

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
BUSINESS AND PROPERTY COURTS OF ENGLAND & WALES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LIST (ChD)

Claim No: IL-2021-000019

BETWEEN:

CRYPTO OPEN PATENT ALLIANCE

Claimant

-and-

DR CRAIG STEVEN WRIGHT

Defendant

JOINT STATEMENT ON LaTeX OF
ARTHUR ROSENDAHL AND SPENCER LYNCH

Background and Instructions

1. Spencer Lynch and Arthur Rosendahl (thereafter “the experts”) met on 19 January 2024 on Microsoft Teams to discuss their respective reports, and the contents of the Joint Expert Statement. This joint report summarises their areas of agreement and disagreement.

Areas of agreement

2. The experts agree that the original Bitcoin White Paper (thereafter “BWP”) was created with OpenOffice 2.4 and not LaTeX.
3. The experts agree that despite resembling the BWP, the PDF file produced from Dr Wright’s main LaTeX file `main.tex` is not the BWP and is contains substantial discrepancies from it including in its spacing, content as rendered, symbols in formulas, and punctuation. About the 14 candidate LaTeX files more generally:
 - a. The experts agree that the PDFs produced from Dr Wright’s other LaTeX files as seen in Exhibits AR20 to AR30 also are not the BWP;
 - b. Mr Lynch had no reason to disagree with the analysis of the genealogy discussed in Mr Rosendahl report at Section 3.2; but

- c. Mr Lynch had not been instructed to do an analysis of those LaTeX files other than `main.tex`, and it was therefore not possible to discuss any further areas of agreement.
4. On the subject of reverse engineering, the experts agree that it is not too difficult to reverse engineer the BWP to create a LaTeX source file that compiles to a PDF file similar to Dr Wright's, which contain the same text, formulae, and diagrams; and is superficially similar to the BWP. It would however be extremely difficult to use LaTeX to create a PDF which was an exact match to the BWP.
5. The experts agree that the visual appearance of similarity to the BWP in the PDFs produced from Dr Wright's LaTeX files is the result of structure, formatting, and content in the raw source code of Dr Wright's LaTeX files, including the packages, and options specified in that code. On the subject of the history of those LaTeX packages and options identified by Mr Rosendahl as problematic in his report, the experts agree that there exists open-source information from which it may be concluded that these packages did not exist at the time, but Mr Lynch stated that he had no first-hand knowledge of those facts.

Areas of disagreement

6. In our meeting, we were not able to identify any substantive areas of disagreement.

JOINT DECLARATION

1. I understand that my duty is to help the Court to achieve the overriding objective by giving independent assistance by way of objective, unbiased opinion on matters within my expertise, both in preparing reports and giving oral evidence. I understand that this duty overrides any obligation to the party by whom I am engaged or the person who has paid or is liable to pay me. I confirm that I have complied with and will continue to comply with that duty.
2. I confirm that I have not entered into any arrangement where the amount or payment of my fees is in any way dependent on the outcome of the case.
3. I know of no conflict of interest of any kind, other than any which I have disclosed in my report. I do not consider that any interest affects my suitability as an expert witness on any issues on which I have given evidence.
4. I will advise the party by whom I am instructed if, between the date of my report and the trial, there is any change in circumstances which affects this.
5. I have shown the sources of all information I have used.
6. I have exercised reasonable care and skill in order to be accurate and complete in preparing this report.
7. I have endeavoured to include in my report those matters, of which I have knowledge or of which I have been made aware, that might adversely affect the validity of my opinion. I have clearly stated any qualifications to my opinion.
8. I have not, without forming an independent view, included or excluded anything which has been suggested to me by others including my instructing lawyers.

9. I will notify those instructing me immediately and confirm in writing if for any reason my existing report requires any correction or qualification or my opinion changes.
10. I understand that:
 - a. my report will form the evidence to be given under oath or affirmation;
 - b. the court may at any stage direct a discussion to take place between experts and has done in this case;
 - c. the court may direct that, following a discussion between the experts, a statement should be prepared showing those issues which are agreed and those issues which are not agreed;
 - d. I may be required to attend Court to be cross-examined on my report; and
 - e. I am likely to be the subject of public adverse criticism by the judge if the Court concludes that I have not taken reasonable care in trying to meet the standards set out above.
11. I have read Part 35 of the Civil Procedure Rules and I have complied with its requirements. I am aware of the requirements of Practice Direction 35 and the Guidance for the Instruction of Experts in Civil Claims 2014.
12. I confirm that I have acted in accordance with the Code of Practice for Experts.
13. I confirm that I have made clear which facts and matters referred to in this report are within my own knowledge and which are not. Those that are within my own knowledge I confirm to be true. The opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinions on the matters to which they refer.

Signed:  CE82BDF80AA841E...

Signed:  A2BCD347962846F...