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(Exhibits 1 and 2 were marked for identification.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good afternoon. Here begins Media Number 1 of Volume 1 to videotaped deposition of Elon Musk in the matter of Tesla, Inc., versus Martin Tripp. This case is in the United States District Court, District of Nevada. The case number 3:18-cv-00296-LRH-CBC.

Today's date is February 21st, 2020, and the time is 1:04 P.M. This deposition is being held at 1224 Beverwil Drive, Los Angeles, California 90035. The videographer is John Azpilicueta here with our certified court reporter Mike Hensley. We're both with Depo Dynamics.

At this time, would counsel please introduce yourselves and state whom you represent.

MR. FISCHBACH: Good afternoon. William Fischbach and Robert Mitchell for the Defendant and Counterclaimant, Martin Tripp.

MR. SPIRO: Alex Spiro and Jeanine Zalduendo on behalf of Mr. Musk.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. May the court
reporter please swear in the witness.
ELON MUSK,
having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, can $I$ have your full name for the record.
A. Elon Reeve Musk.
Q. Mr. Musk, are you under the influence of any medications or controlled substances or anything that might impact your ability to give truthful and accurate deposition testimony here today, sir?
A. No.
Q. Sir, did you understand the oath you just took?
A. Yes.
Q. What does it mean to you?
A. How is this relevant to the testimony?
Q. Sir, I'm not here to answer your questions.

You're here to answer my questions.
A. Okay.
Q. My question for you is, sir, do you understand the oath that you just took?
A. Yes, of course.
Q. What do you think it means?
A. To say the whole truth, nothing but the truth,
and to be truthful at the -- and more importantly to be truthful at the very core of the truth. Q. You would agree with me that something isn't really true unless it's the whole truth; right, Mr. Musk?
A. This sounds like some sort of legalese, semantic argument. The -- what is the whole truth of something? You say, "Is that a tree? What kind of tree is it? Is it a tree with lots of leaves?" Or is -- if you're saying something is a tree is the whole truth? No, of course not.

So what is this, like, semantic trap you're attempting to create here?
Q. Mr. Musk, sir, again, I'm not here to answer your questions, sir.
A. But $I$ can ask you for clarification, can $I$ not?
Q. Sir, do you not understand the question?
A. No.
Q. You don't understand my question?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you or do you not agree with the statement that something isn't true unless it's the whole truth? A. This -- this strikes me as sort of a typical, legal, trick question where you have a -- the question itself is framed in a way that is impossible to answer.
Q. Anything else you'd like to add to your answer, Mr. Musk?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Musk, before we got started here today, you asked my partner Robert Mitchell and I if we were doing this case on a contingent fee; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you think that was an appropriate question?
A. Because your client has not paid his -- I'm told he has not paid his child support payments and is in Hungary and refuses to come to the United States. And if so, he's not paying their child support payments, and they're probably not paying you. So probably you're on a contingency or you're taking that kid's money.

Which is it?
I guess you don't have to answer my questions.
Q. I don't, Mr. Musk.

Mr. Musk, the -- or I've handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 1.

Sir, you're aware that we filed a motion to compel your deposition in this case; is that correct, sir?
A. Sure.
Q. Sir, during oral argument on that motion, the
judge, Judge Baldwin, said a few things to your prior lawyer, Mr. Gates. I want to read them to you right now.

This is the judge talking:
"If there are any shenanigans, Mr. Gates, by your client, he will -- I want to know immediately. So if there's any [behavior] of personal attacks, bullying, or not answering the proper questions, being snarky, anything that is going to be inappropriate" -A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- "I want a phone call when it happens, and I will consider shutting down the deposition... then having it rescheduled in my courtroom for seven hours." A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. "Am I clear on that? So I hope you can take some time and prep your client to make sure that he understands [that he's] not going to fly with this court. So we're not even going to go down that road.
"And if there's any indication that those types of behaviors are happening, and it's making it difficult or almost impossible for Mr. Fischbach to get through a deposition in the time frame that I've suggested, then I will reconsider this, and that's how I will likely handle it.
"So unless you would like to make a trip to
lovely Reno, I suggest that he simply answer the questions that are appropriately posed."

## Did I read that correctly, Mr. Musk?

A. Yeah.
Q. Do you intend to comply with the judge's admonition there?
A. Of course.
Q. And to be fair, Mr. Musk, if you don't ask -understand a question I've asked, please ask me to rephrase it. And I'd be happy to do so, okay?
A. Yes. That's --
Q. However, sir --
A. That's what I will do.
Q. Thank you. If I -- or ask you a question and you answer it, I'm going to assume that you understood the question.

Is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. Sir, I'm handing you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 2.

Do you recognize this document?
MR. SPIRO: Take a moment to read it.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. Sir, is this your declaration that
you supported -- or that you submitted in opposition to your deposition?
A. I suppose it was.
Q. All right. Did you read this before you signed it?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is everything in this declaration true?
A. I certainly believed it to be true. Do you want me to read it in detail?
Q. I do not, Mr. Musk.
A. Yeah.
Q. I want to ask you, however, why this deposition would pose a substantial burden and hardship to you in this case.
A. Well, I have a lot of obligations to run two companies and make sure that the right thing happens there. This case, in my view, is a frivolous case brought by a counterparty who is just a terrible human being. And, frankly, if I may say so, I -- I'm troubled by your association with him.

So instead of me being able to do my duty for the companies, I'm here. This is not -- this is not -this is not -- does not serve anyone. It's not good. It's a waste of time.
Q. I think you knocked your microphone down,

Mr. Musk.
A. Yeah.
Q. Thank you.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Mr. Musk, if it could be on your jacket, please.

THE WITNESS: Yeah.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you, sir.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. And, sir, if I understand you correctly, time is a very precious commodity for you, given the responsibilities you have to these various companies; is that true?
A. Yes. This is -- I have a lot of responsibility, and it's critical to execute that responsibility. If I am constantly deposed in cases that lack merit, as I view this one to be --

MR. FISCHBACH: May I have that marked, please?
(Exhibit 3 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 3. That is an email sent from Martin Tripp to you on May 16th of 2018.

The title of this email is "Stator Scrap Pareto (Month of April)"; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it references something called "NCM"; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. NCM is shorthand for nonconforming material?
A. Yes.
Q. In other words, scrap; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the gist of this email is that Mr. Tripp is expressing concern to you regarding scrap in the Gigafactory; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does Tesla encourage the practice of its employees reaching directly out to the CEO if they see something that concerns them?
A. I do.
Q. In May of 2018 was the amount of scrap at the Gigafactory a serious concern for you?
A. Yes.
Q.

Did you do anything in response to Mr. Tripp's email?
A. I -- I don't recall exactly what I did, but I wanted to -- like, $I$ forwarded it on to have it be looked into.
(Exhibit 4 was marked for identification.)
MR. FISCHBACH: 4?

MR. SPIRO: Copy for me?
MR. FISCHBACH: That is your copy.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 4. This is an email originally from Mr. Tripp to you on June 10th and then a response from you to Mr. Tripp.

And in this email, you state "Getting scrap from when cells exit Panasonic to less than 1 percent needs to be a hardcore goal."

Did you actually write that?
A. Yeah.
Q. And when you say something, do you mean it?
A. Almost always.
Q. Okay. Well, should Tesla employees believe you when you make a statement like that?
A. Yes.
Q. So Mr. Tripp should have believed you when you stated that getting scrap down to 1 percent is a hardcore goal for the company?
A. Of course.
Q. Did you do anything in response to this email to meet that hardcore goal?
A. We did many things, and we have achieved it. No thanks to Tripp.
(Exhibits 5 and 6 were marked for identification.) MR. FISCHBACH: There should be two articles.

MR. SPIRO: Do you have any extra?
MR. FISCHBACH: I gave you both articles at once.

MR. SPIRO: Okay.
THE REPORTER: Counsel, do you wish for these both to be one exhibit or two separate exhibits?

MR. FISCHBACH: Two separate, please.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Mr. Musk, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibits 5 and 6. These are the Linette Lopez articles based on information from Mr. Tripp; correct?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$, yes.
Q. What did you think of Linette Lopez at the time these articles were published?
A. I don't recall exactly what $I$ thought of her on June 4th, 2018.
Q. What about during that general time frame?
A. She appeared to be -- in fact, was -- writing articles that were -- misrepresented the situation at Tesla and was clearly taking confidential information. It was a combination of confidential information being published that was obviously violating somebody's
confidentiality agreement and false information.
Q. So this wasn't the first negative press that Ms. Lopez had published regarding Tesla before; correct, sir?
A. I mean, I don't know if she published something before June 4th or not.
Q. Would you agree with me that, at least at this point in time, you regarded her as somebody not friendly to Tesla?
A. I don't --

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You don't understand the question, or you don't know whether or not she was friendly to Tesla based on those articles?
A. Right. I certainly don't know if she was
friendly to Tesla. She's -- I mean, this -- these articles are clearly not positive or -- yeah.

I mean, I have, like, 10,000 things that I need to worry about to have Tesla operate effectively. This is 1 out of 10,000 .
Q. What did you think about the person that provided the information to Lopez for those articles at the time you learned about them?
A. Well, it's -- clearly somebody is leaking confidential information, breaking their confidentiality agreement, and exaggerating the reality of what is going on.
Q. And how did you feel about that?
A. Well, obviously, I would feel as anyone would feel.
Q. Which was?
A. That Tesla was being wronged.
Q. What did you want to happen to the leaker when you found them?
A. Well, they would have to pay the appropriate legal penalty for violating their confidentiality agreement and misleading -- you know, not just leaking information, but in a way that is actively damaging to the company and, in some cases, false.
Q. Now, both of these articles reference scrap in the Gigafactory; correct?

MR. SPIRO: You can take a minute to read the articles if you want to.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
MR. FISCHBACH: Well, we'll go off the record if he's going to read the whole articles.

MR. SPIRO: Well, you're asking him a question about the articles. You asked the question.

MR. FISCHBACH: Right.
MR. SPIRO: So we're not --
MR. FISCHBACH: But I'm not going to let him chew up time that way.

MR. SPIRO: He's not chewing up time. You're asking him a question. He's been rapid firing answering you. That's not fair.

MR. FISCHBACH: Let's go off the record.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record --

THE WITNESS: Well, do you want me to answer questions about an article? In which case, I need to read the article.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. Time is 1:18 P.M.

MR. FISCHBACH: Take your time, sir.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record.
Time is 1:18 P.M.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Mr. Musk, I think it's clear what you're trying to do here; so let me rephrase the question.

MR. SPIRO: I'll object to the colloquy. Just answer -- just ask questions. All right?

MR. FISCHBACH: Anything else?

MR. SPIRO: Not right now.
THE WITNESS: I think what the judge said applies to both of us.

MR. SPIRO: Yeah, you're not kidding.
MR. FISCHBACH: Thank you, Mr. Musk.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. There were two articles published by Linette Lopez regarding scrap. And Mr. Tripp had sent you two emails regarding scrap; correct, sir?
A. Probably correct. I don't think a lot about Linette Lopez.
Q. All right. So if Mr. Tripp is the leaker, and he's also emailing you regarding scrap in the Gigafactory, that's not a very good way to cover up his tracks if he's leaking information to Lopez, is it?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form.
You can answer if you understand it.
THE WITNESS: I mean, it could be a way to cover up tracks. I don't know. It's not -- you know, it's -I'm not sure that's -- the question is a sensible question. But it's not -- it's not a question that makes sense in my view.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. Well, did it ever occur to you that Mr. Tripp was genuinely concerned about scrap levels in
the Gigafactory and Tesla's seeming indifference to those scrap levels?
A. When I first received email from Tripp, I thought he was sane and genuine. And later, information revealed he appeared to not be sane or at least partially be insane and not be genuine and to be acting out of malice.
Q. And sitting here today, you -- you dispute the veracity of the information that Mr . Tripp provided to Ms. Lopez; is that correct, sir?

MR. SPIRO: Objection as to form. Which
information?
THE WITNESS: He clearly provided scrap
information that was far in excess of reality in some cases.

