EXHIBIT N

```
Page 1
1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
     DISTRICT OF UTAH
3
     THE SCO GROUP, INC.,
4
                    Plaintiff,
5
                                      No. 2:03CV0294
                 vs.
6
     INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS
     MACHINES CORP.,
 7
                       Defendant.
 8
 9
10
11
          VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL DeFAZIO
12
                      New York, New York
13
                  Thursday, January 13, 2005
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
     Reported by:
     Jennifer A. Ocampo, CSR
22
     JOB NO. 169142
23
24
25
```

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

24

25

3

5

6

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

Page 224

Page 222

DeFazio

2

3

4

5

6

7.

12

25

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

Yes.

MR. ESKOVITZ: I'm sorry, objection to form. I don't think there was a question on that

MR. MARRIOTT: I don't know whether there is or not in that but let me just ask one and we'll avoid the problem.

L. Q. Are you familiar with the terms of the 9 early versions of the standard software agreement 10 11 relating to 2.01?

Yes, in general. A.

Q. And did Section 2.01 in the early 13 versions of the standard software agreement 14 include the following language: Quote, Such right 15

to use includes the right to modify such software 16 product, all capitalized, and to prepare

18 aderivative works based upon such software product, all capitalized, comma, provided the resulting

materials are treated hereunder as part of the 20 original software product, all capitalized?

21 A. Yes. 22

Q. Are you familiar with the term 23 24 resulting materials?

A. Yes.

DeFazio

Section 2.01, as you understand it - withdrawn. 2 3

is there -- would you agree, Mr. DeFazio, that source code developed by or for a licensee even if it were included in such a modification or derivative work would not by itself constitute resulting materials.

MR. ESKOVITZ: Objection to form.

A. It would depend on whether the source code developed by the licenses incorporated UNIX system software.

Q. Okay. Let me refer you to the middle paragraph of Paragraph 16 of your declaration.

There it says, a modification or a derivative work would constitute resulting materials, in quotes, to be treated as part of the original UNIX System V software product only so long as it contained any protected UNIX System V source code provided by AT&T, USL or Novell. 19 20 Source code developed by or for a licensee, even if it were included in such a modification or a 22 derivative work, would not by itself constitute 23 resulting materials.

Is that an accurate reflection of your understanding of the AT&T UNIX licensing

Page 223

DeFazio

Q. And that term appears in Section 2.01 2 as we've just quoted from it; correct? 3

Q. Would you agree that a modification or 5 6 a derivative work would constitute resulting materials to be treated as part of the original 7 System V software product only so long as it 8 contained any protected UNIX System V source code 9 10 provided by AT&T, USL or Novell? 11

MR. ESKOVITZ: Objection to form, leading.

... A. That would be my understanding, yes.

Q. Well, let me ask you then in an open-ended way, Mr. DeFazio, what is your understanding of the term resulting materials?

A. The term resulting materials and derivative work I use kind of interchangeably as I described them earlier in discussion with Mr. Eskovitz that it's the integrated collection of 21 UNIX system technology and customer value added, put together as a customer derived operating system product.

24 Q. A modification or derivative work is resulting materials as that term is used within 25

Page 225

DeFazio

2 agreements.

A. Yes.

MR. ESKOVITZ: Objection to form, asked and answered.

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. What was the purpose of treating 7 portions of UNIX System V source code included in modifications and derivative works as part of the original software product? 10

A. The intent was to make sure that our UNIX system technology which was proprietary to us continued to be protected, the intellectual property aspects of it continued to be protected.

Q. The last sentence of Paragraph 16 of your declaration reads, the purpose of treating portions of UNIX System V source code included in a modification - included in modifications and derivative works as part of the original software product was to ensure that UNIX System V source code provided by AT&T, USL or Novell and contained in the licensees derivative works would continue to be protected as if it were stand-alone UNIX

24 System V source code.

25

is that an accurate statement?