

Exhibit 11

In The Matter Of:

In re: ADELPHIA COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION, et al., v.

STEPHEN RUSSELL MARTIN II

November 11, 2005

LEGALINK MANHATTAN

420 Lexington Avenue - Suite 2108

New York, NY 10170

PH: 212-557-7400 / FAX: 212-692-9171

MARTIN II, STEPHEN RUSSELL - Vol. 1

Page 78

1 STEPHEN RUSSELL MARTIN II
2 A. Okay.
3 Q. Are you familiar with the data
4 presented on page 5?
5 A. No.
6 Q. So you are generally not familiar
7 with the issues presented in this presentation?
8 A. I mean, I understand generally what
9 this presentation is intended to do. I don't
10 have any involvement in the allocation process.
11 Q. Are you involved in assessing the
12 impact on the interests of Arahova
13 Communications, Inc., by this allocation
14 process?
15 A. Not at this moment.
16 Q. To the extent that it's the subject
17 of litigation, are you involved in that
18 litigation?
19 A. I guess it depends on what you mean
20 by involved. I mean, certainly I'm involved
21 because I'm here at a deposition today. I am
22 not primarily responsible for handling the
23 litigation between ACC and Arahova bondholders.
24 Q. So you're not advising the
25 company -- you're not advising the company at

Page 79

1 STEPHEN RUSSELL MARTIN II
2 all on this issue?
3 A. Not at this time, no.
4 Q. When you're negotiating these
5 settlements with the DOJ and the SEC, did you
6 make any distinction between the interests of
7 Arahova Communications, Inc., and the interests
8 of ACC?
9 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Objection to the
10 form. You're asking whether he did this when he
11 negotiated? His testimony was that he --
12 MS. KENNEDY: Yes.
13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Objection to the
14 form.
15 MS. KENNEDY: I'm sorry, Terry, I
16 didn't hear.
17 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Objection to the
18 form.
19 A. No, I did not specifically make
20 any -- any specific definition between the two,
21 no.
22 Q. (BY MS. KENNEDY) From your
23 discussions with outside counsel -- let me
24 rephrase.
25 Earlier, you did state that you've

Page 80

1 STEPHEN RUSSELL MARTIN II
2 had discussions with outside counsel regarding
3 the negotiations with the government, correct?
4 A. That's correct.
5 Q. Did you discuss the impact on the
6 interests of Arahova Communications, Inc., with
7 outside counsel?
8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Objection to the
9 form. Instruct the witness not to answer that
10 question, because that would be a privileged
11 communication between counsel and the company.
12 MS. KENNEDY: I'm not asking him
13 what he discussed. I'm asking if he discussed
14 it.
15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Well, the fact
16 that he discussed it reveals the substance of
17 attorney advice. Even answering the question
18 yes or no, by definition, reveals that they were
19 talking about that subject.
20 Q. (BY MS. KENNEDY) Did you discuss
21 the impact of the settlement on the interests of
22 Arahova Communications, Inc., with the SEC?
23 A. Not to my knowledge. Not
24 specifically. I mean, it depends on how you
25 define impact. You know, would they have been

Page 81

1 STEPHEN RUSSELL MARTIN II
2 indicted and were they included as a subsidiary?
3 Yes. Are you talking about allocation issues?
4 No, not to my knowledge.
5 Q. So when you were involved with
6 these -- with these negotiations, were you
7 making a distinction between Arahova
8 Communications, Inc., and ACC?
9 A. Other than making sure that both
10 of those entities were wrapped into the
11 non-prosecution agreement, no, we were not
12 making a distinction when we reached the
13 government settlement agreement amount.
14 Q. Why is a distinction not made?
15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Objection to the
16 form.
17 A. In my view, what we were trying
18 to do was reach the best deal we could with the
19 government for ACC and all of its subsidiaries,
20 so that none of the -- neither the company or
21 its subsidiaries would ever face criminal
22 prosecution by the United States government.
23 And that was our primary duty at that point
24 in time in terms of protecting all of the
25 entities.