MR. FISCHBACH: Mark that, please.
THE WITNESS: I believe at one point he --
THE REPORTER: Just a moment.
THE WITNESS: Sorry.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
(Exhibit 7 was marked for identification.)
MR. FISCHBACH: Ready?
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 7. These are two
emails that you sent to all Tesla personnel; is that correct, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you recognize these emails?
A. Yeah.
Q. And this email -- or both emails were sent shortly after Mr. Tripp was identified as the Business Insider leaker; correct, sir?
A. Well, not that long. Oh, I don't know when he was identified as the -- this says June 18th. I'm not sure exactly what the date is that he was identified as the leaker.
Q. Well, I'll avow to you that he was interrogated by Tesla personnel on June 15th --
A. Okay.
Q. -- and June 16th.
A. Okay.
Q. Approximately how many Tesla employees were there at the time this email was sent?
A. I don't know the exact number. If -- 30,000 perhaps.
Q. You wrote in this email "I was dismayed to
learn... about a Tesla employee who had conducted quite extensive and damaging sabotage to our operations. This included making direct code changes to the Tesla

Manufacturing Operating System under false usernames and exporting large amounts of highly sensitive Tesla data to unknown third parties."

Did I read that correctly, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And the employee you're referring to here is Mr. Tripp; correct?
A. Yes. I do not mention him by name, but, yes, that's -- that is who $I$ was referring to.
Q. What evidence did you have at the time that you sent this email that Mr . Tripp had conducted, quote, "extensive and damaging sabotage" to Tesla's operations?
A. This is the -- the substance of the information that was conveyed to me by Tesla's security team. Q. Okay. So your attorney -- your prior attorney suggested that $I$ look up the definition of sabotage. And in Merriam-Webster, it's defined as, quote, "Destruction of an employer's property (such as tools or materials) or the hindering of manufacturing by discontented workers."

Did Mr. Tripp inflict any physical harm to the Gigafactory?

MR. SPIRO: Is that the whole definition?
MR. FISCHBACH: Is that an objection?
MR. SPIRO: Well, if -- this question's
misleading, yeah. It's an objection to form.
MR. FISCHBACH: All right. The objection is
noted.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Please answer the question, Mr. Musk.
A. I -- I suspect he probably did, but we do not have evidence of that that's 100 percent in this regard. Q. Did Mr. Tripp destroy any batteries or equipment at the Gigafactory?
A. Not that -- not that we caught him doing.
Q. Were production levels of the Gigafactory hindered at all due to Mr. Tripp's conduct?
A. Probably.
Q. Do you have any evidence to support that,

Mr. Musk?
A. We did not catch him doing it.
Q. You go on to state "The full extent of his actions are not yet clear."

So at the time you made this statement, you didn't have a complete investigation of the facts, did you, Mr. Musk?
A. We had to -- there were a lot of -- a lot of negative facts conveyed to me, or believed to be facts, by security team. And it appeared to be just the tip of the iceberg.
Q. Sir, but my question was, at the time you made this statement, you did not have a complete investigation of the facts, did you?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We did not have a complete investigation of the facts, but the facts that had come to light were extremely bad.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. Do you do this often, make statements to all your employees before you have all the facts?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I think this notion that one can have all the facts is -- is, again, sort of an example of legal trickery.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You go on to write "However, there may be considerably more to this situation than meets the eye; so the investigation will continue in depth this week. We need to figure out if he was acting alone or with others at Tesla and if he was working with any outside organizations.
"As you know, there are a long list of organizations that want Tesla to die. These include Wall Street short-sellers, who have already lost
billions of dollars and stand to lose a lot more. Then there are the oil and gas companies, the wealthiest industry in the world. They don't love the idea of Tesla advancing the progress of solar power and electric cars. Don't want to blow your mind, but rumor has it that those companies are sometimes not super nice.
"Then there [all] the multitude of big gas/diesel car company competitors. If they're willing to cheat so much about emissions, maybe they're willing to cheat in other ways?
"Most of the time, when there is theft of goods, leaking of confidential information, dereliction of duty, or outright sabotage, the reason [is really] something simple like wanting to get back at someone within the company or at the company as a whole. Occasionally, it is much more serious."

Are short-sellers and big oil companies -sorry, short-sellers, big oil companies, and traditional car companies enemies of Tesla in your view, Mr. Musk?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say that they're initially enemies, but they have interests contrary to that of Tesla. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Okay. And according to you in that email, they
want to see Tesla die; correct?
A. Some of them do.
Q. Why did you feel the need to reference short-sellers and big oil and competitor car companies and their desire to see Tesla die in this email about Mr. Tripp?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
You can answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: I mean, I'm simply listing the -that there are a lot of people and organizations out there who have interests contrary to Tesla that people may not be aware of

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Okay. What was the point of you linking those outside interests, the big oil and the short-sellers and the car companies, to Mr. Tripp?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form. Assumes facts.
THE WITNESS: This was not implying that he
somehow works for all of those people, but -- but that -- it's possible that he could.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. At the time you sent that email, did you have any evidence that Mr. Tripp was working with short-sellers?
A. On this -- on June 18th?
Q. Yes.
A. No. I wouldn't say that we had direct evidence.
Q. Did you have any evidence that Mr. Tripp was working with oil and gas companies?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any evidence that Mr. Tripp was working with big gas/diesel car companies that are Tesla's competitors?
A. No.
Q. So sitting here today, you have no evidence that Mr. Tripp was working with short-sellers, oil and gas companies, or big gas/diesel car companies during his employment with Tesla; is that correct, sir?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Compound.
THE WITNESS: The -- there did appear to be a link to Jim Chanos, a prominent short-seller of Tesla who is closely associated with Linette Lopez, and the information that Lopez was publishing was beneficial to Chanos.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Anything else?
A. No.
Q. Did you know about the supposed link with

Mr. Chanos when you sent that email?
A. I'm not certain.
Q. You followed up with an email on June 18th, "...last night we had another strange incident that was hard to explain. Small fire on the body-in-white production line. No one was in the area and there were no injuries or significant equipment damage, but it was enough to stop the body production line for several hours.
"Could just be a random event, but as Andy Grove said, 'Only the paranoid survive.' Please be on the alert for anything that's not in the best interest of our company. If you aren't getting a respondent from the emdesk email, please send me a note directly."

Sir, did you think that Mr. Tripp had anything to do with the fire in the body-in-white line?
A. No.
Q. Then why did you follow up your prior email regarding Mr. Tripp with an email about this fire?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: It's just one of a series of incidents that was concerning. There were just a lot of unexplained incidents that caused the Tesla production line to get to -- to fall out that were in our electronic control system and -- yeah. It's just that there were a lot of incidents that stopped the line and there was no clear explanation for why the -- why these
things happened.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Okay. When you sent out that email, did you have any evidence that Mr. Tripp had anything to do with that fire?
A. No.
Q. You have a quote in here, "Only the paranoid survive." Did something that Mr. Tripp did make you feel paranoid, Mr. Musk?
A. Well, no. This is a quote from Andy Grove where he's essentially saying that you should not be complacent and you should take potential threats seriously. And that is the -- an appropriate duty of the CEO of the company.
Q. Do you consider yourself a paranoid person?
A. No.
Q. Have there been fires in Tesla facilities before June 18th of 2018?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. That's outside the scope.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SPIRO: You don't have to answer if I say --
THE WITNESS: Sure.
MR. SPIRO: -- it's outside the scope.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Sure. All right. Sure,
yeah.
MR. SPIRO: That answer can -- that answer can stand.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. SPIRO: And let's move on to something
inside the scope.
MR. FISCHBACH: Well, I disagree. Let me follow it up with a different question.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. When there were fires on other occasions in the Tesla factory, did you send out an email like that to all employees?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form. Objection.
Outside the scope.
If you can answer that, you can answer it.
We'll move on to other subjects.
THE WITNESS: I think I sent out a few emails because I was concerned about -- there were just a lot of incidents that were unexplained that -- yeah. They have an off camera -- security cameras weren't working in that particular area. There was -- there were a lot of sort of strange things that occurred with no explanation. Yeah.

MR. FISCHBACH: 8?
THE REPORTER: Yes.
(Exhibit 8 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Mr. Musk, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 8. This is an exchange between you and Mr. Tripp on June 20th of 2018; correct, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'll avow to you, sir, that June 20th is also the same day that Tesla filed its lawsuit against Mr. Tripp.

Are you aware of that?
A. June 20th?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Now that you mention it, I am.
Q. And it first started -- the first message was from Mr. Tripp to you at 8:57 A.M.; is that right, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Subject of the email is "Termination/Lawsuit"?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And that's your Tesla email address?
A. It doesn't state my email address, but it -assume it is.
Q. Erm@tesla.com?
A. It doesn't show ERM.
Q. But is that your Tesla email address, sir?
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A. Yes.
Q. And that's not a secret within the company, is it, sir?
A. No.
Q. Is it your common practice to communicate with employees that Tesla has recently fired?
A. It's not common.
Q. Why did you respond to this email from Mr. Tripp?
A. I mean, he sent me an email that was clearly a very threatening email saying I have what's coming to me. And so I said -- replied to him that "Threatening me only makes it worse for you."
Q. Did he threaten your physical safety?
A. I took that to imply that it could be a physical
threat, yes.
Q. It said "Don't worry. You have what's coming to
you for the lies you have told to the public and investors."

You took that as a threat to your physical safety, Mr. Musk?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
/ / /

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Why was it so important that you get personally involved in this dispute with Mr. Tripp?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: It is -- it is not usual for -it's not common for me to get involved in individual disputes, but it's also not common for me to have -- for some -- somebody to interact with me in this way; so -BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You go on to state "You should [be] ashamed of yourself for framing other people. You're a horrible human being"; is that right, sir?
A. Yes. I do think he's a horrible human being, yes. I'm quite convinced of that actually.
Q. Thank you.
A. Yeah.
Q. How did he frame -- who did he frame?
A. When he was stealing the data from Tesla, he logged in as -- with other people's usernames in order to hide his tracks and make it look like they were the ones taking the data, not him.
Q. But who? Give me a name, please.
A. I don't recall the names offhand, but it was he -- he logged in with multiple other usernames. And I believe at first we -- we actually thought the person
who had taken the data was someone else because -because he had logged in with their name. And so that's what I would -- any reasonable person would call framing somebody else.
Q. And you were taking this incident with Mr. Tripp personally, it looks like; is that right, Mr. Musk? A. I -- I did take it personally in that he was -it seemed like this is someone who had gone out of his way to harm the company.
Q. And --
A. And he was -- he had betrayed our trust. He betrayed his confidentiality agreement. He had just been an awful person who had done harm to the company. Q. I want to get your -- I want to understand your definition of a "horrible human being," Mr. Musk.

Steven Paddock, the Las Vegas shooter, is that a horrible human being in your opinion?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: Of course.
MR. SPIRO: And if you know anything about these people that he asks you about.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you think Jeffrey Epstein was a horrible human being?
A. Yes.
Q.

Are you equating Mr. Tripp with Mr. Paddock and Mr. Epstein by calling him a horrible person?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: No. I mean, again, you're
engaging in legal trickery.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, you know what a synonym is; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So synonyms for horrible are words like "terrible," "vile," "detestable," "loathsome."

On June 20th, did you view Mr. Tripp as a terrible human being?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: Pretty awful human being for sure.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. My question was did you view him as a terrible human being?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I mean, maybe I wouldn't use the word "terrible" exactly, but pretty awful. He's obviously not as bad as someone who has shot people. But people can use the word like "I had a terrible meal." They don't mean to equate the meal with somebody being killed. It's just that the -- well, there's --
"horrible" and "terrible" cover a wide range of -- of opinions.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. So Mr. Tripp was like a bad meal for you?
A. Do you -- do you wish to spend this -- this deposition engaging in legal trickery or asking at real questions?
Q. Mr. Musk, can you please answer my question, sir.

MR. SPIRO: Was it like a bad meal? That's the question pending.

THE WITNESS: No, it's not like a bad meal.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you think it was reckless for Lopez to publish this information from Mr. Tripp without verifying it?
A. Yes.

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Relevance.
THE WITNESS: Oh.
MR. SPIRO: Form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Yes. More than reckless.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You go on to state "However, betraying your word of honor, breaking the deal you had when Tesla gave you
a job, and framing your colleagues are wrong and come with some legal penalties. So it goes. Be well."

