,10 27:13,15,20 28:7, 48:7,9 thousands 11:3 12 29:10,18 30:5, true 48:17 37:18,21 10,14,17,19 31:23 32:1 34:18,25 **Tuesday** 2:18 5:1 three-year 10:2,5 35:7,10,11,18,22 turn 15:9 24:14 time 5:8 14:2 15:6, 36:3 37:7 40:19, 36:12 45:24 55:11 12,17,19 19:11 21,25 41:2,24 36:15 48:11 51:7 42:3 43:25 44:13 turned 9:2 47:11,15 48:1,11, timely 22:21 turning 26:23 12 52:11 32:20 40:23 31:4 vestings 49:4 times 41:19 54:11 type 56:17 vision 7:19 tips 16:13 41:12 U today 5:11 7:22 8:10 24:25 57:12 underlined 33:11