You also thought Mr. Tripp was a traitor;
correct, sir?
A. I -- I guess.
Q. Well, you said he --
A. -- of course.
Q. He betrayed his word of honor; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So he's a traitor?
A. To -- to Tesla, yes, of course.
Q. He's a horrible human being and a traitor in your mind; correct?
A. He's a bad person for sure.
Q. You state "So it goes." I've seen you use that phrase in other places. What does that phrase mean to you?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to the windup colloquy. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You can answer the question, Mr. Musk.
A. It's just a way of saying that that's life.
Q. And you also wrote "Be well." Did you really wish Mr. Tripp good fortune when you said that?
A. Probably not.
Q. Did you wish him good health?
A. I don't wish anyone bad health.
Q. Hmm. Well, then why did you say "Be well"?
A. Neither here nor there.
Q. You don't know why you said "Be well"?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: It's an off-the-cuff comment.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You mention "legal penalties." What penalties did you have in mind?
A. Whatever is appropriate under the law for breaking confidentiality agreement and leaking vast amounts of confidential information and misleading journalists about the state of the company.
Q. Did you have a particular penalty in mind, though?
A. I do not know of a particular penalty. It's whatever is appropriate under the law.
Q. Now, most people would regard a penalty as a form of punishment. Did you want Mr. Tripp punished for his conduct?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
And don't answer anything that you've had -that has to do with conversations you've had with counsel.

MR. FISCHBACH: I agree with that, sir.

MR. SPIRO: All right.
THE WITNESS: Sure; so --
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. My question was most people would consider penalty a form of punishment. Did you want to see Mr. Tripp punished for his conduct?

MR. SPIRO: And objection to form as to "most people."

But if you can understand that, you can answer it.

THE WITNESS: I thought if somebody engages in repeated and willful violation of their confidentiality agreement in a manner which is egregious and selectively leaks that information in a way that is very harmful to the company and we do nothing, then -- and I -- I as CEO do nothing on the company, I am not serving the interest of the company.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. So when you talked about him receiving significant -- or receiving some legal penalties, was he going to get what was coming to him in your mind, Mr. Musk?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
You can answer that.
THE WITNESS: No. I think he -- the -- he would
pay the appropriate legal penalty.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. He was going to get what was coming to him; right?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: That's not how I put it.
MR. FISCHBACH: 9?
THE REPORTER: Correct.
(Exhibit 9 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Mr. Musk, this exhibit, Exhibit 9, that the
court reporter handed you, this is an email from yourself to Julia Wong.

She's a reporter with The Guardian; correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Had you ever communicated with Julia Wong before this email exchange on June 20th?
A. I don't recall. Possibly, but I don't recall.
Q. And if I could direct your attention to the second to last page, Mr. Musk, it appears that Ms. Wong initiated this email communication with you because she had questions about the lawsuit that Tesla had initiated that day; is that correct, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Tesla has a communications team to respond
to press inquiries; is that correct, sir?
A. Yes. We -- well, yeah, we have communications team.
Q. And you don't respond personally to every press inquiry received, do you, sir?
A. No.
Q. But you responded to this one; correct?
A. This one was directed to me, and at times I do respond directly.
Q. And in this case the inquiry had to do with

Mr. Martin Tripp; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The same Martin Tripp that earlier that day you had called a horrible human being and a traitor; correct?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Misstates the evidence. I don't remember the word "traitor" being in the email. Was it?

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You can answer the question, Mr. Musk.
A. This is a person that I -- that $I$ thought was a horrible human being and had betrayed the trust of the company.
Q. Thank you, sir.

You wrote "Tripp sent me a threatening email
this morning. Below is the exchange. I was just told that we received a call at the Gigafactory that he was going to come back and shoot people. The police have been alerted and we have posted additional security. Our comms team can fill you in."

What was Mr. Tripp going to shoot people with, Mr. Musk?
A. What was Mr. Tripp -- what do you mean "What was Mr. Tripp going to shoot people with?"
Q. Well, you wrote in here "I was just told that we received a call at the Gigafactory that he was going to come back and shoot people."

I'm asking you what was he going to come back and shoot people with?
A. Guns. What do you mean?
Q. Well, what kind of gun? A rifle?
A. I don't know what kind of guns.
Q. A shotgun?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: What -- what is the point of asking me what type of guns he has? I -- I don't know what type -- I don't know what guns he has. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you know whether or not he was going to come back with an automatic or semiautomatic weapon?
A. I was -- I was simply told by security that the -- we received a call saying that -- that Marty Tripp was going to -- was -- was on his way to the Gigafactory and was heavily armed, was extremely volatile and angry, and it sounded like he was going to try to shoot everyone.
Q. So when you sent this email to Julia Wong, you didn't know what kind of gun Mr. Tripp was going to come back and shoot people with, did you, Mr. Musk?
A. No. But I was told he was heavily armed.
Q. And you didn't know what kind of --
A. Presumably, that is not a small gun.
Q. You didn't know what kind of ammunition

Mr. Tripp was going to use, did you, Mr. Musk?
A. No. It -- I was told he was heavily armed, and that usually means something much bigger than a handgun. Q. All right. You didn't know whether or not he was going to use an automatic, a semiautomatic weapon, did you, Mr. Musk?
A. No. I was simply told that he was heavily armed, volatile, and on his way to the Gigafactory. Q. How was he going to get back to the Gigafactory?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know. By car presumably. / / /
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BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Well, did you know?
A. No. But, I mean, people -- he would just
get there -- go there by car or, like -- it's not like it's in a secure location.
Q. But you didn't know how Mr. Tripp was going to go back to the Gigafactory -- did you, sir? -- when you made that statement?
A. Do you mean what form of transport he would use?
Q. Yes.
A. I mean, presumably he'd drive. I mean, I don't think he would use a helicopter or walk.
Q. Who made the call?
A. Who made what call?
Q. The call that you reference in here, "We [just] received a call at the Gigafactory."

Who made the call?
A. I don't know who made the call.
Q. Did the caller have an accent?
A. I was not on the -- I was not on the phone when this person called.
Q. Did the caller have an accent?

MR. SPIRO: Objection.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if this caller had an accent.

MR. SPIRO: Asked and answered. Form. He has no idea. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. The Gigafactory is outside of Reno, Nevada; is that correct, sir?
A. Yes. It's, like, 15 minutes east of Reno.
Q. And the call center is actually in Las Vegas; is that right?

MR. SPIRO: If you know.
THE WITNESS: We have a call center in Las
Vegas.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you know whether or not this call was received at the actual Gigafactory in Reno or at your call center in Las Vegas?
A. I don't know.

As I said, I was simply told -- and this is obviously a very serious matter -- that Marty Tripp is heavily armed, extremely angry, and on his way to Gigafactory.

And if, when you receive something like that, it's a credible threat, you have to take such threats seriously. If you don't take them seriously, there could be a lot of people that die.
Q. And Tesla had informed the sheriff's department
immediately after receiving that call; correct, sir? A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what time that call came in?
A. I don't know. I do not know.
Q. All right. You're not aware that it came in at 1:50 P.M. in the afternoon?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form. Asked and answered. He said he doesn't know.
(Exhibit 10 was marked for identification.) BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you -- or at least it's by your right hand --

MR. SPIRO: By your right hand.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. -- deposition Exhibit 10. This is from Shamara Bell, the individual that received the call. "Received a call. Caller preferred to remain unknown. Friend of Martin Tripp is concerned that he may do something violent and volatile. Says he is concerned because he's very hostile and very well armed."

Do you see that email was sent at 1:50 P.M.,
sir?
A. Yes. To -- to -- it wasn't sent to me.
Q. Correct. I'm saying the email was sent at 1:50 P.M.
A. Yes.
(Exhibit 11 was marked for identification.) BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 11. This is the Sheriff's report from the alleged threat. I just want to direct your attention briefly to the third page.

It states "On June 20, 2018, at approximately 1413 hours Deputy Carter, Deputy Hamblin and I were dispatched to an "active shooter threat" at 1 Electric Avenue."

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. So the call to Shamara Bell was received at approximately 1:50 P.M., and less than 25 minutes later the sheriff is dispatched; correct?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form, and this doesn't say when the call was received.

MR. FISCHBACH: I said when the sheriff was dispatched.

MR. SPIRO: As to the first point that you made in the compound question that you asked. You said that the call was received at this point. All he said is that the email said.

MR. FISCHBACH: You can answer the question,

Mr. Musk.
MR. SPIRO: If you can understand the question, you can answer the question.

THE WITNESS: I mean, it's not -- the exact
timing is not clear.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. But you would agree with me that Tesla notified the sheriff's department right away; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Are you aware that your statement to Julia Wong is the first statement to any member of the press regarding the alleged shooting threat?
A. No.
Q. All right. Do you know why your comms team did not make any prior statements to the press regarding the shooting threat before you did?
A. No.
Q. And if it's such an important matter, why would your comms team not inform the press?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form. It's an improper question.

You can answer if you can. Do you know why they didn't inform the press? Do you know why some other person didn't inform the press? You can answer that
question.
THE WITNESS: I think they -- they -- they would have, but this was all happening very quickly. And so the -- you know, if it's happening quickly, then, well, I will respond directly. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. I want to go back to the information you received about the call. Who told you about this call that was received at the call center?
A. I was -- I think some members of our security team and human resources.
Q. Who?
A. I don't recall. I was told by many people. There was -- I don't know. Probably, I don't know, half a dozen people that were on a call.
Q. Did you ask any follow-up questions?
A. Yes. I asked can we -- do we have a recording of the call? Let's try to figure out, you know, how serious is this. Is this -- is he actually on his way to the -- to -- you know, what -- you know, how -- how seriously should we take this? Is this, like, a -- a four-alarm fire, a one-alarm fire?

It's obviously a very serious threat that one needs to take credibly, but there is proportionate response just as a fire department would have for a
class of fire. So we need to try to find out what -how severe, how immediate. It's clearly a serious threat, but how severe and what action should we take to safeguard the people.
Q. Was the call recorded?
A. I believe it was not recorded. That's what I was told.
Q. When you asked the question "Should we take this threat seriously?" was there any other evidence or information to corroborate what the alleged caller had said?
A. You always have to take a threat of a heavily armed angry shooter seriously, obviously.
Q. That wasn't what my question, Mr. Musk. My question was was there any other information or evidence that you had to corroborate what was stated in this anonymous phone call?

MR. SPIRO: Him personally or Tesla's security?
MR. FISCHBACH: Him personally.
THE WITNESS: No. That's -- the information I had was -- was a direct threat to the company. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. So the only information you had came from an anonymous phone call when you made this statement to Julia Wong at The Guardian; is that correct, sir?

MR. SPIRO: The only -- objection to form.
THE WITNESS: We had received a -- what seemed, to us, to be a credible threat to the safety and well-being of the people at Tesla, yeah. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. Sir, my question is other than this anonymous phone call for which there was no recording, when you made that statement to Julia Wong, did you have any other independent evidence or information to corroborate what that caller had said?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Did you mean information at that time, or other information they previously had relating to Mr. Tripp being fired and any other issues he had?

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you understand the question, Mr. Musk?
A. Well, now that you mention it, I believe I did have a conversation with Nick Gicinto or one of Tesla's security people about Marty Tripp. And he said something about the -- Marty Tripp having several guns and trying to sell a gun to another employee. This, I think, adds some credibility to the threat. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. When did that conversation happen?
A. I'm not sure of the exact timing.

He did try to sell the gun to --
MR. SPIRO: What?
THE WITNESS: Is that a --
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you know whether or not the call with Mr. Gicinto was before or after you made that statement to Ms. Wong?
A. I think it was probably before, but I'm not sure of the exact timing. I mean, I talked to Nick Gicinto quite frequently at the time.
Q. Did Mr. Tripp actually ever show up at the Gigafactory and shoot anybody?
A. No.
Q. Was Mr. Tripp ever apprehended on his way to the Gigafactory to shoot anybody?
A. No.
(Exhibit 12 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as --

THE REPORTER: 12.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. -- deposition Exhibit 12. I want to direct your attention to Interrogatory Number 12 , which is going to be on page 7 of this document.

And it states "Identify and explain all information regarding the alleged threat known by Elon Musk prior to his sending the email communication referenced in Paragraph 54 of the counterclaim including: when Mr. Musk first became aware of the alleged threat, all persons with whom Mr. Musk discussed the alleged threat on June 20, 2018, who provided Mr. Musk with the information of which he was aware, [and] what actions Mr. [took]" -- "[muster]" -"Mr. Musk took to verify the information."

Now, if you could, sir, take a moment to silently read to yourself Tesla's response to that on the following page.

THE WITNESS: Sir, may I have a water or something?

MR. SPIRO: Sure.
MR. FISCHBACH: Go ahead.
MR. SPIRO: Can you read back the question.
(The Reporter read the record as requested.)
MR. SPIRO: Then the question before that.
(The Reporter read the record as requested.)
MR. SPIRO: Sparkling okay?
THE WITNESS: Sure, yeah.
Yes, I see it.
/ / /

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right, sir. Did you have a chance to read Tesla's response?
A. The whole response?
Q. Yeah. It's about a page and a half.
A. Yes, I read it.
Q. All right. Sir, there is no reference in that response to Mr. Gicinto providing you any information about Mr. Tripp having firearms, is there?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Not in this.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you have any evidence that Mr. Tripp did anything to make preparations to go back to the Gigafactory and shoot people?
A. No.
Q. All the information came from that one anonymous phone call; is that correct, sir?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form, "all the information." BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Let me clarify. All the information you had in your possession when you made that email to Julia Wong was based on that anonymous phone call on June 20th; correct, sir?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
If he's asking you about just that moment, fine. If he's asking you about everything you had learned prior to the moment of the anonymous call regarding Mr. Tripp or regarding Business Insider, that's a different question.

If you understand which of the two he's asking, you can answer it.

MR. FISCHBACH: Let me rephrase the question.
MR. SPIRO: Yeah. All right.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All the information you had about an alleged threat to shoot up the Gigafactory came from that anonymous phone call; is that correct, sir?
A. Specifically about the threat to shoot up the Gigafactory or however you want to call it, that -- that was that call, yes. But you have to take these things very seriously. It's when people don't take these things seriously that they go awry. You can't be cavalier about such things.
Q. And Mr. Tripp never actually bought a firearm to the Gigafactory on June 20th, did he?

MR. SPIRO: If you know.
THE WITNESS: I don't know. He may have.
// /

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you know whether or not Mr. Tripp ever fired a weapon at the Gigafactory on June 20th?
A. That is unlikely.
Q. Do you know whether or not Mr. Musk -- or, excuse me, Mr. Tripp ever set foot in the Gigafactory on June 20th?
A. I don't.
Q. Are you aware that on June 20th Mr. Tripp was in

Reno being followed by private investigators hired by Tesla?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I --
MR. SPIRO: If you learned anything -- if you
learned anything about any of this through counsel, you can't answer the question.

MR. FISCHBACH: I disagree. It's just a yes or no question. I'm not asking him for the contents of the communication. I just want to know were you aware of this fact, Mr. Musk.

MR. SPIRO: You can answer if you were aware of the fact that Mr. Tripp was identified somewhere other than -- near the factory, in other words.

Do you understand?
THE WITNESS: Sorry, on what -- on what date are
we talking about?
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. June 20th, sir.
A. Okay.
Q. Same date that you called him a horrible human being. The same day that you emailed Julia Wong.
A. Yes, yes.

MR. SPIRO: Were you aware on that date that he was in another place? Again, his question --

THE WITNESS: No.
MR. SPIRO: -- assumes that.
THE WITNESS: I didn't know where he was.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. To your knowledge, did your statement to Julia Wong do anything in assisting the sheriff in locating Mr. Tripp?
A. No.
Q. Sir, are you authorized to make public statements to the press on behalf of Tesla?
A. Yes.
Q. And if somebody were to travel from Reno to the Gigafactory, how would they typically get there by vehicle?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form. You know that's an improper question.

If you can answer that question, you can answer that question --

THE WITNESS: I mean, they said that -MR. SPIRO: -- how people sometimes come to the Gigafactory.

THE WITNESS: Okay. We have two highways: one on north side, one on south side.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. And approximately how far is it from the Reno area, sir?
A. 15 -- 15 to 20 minutes.
Q. Why was it so important that you inform the press about the alleged threat rather than your communications team?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
You can answer that.
THE WITNESS: Right. I mean, it's not that it was so important that it be me or them, but since the -given the timeliness of the email where the Guardian reporter was clearly writing the story as though Mr. Tripp was the wrong part -- the wronged party when he was, in fact, not the wronged party.

And to the best of my information, he was at -at risk of coming to Tesla and killing people. I thought perhaps this is information that she should be
aware of in writing this article that this -- this -that, to the best of my knowledge, this person was armed and dangerous and had already committed crimes against the company. This -- pretty serious.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. I mean, your information or your communications team was certainly capable of providing this information to Ms. Wong; correct, sir?
A. Yes, of course.

MR. FISCHBACH: What are we on?
THE REPORTER: 13.
(Exhibit 13 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 13. I want to draw your attention to the second page. It's an email from Shamara Bell to Jeff Jones on June 21st, the day after the alleged threat.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Can you read the second page silently to yourself, sir.

MR. SPIRO: He's not a recipient of this email.
MR. FISCHBACH: I know he's not, but this has to do with the investigation into the alleged threat, and it's within the scope of the deposition.

MR. SPIRO: That's -- I'm not -- you can ask the question. I just --

THE WITNESS: Yes, I read that -- read this email.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. Do the exact words "going to come back and shoot people" appear anywhere in this email? A. No. It says that he -- that he -- he fears for the safety of the employees at the factory because Tripp was extremely volatile and heavily armed, that he was extremely upset.

MR. FISCHBACH: Actually, I'll give you this one.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I mean, what -- I mean, what -- well, I think what -- what matters here is that this person is saying that he fears for the safety of employees at -- at the factory because Tripp is extremely volatile and very well heavily armed.

MR. FISCHBACH: Thank you, Mr. Musk.
Can you mark that, please.
(Exhibit 14 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what's been marked as deposition Exhibit 14. This is an IM chat between Shamara Bell, who took the call, and a

Robert Smith.
She specifically says "I never said 'shoot the place up' though. I ain't that ghetto. Sheeeeshh."

Did I read that correctly, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know why there's no recording of that anonymous phone call, sir?
A. I don't.
Q. And by sending this information to Julia Wong, it was your desire -- excuse me.

By sending this information to Julia Wong about this alleged threat that he was going to come back and shoot up the Gigafactory, you wanted Ms. Wong to publish that in the media; correct, sir?
A. I thought this was important information if she's going to be writing an article about Marty Tripp. Q. So you wanted her to publish it; correct?
A. It was salient information, and I certainly, you know, believed at the time that this -- that he represented a very serious threat to the safety of the company.
Q. Do you expect that she would publish this information you gave to her?
A. I thought she -- she might publish it, yes.

MR. FISCHBACH: 15.
(Exhibit 15 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 15. This is an email from you again, Julia Wong. This one's roughly an hour and a half later at 6:57 P.M.

And you wrote "He initiated the email exchange this morning at 8:57 A.M. I certainly would not have initiated contact, nor would $I$ even know his personal email address, and it was probably unwise for me to have responded. This is what he sent."

Why was it unwise for you to have responded to Mr. Tripp's email that he sent you that morning, sir? A. I think it would have been -- it would have been better to have Tesla communications write this information. Me -- me responding made it too personal. Q. You would have preferred that the Tesla communications team respond to Mr. Tripp's email to you that morning?
A. Yeah. I mean, in -- in replying to him, I had simply given him fodder for the press.
Q. What do you mean by that?
A. He clearly just -- he wanted a lot of press.

That was obvious. He's sending my emails to the press. And so I was a fool for responding to him --
Q. But you also --
A. -- because $I$ was -- I was just giving him more press.
Q. But you also sent that same exchange to Julia Wong, didn't you, sir?
A. I sent the exchange to clarify what was actually sent because Marty Tripp implicitly lied to Julia Wong by claiming that $I$ had somehow attacked him when in fact he is the one who sent me the -- the email first. But he deleted that.
Q. Why did you take that email from him so personally?
A. The email of -- which email are you talking about?
Q. The email that he sent that you morning at 8:57 A.M. where he said "You're going to get what's coming to you" or words to that effect.

Why did you take that so personally?
A. Well, I mean, the -- some guy's threatening me.

And "get what's coming to you" could mean a physical threat. It could mean -- it could mean any one of a number of things. It certainly is a serious and -- one should take this seriously, obviously.

MR. FISCHBACH: All right.
Do you need to take a break, Mr. Spiro?

MR. SPIRO: No.
THE WITNESS: No.
MR. FISCHBACH: Okay.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. And you sent that exchange to Julia Wong. What are -- what are people supposed to think when they see you engaging in that kind of back and forth with Mr. Tripp?
A. I don't know what people are supposed to think.
Q. Why did you want -- did you expect that Julia Wong would publish that exchange between you and Mr. Tripp?
A. This is the exchange that Tripp sent to Wong, and then I -- I provided the clarification that, no, he had initiated the attack.

Is that what you mean?
Q. No. I'm saying was your expectation that if you sent her this exchange, she would publish it; correct?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. Did you think there was a chance she would publish it if you sent it to her?
A. Yes.
Q. Why would you want her to publish that?
A. When you say "that," what are you refer -referring?
Q. The exchange between yourself and Mr. Tripp earlier that morning.
A. She already had the exchange that -- that -Tripp had sent her the exchange. That's my understanding.

Is that incorrect?
Q. Well, but why would you want people to see that -- you sent the exchange yourself. Why would you want people to see that?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered. He already told you that she already had the exchange anyway; so what are you -- the question is incomprehensible.

MR. FISCHBACH: You know, your -- your attorney has actually made a good objection. Let me rephrase the question.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. If Mr. Tripp had not sent that exchange to Julia Wong first, would you have sent it?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Calls for speculation. It's improper form.

THE WITNESS: Probably not, yeah.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Did Tesla ever make any effort to determine the identity of the caller that called in the alleged

Gigafactory threat?
A. Yes, I'm sure. Yes.
Q. What did Tesla do?
A. Tesla security investigated or talked to the person who received the call. I don't know all the details of what -- what occurred, but certainly there was an attempt to figure out the seriousness of the threat. Like, is it something -- as I said, what level of security should we have? Where should we have it? Q. What my question was, sir, did Tesla make any effort to determine the identity of the caller. And my follow-up question was what did Tesla do.

So what did Tesla do --
A. I don't know all of the things Tesla does, but I know Tesla did try to find out the identity.
Q. Mr. Musk, you're an intelligent man. I think you know where my questions are going, but please let me finish them.
A. I don't actually.
Q. Other than interviewing Shamara Bell, what else did Tesla do to determine the identity of the caller?
A. I don't know all the actions that Tesla did.
Q. Do you know where the sheriff eventually found Mr. Tripp?
A. No.
Q.

Did you have any idea where Mr. Tripp was on June 20th?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered.
MR. FISCHBACH: Let me strike that. Let me
rephrase the question.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. On June 20th, did you have any idea where

Mr. Tripp was at any point during that day?
A. I don't know where he was.

MR. FISCHBACH: What?
THE REPORTER: Just showing you the number.
MR. FISCHBACH: Oh, thank you.
(Exhibit 16 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 16.
A. Yeah.
Q. This is a follow-up email by Sarah O'Brien kind of piggy-backing on your initial communication with Julia Wong. And Sarah says "I'll take it from here."

Sarah O'Brien was a member of the Tesla communications team at that time; correct, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. When somebody on your communications team says "I'll take it from here," what do you interpret that to
mean?
A. They will correspond with the media from that point.
Q. That is, you don't have to have any further involvement?
A. No, yeah. I mean, I can if I want to. It's up to me.
Q. But you sent a subsequent email to Julia Wong even after Sarah O'Brien sent this email "I'll take it from here"; correct, sir?
A. I presume you have an exhibit I -- to that effect.
Q. The prior exhibit, Exhibit 15. Email sent at 6:57 P.M.

MR. SPIRO: Do we know the time zone these are in?

MR. FISCHBACH: No.
MR. SPIRO: Okay.
MR. FISCHBACH: But these are as Tesla disclosed them. Would Tesla like to supplement its disclosure so that we can tell the time zone?

MR. SPIRO: I'm just asking if we know the time zone.

MR. FISCHBACH: Well, the answer is no. And I'm just -- does Tesla want to supplement its
disclosures?
THE WITNESS: No. I mean, I think it's --
this -- these times probably make sense.
I looked at it, yeah.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. But, sir, you actually communicated again with Julia Wong after Sarah O'Brien said "I'll take it from here"; correct, sir?
A. That appears to be the case.

I'm not sure $I$ would have read Sarah's email, but her email was sent.
Q. You were copied on Sarah's email; correct?
A. The "I'll" --
Q. She actually sent it to you; correct?
A. The "I'll take it from here"?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. She sent it to me, yes.
Q. All right. But you don't know if you read it?
A. I'm not sure if I read it before responding to Julia Wong. I get a lot of emails.
Q. And I believe you testified earlier, sir, that this information about Mr. Tripp and the alleged threat was very important information about the safety and welfare of Gigafactory employees and that's why you wanted her to have it; is that right?
A. Yes. I thought there was -- to the best of my knowledge, there was a serious threat.
Q. All right. If that was so important, why didn't your communications team, or anybody else for that matter, report that threat to the media immediately after the threat was received?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I mean, they probably would have, but this was all occurring in the span of a few hours or course of one day.
(Exhibit 17 was marked for identification.) BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what's been marked as deposition Exhibit 17. This is an email from Sarah O'Brien to Julia Wong right after she sent you the "I'll take it from here" email.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And it starts off by saying "Attributed to a Tesla spokesperson. This afternoon, we received a phone call from a friend of Mr. Tripp telling us that Mr. Tripp would be coming to the Gigafactory to shoot up" -- excuse me, "to 'shoot up the place.' Police have been notified and actions are being taken to enhance security at the Gigafactory."

MR. SPIRO: "Shoot the place up" not "shoot up the place."

MR. FISCHBACH: Mr. Spiro, thank you, sir. You're right. It says "shoot the place up." And since we're -- our attention has been drawn to that exact phrase, does that exact --

MR. SPIRO: You just misquoted it. That's why I'm just --

MR. FISCHBACH: Thank you, sir, and I greatly appreciate that. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Does that exact phrase "shoot the place up" appear in any of those communications from Shamara Bell that we were looking at?
A. That was not how she described it.
Q. In fact, she specifically denied using words to the effect of "shoot up the place" or "shoot the place up"; isn't that right, sir?
A. In that text exchange, she does, yes. I mean, she doesn't object to the substance of it, just the -just the phrase itself.
Q. Have you ever talked to Shamara Bell?
A. No.
Q. Now, there's roughly 26 minutes between Exhibit 17, the email from Sarah O'Brien to Julia Wong,
and then your initial email with Julia Wong.
Do you recall having any communications with anybody else in the intervening 26 minutes regarding Mr. Tripp?
A. No.
Q. Is it typical for you to communicate with members of the press about lawsuits that the company is involved in?
A. I wouldn't say it's typical. It's occasional.
Q. The -- there was a reference, I think, in your communications to Ms. Wong and then the subsequent communications from Ms. O'Brien that the caller was a friend of Mr. Tripp.

How do you know he was a friend of Mr. Tripp?
A. We only have what the person who took the call -- we only have that information.
Q. Okay. Was the caller in fact a friend of Mr. Tripp?
A. We do not know.
Q. I'd like to go back to the sheriff's report. I believe that's Exhibit 11, sir.

MR. SPIRO: It's right there to your right.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. And, sir, I want to draw your attention to the
fourth page on that exhibit. It actually says -- I'm sorry, the sixth page on that exhibit. It actually says page 3 at the top, but the sixth page, sir.

The first few words at the top there are "for his wife as a gift." Do you see that?

Do you see the words I'm referencing, Mr. Musk?
A. Yes.
Q. It states here "Based [on] our interview with him," Mr. Tripp, "Chief Dosen and I concluded that Tripp was not armed; did not likely have access to firearms; and did not present a threat at that time. Chief Dosen notified our dispatch and Gourthro that the active shooter threat was not viable at that time."

Who is Gourthro?
A. I don't know who Gourthro is, sorry.
Q. Do you know who Sean Gourthro is?
A. The name doesn't ring a bell.
Q. All right. Was he the security manager for the Gigafactory at the time?
A. He may have been.
Q. Were you informed at some point later in the day on June 20th that the sheriff's department had concluded that the active shooter threat was not viable?
A. I would not take this -- those threats to be not be viable. It's simply that they did not have enough
information to go further.
Q. Well, sir, I'm -- the words used by the
sheriff's department are "that the active shooter threat was not viable at that time."

And my question for you, sir, is were you informed at any point on the 20th that the sheriff had concluded that the active shooter threat was not viable at that time?
A. I mean, I think the -- the key phrase here is
"at that time," which means at a subsequent time it could easily be viable.
Q. And, sir, my question isn't that. My question is were you informed at any point on June $20 t h$ that the sheriff's department had concluded that the active shooter threat was not viable at that time?
A. I mean --

MR. SPIRO: If you recall whether or not you were told that at that day.

THE WITNESS: What $I$ recall is that they -- that they did not have enough evidence to take action on him. That's -- that's -- that's essentially the substance of it.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you recall when you learned that?
A. I don't recall the exact hour of the day in 2018
when this occurred. I mean, it's -- I mean, he's -he's claiming, like, possession of a Hi-Point carbine. I mean, this sounds -- like, really I think this, if anything, amplifies concerns.
Q. Was Mr. Tripp found in possession of a Hi-Point carbine?

MR. SPIRO: If you know.
THE WITNESS: I do not know.
I mean, Tripp had advised a work colleague that he owned many firearms.
(Exhibit 18 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Were you aware of that fact when you made that statement to Julia Wong?
A. I think so, but $I$ am not certain.
Q. Well, it wasn't in Tesla's interrogatory response, was it?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not certain.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Okay. And do you know why that would have been omitted from Tesla's interrogatory response if you in fact had that information --

MR. SPIRO: Objection.
MR. FISCHBACH: -- in your possession when you
made that statement to Julia Wong?
MR. SPIRO: Objection to form, and the
interrogatory response doesn't ask that specific question. So it's misleading and objection to form.

If you even know the objection -- if you even know what the interrogatory responses are, you can answer that.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure whether $I$ knew it or not, but if it was admitted, it certainly would have been as -- perhaps an oversight. And we perhaps should amend the interrogatory to include that information. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. We'll look forward to that, Mr. Musk.

Sir, the court reporter handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 18.

Right hand, Mr. Musk.
MR. SPIRO: Right hand.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, this is an email from Dave Arnold to j.murdock at Newsweek June 21st, 2018. And I just want to draw your attention to the final paragraph. "Also, so you're aware, yesterday afternoon, we received a phone call from a friend of Mr. Tripp telling us that Mr. Tripp would be coming to the Gigafactory to 'shoot
the place up.'"
Did I get that right; Mr. Spiro?
MR. SPIRO: I think that time you got it right.
MR. FISCHBACH: Thank you.
MR. SPIRO: You didn't get it right the last
time.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. "Police have been notified and actions are being taken to enhance security at the Gigafactory."

Mr. Musk, do you know why -- well, who's Dave Arnold?
A. He's in the communicate -- he was in the communications team of Tesla.
Q. Do you know why Mr. Arnold would provide that information to Newsweek the day after the sheriff's department had determined that the active shooter threat was not viable at that time?
A. No.
Q. Do you think that by omitting the fact that the sheriff's department had determined that the active shooter threat was not viable at that time, that Mr. Arnold was in fact telling the whole truth to Newsweek here?
A. I -- I don't know what Dave Arnold meant.
Q. I'm not asking you what he meant. I'm asking
you do you think that Mr. Arnold was in fact providing the whole truth if you omitted the fact that the sheriff's department had concluded that the active shooter threat was not viable at that time?
A. I think there you go again with legal trickery being the whole truth. Like, what -- you know, possibly there's some things that were -- weren't included for whatever reason.

I mean, Dave Arnold, just looking at this email, is just going through a series of bad actions that Mr. Tripp engaged in: lying about the scrap at the Gigafactory and misleading investigators, lying to the media repeatedly, and just a -- he was just going through a whole series of false claims. This was not necessarily to -- to be a complete list of false claims, but it is certainly a long list of false claims.
Q. All right. And you certainly agree with me there's nothing in that email from Mr. Arnold referencing the fact that the sheriff's department had concluded that the active shooter threat was not viable at that time?
A.

That was not in the email. But, again, "at that time" just mean -- that implies at another time it could absolutely be viable, and that's how we should treat it.

MR. FISCHBACH: Can you put those in order,
please.
(Exhibit 19 was marked for identification.) BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Mr. Musk, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 19. This is a tweet from you dated July 5th of 2018. "Indeed, very simple question. To be specific: @linette" -- or, excuse me, "@lopezlinette, did you compensate or promise to compensate Martin Tripp for inside information about Tesla? Did he, under that inducement, provide you with exaggerated negative info, which you printed but turned out to be untrue?"
A. That is a correct reading.
Q. Now, this was after Tesla filed its lawsuit against Mr. Tripp; correct?
A. There's no date on this but --
Q. Actually it's dated July 5th of 2018. And the lawsuit was filed June 20th of 2018.
A. Okay; so, yes, it's after.
Q. Okay. Why did you feel the need to comment on Mr. Tripp when there's active litigation by Tesla against him?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm -- I'm not sure. I don't know.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. What was the message you wanted to send with this tweet about Mr. Tripp?
A. Oh, actually I think the -- Nick -- Nick

Gicinto, one of the members of Tesla security, had told me that there was some guy who was a friend of Tripp's who said that Linette Lopez had offered him $\$ 50,000$ for, you know, basically insider information on Tesla and implied that Tripp had received similar payment.
(Exhibit 20 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 20.

Sorry, I gave you the wrong one, Alex. That's Gicinto. That's 20 right there.

MR. SPIRO: All right. Thanks.
MR. FISCHBACH: And you've got Mr. Gicinto; correct, Mr. Musk?

MR. SPIRO: Can I just check?
MR. FISCHBACH: The deposition --
THE WITNESS: Yes, 20.
MR. FISCHBACH: Thank you.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. And, sir, I deposed Mr. Gicinto. And you'll see on page 66 of the deposition, I highlighted a specific
question: "Did your investigation uncover evidence of Linette Lopez compensated or promised to compensate Martin Tripp for inside information about Tesla?"

And his ultimate response is on the last page.
"Ultimately there was nothing that we uncovered showing a connection to any compensation between him and Ms. Lopez."

So if Mr. Gicinto said under oath that he uncovered no evidence of compensation, why were you suggesting that there had been compensation in this tweet on July 5th of 2018?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form. Objection. Misleading.

THE WITNESS: Again -- yes, exactly. Just constant legal trickery questions. If that's how you want to spend the day --

I was asking her if this was true. Since it -just -- Nick Gicinto had said that a friend of his -- a friend of Tripp's had been offered money for insider information by Linette Lopez, then perhaps Tripp had as well. And this is a very simple thing to just say "No. No, he didn't." BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. What information did you have in your possession at that time that Mr. Tripp had been
compensated or offered compensation from Linette Lopez? A. This was from his friend, or claimed friend, that Nick Gicinto told me about.
Q. Who was that?
A. I don't recall the name.
Q. And you didn't undertake any -- well, I shouldn't say that.

Did you undertake any personal investigation to determine whether or not Mr. Tripp had been compensated or offered compensation from Linette Lopez?
A. No.
(Exhibit 21 was marked for identification.)
MR. FISCHBACH: 21?
THE REPORTER: Yes.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Mr. Musk, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 21.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. It's there by your right hand, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. And this is you stating "Are you 100 percent certain that @businessinsider stands by @lopezlinette and supports everything she's done? Why won't Lopez go on record saying that she never offered Tripp anything for inside info or asked him to break his
confidentiality agreement by taking detailed video of Tesla IP?"
A. Yeah. What about it?
Q. That's my question, Mr. Musk. What was the message that you intended to send by tweeting this information out about Ms. Lopez and Mr. Tripp?
A. I was just asking the question.
Q. Right. But what was the message you were trying
to convey with this question?
MR. SPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered.
If you have anything to add, you can add it.
THE WITNESS: I have nothing to add.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. So you weren't conveying any message whatsoever with this question?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered. Objection. Form.

THE WITNESS: I was asking a question. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Right. But you weren't trying to convey any message with that question?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form. Objection. Asked and answered.

If you have anything to add, you can add it. If not, he's asked the question four times.

THE WITNESS: I have nothing to add.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You were just pondering something? Is that what you were doing, Mr. Musk?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form. Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: The judge said don't waste time. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. And the judge said answer my questions. So I'm asking you, Mr. Musk, were you just posing a question? Or did you intend to convey a message with this tweet?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered.
But you can answer the same answer that you've already given if you'd like.

THE WITNESS: I answered the question.
(Exhibit 22 was marked for identification.)
MR. FISCHBACH: 22?
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 22.
A. James Uelmen, yes.
Q. $\quad$ ir, this is an email from Mr. Uelmen to you June 20th, 2018. It says "Sir, I worked as a Quality Tech in Stator as well as cooling tubes and a few other departments. I was terminated last week (unfairly I
believe). I was told someone called the 800 [number] on me and that even though $I$ had no history of offensive behavior, that was enough to terminate me."

It goes on to state "All I want is my job back.
But while I was there, I did work closely with Martin Tripp and he has reached out to me."
A. Right.
Q. What did you do in response to this email, Mr. Musk?
A. I believe I asked Nick Gicinto to talk to him.
Q. All right. Do you know if Mr. Gicinto ever talked to him?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. What -- what information did you receive from Mr . Gicinto regarding Mr. -- is it
"Uelmen"?
A. I'm not sure how to pronounce his last name.
Q. All right. What information did you receive from Mr. Gicinto?

MR. SPIRO: Is there a time period?
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Do you recall receiving any information from Mr. Gicinto regarding Mr. Uelmen?
A. Yes. That -- Uelmen is -- is -- I think he
claimed to Nick Gicinto that there was, like, this $\$ 50,000$ payment for insider information from Linette Lopez and, I believe, implied that Tripp had received something to that effect.

MR. FISCHBACH: 23.
(Exhibit 23 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 23. That's an email --

MR. SPIRO: Do I get a copy of this?
MR. FISCHBACH: Where is the other one?
MR. SPIRO: I can just look at his if that's -THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's fine.

MR. SPIRO: It's short. I don't care.
MR. FISCHBACH: Thank you.
MR. MITCHELL: Here it is.
MR. FISCHBACH: Oh, there it is. I'm sorry.
Here you go, Mr. Spiro.
MR. SPIRO: Yeah, thanks.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. It's originally an email from Mr. Uelmen to you.
"Sir, I worked with Marty Tripp. I was a Quality Tech and I am being contacted by reporters because he gave them my name. I need some advice. I was a loyal and
hardworking employee. I believe in what you" -"[you're] trying to do. I have a family and all I want is to be a good father and husband. Please contact me."

And you responded with "What is the situation with Marty? How can I help?"

Why did you respond personally to this email?
A. It's normal for me to respond to people at Tesla. It's -- this was not unusual. So I am actually generally quite reachable.
Q. Right. But, sir, at this point in time you've got investigators, you've got lawyers, all of them looking at Martin Tripp.

Why did you feel the need to personally respond to this email?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to the form of the question and the windup, if that's even -- if any of that's even true.

But what -- what -- you can answer the question of --

THE WITNESS: I mean, it's --
MR. SPIRO: -- why did you respond to this email.

THE WITNESS: I -- I mean, this -- this guy is -- said he had important information regarding Tripp. So I replied "What is the situation with Marty?

How can $I$ help?"
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. What were you going to do to help Mr. Uelmen? A. At no point did we offer him any compensation or any quid pro quo.
Q. Well, that wasn't my question, sir. My question was what were you going to do to help Mr. Uelmen?

MR. SPIRO: If you know.
THE WITNESS: I mean, this is just a simple question, "How can I help?"
Q. Well, but what were you going to do to help him?
A. I -- you know, I need to know what is going on.

I don't know what I could do to help him.
Q. What kind of help were you willing to offer Mr. Uelmen?

MR. SPIRO: If you can answer that question.
THE WITNESS: What do you mean?
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, I -- it's your -- it's your email. What kind of help were you willing to offer Mr. Uelmen when you wrote this email?

MR. SPIRO: Again, I'm objecting to form. It's incomprehensible.

If you can answer that question, you can answer it.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, the -- I mean, the implication is that -- that there was some quid pro quo offered here where if he provided information, then he would be compensated in some way. And that did not occur at any point.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Did you ever talk with Mr. Uelmen?
A. I don't think I ever spoke to him.

MR. FISCHBACH: 24?
THE REPORTER: Yes.
(Exhibit 24 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 24 . This is an email -- at least it appears to be an email that you'd forwarded to somebody with the name Deth stayerr with the title "They're not [that] smart." It includes some communications between yourself and Bonnie Norman.

Who's Bonnie Norman?
A. Bonnie Norman has a -- she used to run or may still run Tesla Motors Club. They're kind of a website by Tesla users.
Q. Is she generally a pro-Tesla person, anti-Tesla person?
A. I mean, she's mostly pro-Tesla. Not -- you
know, she's -- yeah, that's a -- it is a customer-focused web site. So she's not entirely pro-Tesla, but she's mostly pro-Tesla.
Q. Well, is she a Tesla employee?
A. No.
Q. Is she compensated in any way by Tesla?
A. No, not that I'm aware of.
Q. Why were you communicating with her about

Mr. Tripp if she's the facilitator of this consumer-oriented website?
A. I guess she sent me an email saying that there's some connection between a short-seller and Marty Tripp. Q. And so why did you -- so she sent you an email. Why did you feel the need to respond to that email about a connection between a short-seller and Mr. Tripp? A. I mean, I've had many email correspondences with Bonnie; so yeah. I mean, she's saying here that there appears to be some connection between Chanos, Fossi, and Tripp. And then my reply is "I wonder if Tripp was sent to work with Tesla directly or indirectly by Chanos. That would be pretty crazy."
Q. Who's Chanos?
A. He's a short-seller of Tesla who goes on the media all the time saying Tesla is going to be worth zero. Turns out that's not true.
Q. What's the stock price today?
A. I don't know. Let's just say it didn't work out well.
Q. When you're right, you're right, Mr. Musk.
A. Yeah.
Q. Why was --
A. Place your bets.
Q. Why was she -- why was she even investigating whether or not there was a link between Mr. Tripp and Mr. Chanos?
A. I don't know.
Q. Did you ask her to investigate that?
A. No.
Q. So then she just provided you unsolicited information that there might be a link between Mr. Tripp and Mr. Chanos?
A. I believe so.
Q. Why did you forward this conversation on to Deth stayerr?
A. Do you mean wateroflife420?
Q. Yeah.
A. Oh, I just thought this was just crazy that -- I just thought it was like, wow, this is pretty wild stuff; so yeah. I mean --
Q. Why did you feel the need to -- why did Deth
stayerr need to know this information about Mr. Tripp being allegedly connected with Mr. Chanos?
A. Well, I had had some conversations with Deth stayerr about this, you see.
Q. Who is Deth stayerr?
A. The Deth stayerr legal name is Claire Boucher.
Q. And who is that?
A. That is my girlfriend.
Q. By the way, congratulations, Mr. Musk.
A. Oh, thank you, I think.
(Exhibit 25 was marked for identification.)
MR. FISCHBACH: That's 25; right?
THE REPORTER: Yes.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Before we go on to Exhibit 25, sir -- I mean, other than this speculation from Ms. Norman, did you ever have any evidence that Mr. Tripp was in fact working with Mr. Chanos?
A. There was -- I think -- I think Uelmen conveyed to Gicinto that there was some connection, yeah.
Q. Did your investigation of Mr. Tripp uncover any connection between him and Mr. Chanos -- strike that.

Did Tesla's investigation of Mr. Tripp uncover any connection between him and Mr. Chanos?
A. There were -- there were a lot of coincidences,
but there was not an -- there was no -- there was no hard evidence, but a lot of strange coincidences.

Linette Lopez just constantly posts about Chanos and how they're best friends and then -- and then writes articles that are in his -- in his interests.
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 25. This is an email from yourself, again, forwarded in -- forwarding an email from yourself to C* titled "Fwd: gigaman_nv." I see Todd -- is it "Maron"? Is that how it's pronounced?
A. Yes.
Q. He was Tesla's general counsel at the time?
A. Yeah.
Q. He's copied on these emails; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is Todd Maron copied on your emails to Bonnie Norman?
A. Because it would obviously be a serious concern if Tripp had been sent to work at Tesla by a short-seller to provide them with insider information and if he had exaggerated negative info to journalists from a position of credibility on the inside. Q. Did Tesla's investigation of Mr. Tripp ever uncover any evidence that Mr. Tripp had been sent to
work for Tesla by a short-seller or to provide -- inside information?
A. It sure seemed that way, but we couldn't -- we couldn't ever find any hard evidence. It sure seemed odd that somebody would be this energized to provide negative information to the press. Unless they're paid for it, why are they doing it? Maybe you know.
Q. It appears that Bonnie Norman is receiving information from others that aren't really identified in this email.

Do you know who was providing Bonnie Norman information about Mr. Tripp?
A. No.
Q. Do you know how she vets these people that are providing this information?
A. No.
Q. How would you know if -- whether or not their agenda aligned with Tesla's agenda if you don't know how they're vetted?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form.
If you can understand that question. You can answer it, if you can understand it.

THE WITNESS: I don't understand the question. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. If you don't know how --
A. It's not an understandable question, I think, is the problem.
Q. That's a fair -- fair response, Mr. Musk. I'll try to rephrase it.

If you don't know how Bonnie Norman is vetting these people that are giving her information, how do you know whether or not their agenda aligns with Tesla's agenda?
A. I don't.
Q. Why use Bonnie Norman to investigate Mr. Tripp when you have attorneys and private investigators and inhouse investigators?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Assumes facts.
But you can answer the actual question.
THE WITNESS: I mean, it's just sort of typical legal complex question where you can't answer the question without giving some credence to the initial part of the question or the latter part of the question. This is, like, Law 101 BS.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Well, let me -- let me break it down for you, Mr. Musk.
A. Yeah.
Q. This is an email sent July 22nd of 2018; correct, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And the suit was filed on June 20th of 2018; correct?
A. Sure.
Q. And even before the lawsuit was filed and after the lawsuit was filed, Mr. Gicinto and Mr. Nocon and their team were investigating Mr. Tripp; correct, sir?
A. Yeah. I -- yes, I think so.
Q. So, again, sir, my question is if you've got attorneys --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- if you've got investigators, why do you need Bonnie Norman to be investigating Mr. Tripp?
A. I'm not asking Bonnie Norman to investigate Tripp. She's doing it. It's up to her. Free country. Q. You don't think you're encouraging her, by responding to these emails, to continue with her investigation?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
If the question is, you know, were you encouraging her, that would be a proper question. You can answer that question.

THE WITNESS: I mean, I would certainly be -welcome any information that was relevant to the situation.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Why did you forward this email on to $C *$ ?
A. AKA Deth stayerr.
Q. Oh, is that also Deth stayerr?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

But the question still stands, sir. Why did you feel the need to send this email to your girlfriend? A. I was discussing the case with her and -- and -yeah. Just sort of -- I was just outraged by the situation.
Q. So your girlfriend is somebody that you have had discussions with regarding Martin Tripp?
A. Yes.
Q. What kind of discussions?
A. Well, I just said that there was -- outrageous
that this guy was, you know, breaking his confidentiality agreements and sending false information to the media and he appeared to be working with short-sellers.
Q. Was this gigaman_nv account ever linked to

Mr. Tripp?
A. I don't know.

MR. FISCHBACH: 26?
THE REPORTER: Yes.
(Exhibit 26 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 26. This is an email dated August 21st of 2018. It's from you to Juleanna Glover, copied to Kimbal Musk and Dave Arnold.
A.
Q. The title of the email is "Re: WSJ Story on Combating Tesla Critica." I assume that was supposed to be "critics."
A. Yes. What is it?
Q. And I want to draw your attention to -- I believe it's the fourth page in, sir. Can you go to the fourth page, please, Mr. Musk.

Are you there, sir?
A. What -- is this -- what -- what are you referring to?
Q. Right. I'm just drawing your attention to the fourth page of the exhibit, sir. Are you there?
A. I mean --

MR. SPIRO: It's the page -- it's obviously the page with Tripp -- the word "Tripp" on it; right?

THE WITNESS: Is it page 4, or what's the actual thing?

MR. SPIRO: Here. I assume it's the page with

Tripp on it.
MR. FISCHBACH: This one right here. Ends with
"Elon."
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SPIRO: Yeah. Right there.
THE WITNESS: Got it.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. All right. And you wrote "As far as Tripp is concerned, that guy stole gigabytes of Tesla data, changed the data to make it sound terrible (fortunately, to a ridiculous degree) and posted it online. At one point, he claimed we had more scrapped parts than the total output of our Gigafactory, which is physically impossible.
"Tripp broke a dozen or more laws and caused great harm to the citizens of Nevada. Tesla legal has met with the Nevada Attorney General's Office and my understanding is that they are likely to move forward with a criminal case. Facts are unequivocal."
A. Yeah. What about it?

Oh, and also I thought it was very odd that the former Attorney General of Nevada, George Chanos, is John Chanos's cousin and self-described best friend. That's super weird. Q. No, you actually did mention that, Mr. Musk.
A. Yeah.
Q. But my question for you, sir, is did you believe Mr. Tripp -- in addition to being a horrible person and somebody that betrayed his word of honor -- was also a criminal?
A. Do I believe that Tripp is a criminal and someone who -- and I -- betrayed his -- he has no honor. Q. But, sir, my question was in addition to him being a horrible person --
A. Yes.
Q. -- excuse me, a horrible human being and somebody that betrayed his word of honor, did you also think he was a criminal?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Did you want him --
A. In fact --
Q. -- punished in the --
A. -- I believe he has a warrant out for his arrest.
Q. How do you know that?
A. I was told that.
Q. Who told you that?

MR. SPIRO: Well, if you learned it from counsel, you can't -- you can't disclose -communications with counsel. But obviously everybody in
this room knows that's true; so --
MR. FISCHBACH: I'm asking Mr. -- assuming that communication didn't come from your attorney, Mr. Musk --

MR. SPIRO: No. I think it did, though.
MR. FISCHBACH: It did. It did.
MR. SPIRO: So you can't answer the question.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, so they're full of it.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Excuse me, what was that?
A. This is troubling that you would write your -associate yourself with someone who has a warrant out for their arrest for failure to pay child support.
Q. Why is that troubling?
A. I think it's -- you know. You're just associating yourself with a terrible person. I mean, who pays -- who spends money on legal fees, pays for that fancy suit, instead of paying for their child? Q. Anything else, Mr. Musk?
A. Not at this time.
Q. When you sent this email, did you want to see Mr. Tripp punished in the criminal justice system for what he had done?
A. Certainly -- well, independent of whether Tesla wants him to be punished, as we just talked about,
there's a criminal arrest warrant out for him. Q. And, sir, I'm not referring to the fact that maybe you or people working for you are -- are still monitoring Mr. Tripp. I'm referring to this email which is a statement by you about a meeting having occurred between Tesla legal and the Nevada -- Nevada Attorney General's Office.

And my question for you is did you want to see Mr. Tripp punished in the criminal justice system for what he had done at Tesla?
A. Yes. I thought he had committed a crime and deserved to pay the appropriate penalty.
Q. Did a prosecution move forward?
A. No.
Q. You don't know?
A. I -- they -- they did not move forward.
Q. Why didn't they move forward if the facts were unequivocal?
A. I -- I still think this is a major issue with the attorney -- the Attorney General's Office of Nevada should have moved forward.

It was very odd that Laxalt was close with George Chanos. In fact, I was told that Laxalt had gotten his job because of George Chanos who is Jim Chanos' best friend and cousin. And this is one of the
most prominent short-sellers of Tesla. Very weird. Q. So there was a --
A. I think that -- I think that -- I think there's some chance that George Chanos intervened with the attorney general -- with the Attorney General of Nevada to stop this case, which is not good.
Q. All right. So you think that Jim Chanos conspired with the Attorney General of Nevada to prevent criminal charges from going forward against Mr. Tripp?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form. He said some chance.

THE WITNESS: I think there's some chance that he worked with his -- that Jim Chanos worked with his cousin George Chanos the -- George Chanos is the former Attorney General of Nevada. And I -- and I -- I was told that Laxalt had gotten his job as a result of George Chanos and that George Chanos was very influential with the Attorney General.

So there is some chance that what -- where there should have been a criminal investigation, that it was interfered with.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Are you aware that your counsel, your former counsel of record, John Hueston, gave a PowerPoint presentation to members of both the Nevada Attorney

General's office and FBI agents advocating for a criminal prosecution of Mr. Tripp?
A. I don't know that -- about a PowerPoint presentation, but I -- I know he talked to them.
Q. Were you present at that meeting?
A. No.
Q. Let's go to the first page of that exhibit, sir, Exhibit 26.
A. Yes.
Q. You wrote at the bottom "Don't they have anything" -- or, excuse me, "Don't they have something else to write about? It is so tiresome to see myself in the news," exclamation point.

Do you see that?
MR. SPIRO: Objection. This is outside the scope.

MR. FISCHBACH: No. It's --
MR. SPIRO: You don't have to answer that.
MR. FISCHBACH: It's a communication from
Mr. Musk. It's an email from Mr. Musk.
MR. SPIRO: Yeah. But it's outside the scope of the -- of the rules of your deposition.

MR. FISCHBACH: Well, I'm glad you mentioned that because --

Mark that. Mark that.

THE REPORTER: Mark which?
MR. FISCHBACH: Both of those.
THE REPORTER: As separate exhibits?
MR. FISCHBACH: Yes.
THE REPORTER: This is 27.
MR. FISCHBACH: Great.
(Exhibit 27 was marked for identification.)
THE REPORTER: And this is 28.
MR. FISCHBACH: Great.
(Exhibit 28 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibits 27 and 28. Exhibit 27 is a letter dated September 23rd, 2019, from myself to your former attorney Mr. Sean Gates discussing topics for your deposition. The second topic is any written or email communications disclosed by Tesla to or from Elon Musk.

Do you see that, sir?
THE WITNESS: This one right here?
MR. SPIRO: It's the other exhibit. The one to your right.

THE WITNESS: Oh.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You see those bullet points, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Second bullet point is "Any written or email communications disclosed by Tesla to or from Elon Musk."

Did I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And $I$ will avow to you, sir, that this was in fact Exhibit $K$ to our motion to compel your deposition that's referenced in the court's order here at Exhibit 28. And it says "The Court will allow Elon Musk to be deposed on items 1, 2, 3, and 5 as outlined in Exhibit $K$ [to] the motion to compel."

So subject to any written or email
communications disclosed by Tesla to or from email -- to or from Elon Musk, Exhibit 26 is in that category, is it not, Mr. Spiro?

MR. SPIRO: My objection's noted. You can ask the question.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. So, sir, you wrote in here "Don't they have something else to write about? It is so tiresome to see myself in the news," exclamation point.

Did I read that correctly, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And above that, you wrote "Will tweet as I wish
and suffer the consequences. So it goes."
Did I read that correctly, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see any conflict between those two statements, it's tiresome to see yourself in the news but you'll tweet as you wish and suffer the consequences?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form. It's not a permissible legal question.

But you can answer if you can understand it.
THE WITNESS: I can't understand it.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. I said do you see any conflict between those two statements.

MR. SPIRO: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: Same response. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You don't understand the question?
A. No.
Q. Did I read the two statements correctly?
A. Did you -- can you read?
Q. I said did I read the two statements correctly, Mr. Musk.
A. I think you spoke the words from the email.
Q. Do you know the two statements I'm referring to?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So do you see any conflict between those two statements?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: So --
MR. SPIRO: You can -- if you can understand the question, you can ask. If you can't, you don't have to --

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Unfortunately I cannot understand it. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. What did you mean when you said "Will tweet as I wish and suffer the consequences"?
A. Well, I think I meant that I will tweet as I wish -- you know, First Amendment -- and suffer the consequences.
Q. Nothing more than that?
A. I don't think there's a deep and hidden meaning between -- behind the simple statement.
Q. Is that -- is that a general attitude towards your statements on Twitter, or was it more specific?

MR. SPIRO: Well, objection to that question as being outside the scope of the deposition.

MR. FISCHBACH: I'm asking him what the statement meant.

MR. SPIRO: And he's already answered you. It meant what the words said.

Do you have anything further to add?
THE WITNESS: No.
Well, I did delete my Instagram because it's weak sauce.

MR. SPIRO: Thank you for adding that for the record.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Is it still deleted, Mr. Musk?
A. It's hard deleted, unrecoverable.
Q. Well, this was -- this email was dated

August 21st of 2018. Before you deleted that Instagram account, did you use it to message anybody about Mr. Tripp?
A. No.
Q. Other than erm@tesla.com, what other email
accounts have you used to communicate with others regarding Martin trip?
A. I mean, I think some of the emails had
erm@spacex.com. I don't think anything else.
Q. So other than erm@tesla.com and erm@spacex.com, what other emails have you used to communicate with others regarding Martin Tripp?
A. I don't think I've used any other emails.
Q. Do you have any other emails?
A. I have, like, some spam accounts.
Q. What are those emails?
A. Elonmusk@yahoo.com. It's pretty embarrassing.
Q. Any other ones?
A. Elonmusk@gmail.com, but I haven't checked either of these email addresses in years.
Q. Any others?
A. No. I mean, I have a Neuralink email address, but this is unrelated.
Q. Have you ever communicated with anybody about Mr. Tripp via text message?
A. I mean, it's possible that I may have communicated with Nick Gicinto.
Q. Okay. Who else is it possible that you may have communicated with?

MR. SPIRO: Don't guess. If you actually know.
THE WITNESS: I don't actually know.
MR. FISCHBACH: There's one minute left on the
tape. Let's go off the record and change out the tape.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. Time
is 3:06 P.M.
(A break was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the beginning of
Video Media Number 2 to videotaped deposition of Elon

Musk. Going back on the record. Time is 3:15 P.M. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Mr. Musk, we discussed earlier about the fact you deleted your Instagram account and you claim you had not communicated with anybody regarding Mr. Tripp via Instagram messenger.

Have you communicated with anybody regarding Mr. Tripp over any other kind of social media platform messaging such as Twitter, Facebook, Snapchat?
A. I've never been on Facebook, and I -- I never used Snapchat. I don't think there was -- I -- I don't -- I don't think there's been any communication on Twitter.
Q. You never messaged anybody on Twitter regarding Mr. Tripp?
A. I mean, it's possible that I may have, but I don't recall having done so.
Q. Have you received any messages on Twitter via -or regarding Mr. Tripp?
A. That are -- you -- you can't just message me, yeah.
Q. Well, I don't know. I've never tried, Mr. Musk.
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. But have you ever sent to anybody messages --

MR. SPIRO: Some lawyers have, you know. Some
random lawyers.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. SPIRO: We've had problems.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. I mean, any public
messaging of me -- or replying to me would be public information.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. But I'm talking about private messages via

Twitter.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Oh}$.
Q. Have you ever exchanged private messages with anybody on Twitter --
A. No --
Q. -- about Mr. Tripp?
A. -- I don't think so.
Q. The Twitter account you used for the statements about Mr. Tripp and Linette Lopez was @elonmusk. Do you have any other Twitter accounts?
A. No. It's literally the only social media thing I use at all.
Q. Have you ever had any phone conversations with Bonnie Norman about Mr. Tripp?
A. No.
Q. Did you approve of Tesla bringing this lawsuit against Mr. Tripp?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you think it was the right thing to do?
A. Yes.
Q. If somebody had come to you and said "Let's not," you know "spend" --

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
MR. FISCHBACH: All right. Let me finish the question. Then I'll let you interpose your objection.

MR. SPIRO: Okay.
MR. FISCHBACH: If somebody other than your attorneys had come to you and said, "Let's not waste time and money on this," would you have listened to them?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. Form. Calls for speculation. It's an improper question.

You can answer it if you can answer what would have hypothetically happened in some if scenario that would never be admissible in a courtroom.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I -- I can't.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. You can't answer that question?
A. I am unable to answer your question.
Q. Do you understand the question?
A. I don't.

MR. FISCHBACH: Read the question back to the
witness.
MR. SPIRO: If you understand the question, answer it, if you can understand what would happen if somebody came to you. Do you know whether you would have proceeded, or -- or do you think it would have had any impact on you? Like if --

THE WITNESS: So if somebody had come up to me -- I'm not sure --

MR. SPIRO: And said maybe we shouldn't -- maybe we shouldn't go forward.

THE WITNESS: This is like a -- such a -- like, a -- I'm not sure what this sort of bizarre hypothetical is meant to get at and -- sorry, I don't know what you mean.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Okay. Do you understand the question?
A. No.

MR. FISCHBACH: Please read the question back to the witness.
(The Reporter read the record as requested.)
THE WITNESS: If -- it depends on who that would be. Like, this is just a bizarre hypothetical. I -it -- it's, like -- this is an impossible to answer question.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. If one of the other senior offers at Tesla had come to you with that and said, "Let's not waste time our time and money on Martin Tripp by suing him," would you have listened?
A. I would have taken that into account.
Q. Would you have listened to the advice -- strike that.

Would you have followed the advice?
MR. SPIRO: Objection to form as to all these questions.

You can answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: I certainly listen to people's opinion, and then $I$ may agree or disagree with that opinion.

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sitting here today, knowing what you know, do you think any of the statements that are the subject of Mr. Tripp's counterclaims are in fact false?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
But you can answer.
THE WITNESS: Pardon? Could you say that again.
MR. FISCHBACH: Read the question back to the witness, please.
(The Reporter read the record as requested.)
MR. SPIRO: Same objection.

Try to answer it.
THE WITNESS: I -- I don't -- wait. Do I
believe that -- any of Tripp's counterclaims are what? What are you talking about?

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Well, sir, a counterclaim --
A. Do you want say what these things are?
Q. Certainly, Mr. Musk. The counterclaim are based on statements made by you about Mr. Tripp, statements made in that June 17 th email that you sent to everyone at Tesla, statements that you made to Julia Wong on June 20th to Julia Wong, and then statements you made on Twitter insinuating that Mr. Tripp had been compensated or promised compensation from Linette Lopez.

Sitting here today, knowing what you know, do you think any of those statements are false?

MR. SPIRO: Objection to form.
Answer the question if you can answer the question.

THE WITNESS: Can you just be specific about what statements you're referring to. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. I just told you, Mr. Musk. Do you need me to tell you again?

MR. SPIRO: So the tweets to Linette Lopez.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. SPIRO: The questions.
THE WITNESS: Do I think the tweets were false?
The -- I -- where I asked the questions?
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, I'm asking you, sitting here today --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- knowing what you know, do you think any of those three statements that $I$ just referenced are in fact false?
A. Please state the statements --
Q. All right.
A. -- one at a time, and I'll say yes or no.
Q. Statement number one --
A. Yes.
Q. -- June 17 th email stating that Mr. Tripp had caused extensive and damaging sabotage to Tesla's operations.

Sitting here today, knowing what you know, do you think that statement's false?
A. No. I think he did do it.
Q. All right. Sitting here today, the statement on June 20th to Julia Wong stating that you had just -- or the -- Tesla had just received a call at the Gigafactory that Martin Tripp was going to come back and shoot the
place up, do you think that statement was false?
A. No. I think that's true.
Q. All right.
A. What? Of course.
Q. Sitting here today, the tweet you made on July 5th insinuating that Mr. Tripp had been compensated or promised compensation from Linette Lopez -- do you think, sitting here today, knowing what you know, that statement's false?
A. That's -- that's -- again, you're engaging in legal trickery. I asked a question. That's not the same as making a statement.
Q. Do you wish to retract any of the statements regarding Mr. Tripp that are the subject of his counterclaims?
A. No.
Q. Do you wish to apologize to Mr. Tripp for anything?
A. I certainly do not.
Q. Have you read Mr. Tripp's deposition in this case?
A. No.
Q. Did you watch the video of Mr. Tripp's deposition?
A. No.
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Q. Are you aware that during his deposition Tesla's counsel asked if he had been ever diagnosed with any kind of psychological condition?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Based on Tesla's investigation of Mr. Tripp, do you think he has any kind of psychological condition?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. If you --
THE WITNESS: You're asking my opinion? I think he's a -- mad and bad. BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Is that a psychological condition?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Can $I$ find -- can $I$ find that in the DSM-5?
A. Well, you may know it better than I do.
Q. Are you aware that your attorney also asked

Mr. Tripp during his deposition whether or not he had ever been diagnosed as a, quote, "narcissistic sociopath"?
A. No, I didn't know that. But it sounds like -sounds true.
Q. Do you think Martin Tripp's a narcissistic sociopath?
A. I think -- I think the word "narcissist" and
"sociopath" are abused. Do I think that it partly applies to him? Sure.
Q. Do you have some kind of unique ability to identify narcicisstic sociopaths?
A. You mean by looking in the mirror?
Q. That wasn't my question, sir.

Do you have some kind of unique -- do you have some kind of unique ability to identify narcicisstic sociopaths?
A. I mean, I think $I$ have above average insight to people's personalities.
Q. And, sir, since you've brought it up, do you think you're a narcissistic sociopath?
A. No.
Q. All right. Then why did you say "by looking in the mirror"?
A. I was making a joke.
Q. All right.
A. You obviously didn't get it.
Q. Are we here to joke, Mr. Musk, or are we here to talk about the truth?
A. We're here to talk about the truth.
Q. Are you aware that during Mr. Tripp's deposition

Tesla's counsel asked him if he had had an extramarital affair?
A. No.
Q. Did Tesla's investigation include whether or not he had had an extramarital affair?
A. No.
Q. Do you think that's even relevant to this case?

MR. SPIRO: Objection. It calls for a legal answer. Whether or not it's relevant is for a court to decide.

You don't -- I mean, you can't answer a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: I mean, it -- I don't know if it would be relevant. It seems a little obtuse. It may speak to character, but it seems a little obtuse.

MR. FISCHBACH: What number are we on?
THE REPORTER: 29.
(Exhibit 29 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Mr. Musk, I see that you laughed, but I do have a serious question about this exhibit, Exhibit 29. A. I -- I thought -- I thought this -- you're not -- that you were going to -- that -- that this was not about jokes. And here you are putting a joke on -you're wasting time in the deposition for jokes. Q. I want to know, Mr. Musk. This tweet that was actually on February of this year in which you're
apparently wearing a $T$-shirt, was that you in this photograph here, sir?

MR. SPIRO: Can you tell me how this comports with the court's ruling?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. SPIRO: These questions are --
MR. FISCHBACH: Well, let me ask a question then.

MR. SPIRO: Okay.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. When you posted this tweet, was this a reference
to Mr. Tripp or your deposition here today?
A. No, of course not.

It's really funny that you think that, though.
Q. I don't know unless I ask, Mr. Musk.
(Exhibit 30 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Any other jokes you want to tell, Mr. Musk?
A. No. Any other jokes you want to tell?
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what's been marked as deposition Exhibit 30. This is a letter from -- well, it's to Martin Tripp dated September 29th, 2017. And if you'll look at the fourth page, it appears to be signed by you.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yeah. That's not an actual -- I mean, that's just a -- it's not like a -- I didn't sign this thing. Q. Well, it's says "Signed, Elon Musk, Chairman of the Board and CEO"?
A. It's e-signed.
Q. All right. But that's what it says "Elon Musk, Chairman of the Board and CEO"?
A. Yeah. I think this is just a standard letter that's given to all employees.
Q. Are you still Chairman of the Board?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware --
A. I'm the chairman of $b-o-r-e-d$.
Q. Are you aware of the damages that Mr. Tripp is seeking in this case?
A. No.

MR. FISCHBACH: Take another break.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off record. Time is 3:27 P.M.
(A break was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record.
Time is 3:29 P.M.
MR. FISCHBACH: 31?
THE REPORTER: Yes.
(Exhibit 31 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. Sir, the court reporter has handed you what has been marked as deposition Exhibit 31. This is Mr. Tripp's answer and counterclaim.

Did you ever review the counterclaim by
Mr. Tripp?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever read it?
A. I have not.
Q. Did you ever take the time to look as to whether
or not some of the allegations in his counterclaim are
in fact true?
A. I -- no.
Q. Why not?
A. Because I -- I -- he -- he is just a huge liar and a criminal in my opinion.
Q. All right. Was it not important to you to determine whether or not there was any veracity to the allegations in the counterclaim?

MR. SPIRO: You can respond to that other than revealing conversations you've had with counsel obviously; so --

THE WITNESS: Yeah. We have to -- I mean, I've certainly discussed this case with counsel. But yeah, I mean, it -- this is -- this is obviously just -- or, in
my view, Tripp's attempt to get leverage over Tesla and me while escaping from his crimes obviously.

And you're representing him. Shame on you.
BY MR. FISCHBACH:
Q. $\quad$ Shame on me?
A. Shame, yes.
Q. Why shame on me?
A. Shame on you for representing such a bad person.
Q. Well, what do you mean by that, Mr. Musk?
A. I mean -- well, among a set of -- among his many other crimes, in my view, you know, he's not even paying for child support, and he's on the run in Hungary.
Q. But that was -- you said shame on me. Why shame on me for representing Mr. Tripp?
A. Well, you're -- you're -- you're representing such a bad person, you know.
Q. Anything else?
A. That's part of what's -- you know, like,
there's -- there's a lot of things right about this country. Some of them, they're wrong.
Q. Anything else?
A. I would put you in that category.
Q. Anything else? You think I'm what's wrong with this country?
A.
I think you're part of it, yes. Yeah.
Q. Anything else? Do you have any other insults you want to say to me during this deposition, Mr. Musk? A. Do you have any insults you want to say to me? Q. No. I don't answer your questions, Mr. Musk. You answer mine.

My question was do you have any other insults you'd like to state to me during this deposition?

MR. SPIRO: It's -- it sound like -- it sounded like no; so let's move on to another question about the Tripp case. It's, you know, limited categories for this deposition.

MR. FISCHBACH: Mr. Spiro, do you have any questions?

MR. SPIRO: I don't.
MR. FISCHBACH: Mr. Musk, thank you for being here today, sir. So it goes. Be well.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes today's deposition of Elon Musk. A total of two media was used. We're going off record. Time is 3:32 P.M. Thank you.
(Deposition concluded at 3:32 P.M.)

TRANSCRIPT ORDERS
THE REPORTER: And how soon did you need your
transcript, Counsel?
MR. FISCHBACH: Fairly soon.
MR. SPIRO: Can we mark this as confidential?
THE REPORTER: Mr. Spiro, a copy for you?
MR. SPIRO: She'll handle it.
THE REPORTER: How soon did you need that?
MR. FISCHBACH: Fairly quick.
MS. ZALDUENDO: Can we get a rough within 24
hours?
THE REPORTER: Absolutely.
And a rough for you as well?
MR. FISCHBACH: Yeah, that's fine.
THE REPORTER: And your final?
MR. FISCHBACH: No more than 10 days.
THE REPORTER: That's normal course. I can expedite sooner if you'd like.

MR. FISCHBACH: Five days.
MS. ZALDUENDO: Working days or five days?
THE REPORTER: Five business days.
MS. ZALDUENDO: Yeah. I think as long as we can get a rough in 24 hours, five days is fine.
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