FILED

2		2009 SEP 15 AM IO: 29 CLERK US DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT COURT LOS ANGE. FS BY DER and TONY FREITAS AS DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	GREG D. CROWDER, an individual; TONY FREITAS, an individual, Plaintiffs, v. NBC UNIVERSAL, INC., a Delaware corporation; SCOTT STUBER PRODUCTIONS, INC., a California corporation; BRANDON CAMP, an individual; MIKE THOMPSON, an individual; and DOES 1 through 10, Defendants.	CASE NG. V09-6681 0DW AGRA COMPLAINT FOR: 1. COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT 2. VIOLATION OF LANHAM ACT 3. BREACH OF IMPLIED CONTRACT 4. PRELIMINARY AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION 5. DECLARATORY RELIEF DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
20 21 22 23 24 25		
26 27 28	 This lawsuit concerns one of the most flagrant acts of plagiarism in recent film history. Plaintiffs' screenplay entitled "Truth" was read, re-read, and read again by high-level Universal Pictures executives, who loved the script, but wanted to turn 	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

"Truth" into a romantic drama. And that is exactly what Universal did, to wit: turn
"Truth" into a romantic drama – this one entitled "Love Happens," starring Jennifer
Aniston and Aaron Eckhart, which is scheduled to be released on September 18, 2009.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiffs are, and at all times herein mentioned were, individuals, residing in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

3. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and belief, allege that Defendant NBC UNIVERSAL, INC. (hereinafter "Universal") is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, and is, and at all times herein mentioned was, doing business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and
 belief, allege that Defendant SCOTT STUBER PRODUCTIONS, INC. (hereinafter
 "Stuber") is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation, organized and existing
 under the laws of the State of California, and is, and at all times herein mentioned was,
 doing business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and
 belief, allege that Defendant BRANDON CAMP (hereinafter "Camp") is, and at all
 relevant times herein mentioned was, an individual, residing in the State of California,
 County of Los Angeles.

6. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and
belief, allege that Defendant MIKE THOMPSON (hereinafter "Thompson") is, and at all
relevant times herein mentioned was, an individual, residing in the State of California,
County of Los Angeles.

7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and
belief, allege that DOES 1 through 5 are, and at all times herein mentioned were,
corporations, partnerships, or other business entities, which were and are legally

19

20

21

responsible and liable for the acts, omissions, and events referred to in this Complaint. 1

8. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and 2 belief, allege that DOES 6 through 10 are, and at all times herein mentioned were, 3 individuals, who were and are legally responsible and liable for the acts, omissions, and 4 events referred to in this Complaint. 5

9. Plaintiff are ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued 6 herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants under such 7 fictitious names. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege their true 8 names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. 9

Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based on such information and 10. 10 belief, allege that Defendants, and each of them, are, and at all times herein mentioned 11 were, the alter egos, agents, employees, partners, joint-venturers, co-conspirators, 12 owners, principals, and employers of the remaining Defendants, and each of them, and 13 are, and at all times herein mentioned were, acting within the course and scope of that 14 agency, employment, partnership, conspiracy, ownership, or joint-venture. Plaintiffs are 15 further informed and believe and, based upon such information and belief, allege that the 16 acts and conduct herein alleged of each such Defendant were known to, authorized by, 17 and/or ratified by the other Defendants, and each of them. 18

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

Jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court pursuant to 17 U.S.C. Sections 101 11. et seq., 28 U.S.C. Sections 1332 and 1338, and the supplemental, ancillary and/or 22 pendant jurisdiction of this Court. 23

12. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1391, in that 24 the unlawful acts and violations hereinafter described have been and are presently being 25 carried out and made effective within the boundaries of the Central District of California. 26 $\parallel \mid$ 27 /// 28

1 2

3

4

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(For Copyright Infringement – Against All Defendants)

13. Plaintiffs adopt, reallege, and by this reference incorporate, Paragraph 1 through 12, inclusive, hereinabove.

14. Plaintiff Crowder has been a screenwriter and film producer for ten years. 5 In addition, he is one of the founders of the production company, Six Reel Pictures. In 6 addition to writing and producing, he worked as an associate casting director on several 7 films including "Michael Landon, The Father I Knew" and "Blowback." Plaintiff 8 Crowder also worked as an associate casting director with Barbara Shannon Casting, 9 CSA for approximately five years, casting national commercial campaigns for AOL, 10 Buick, and Chevy. In addition to his film and commercial work, Plaintiff Crowder 11 worked as a professional photographer for over fifteen years, shooting, among other 12 things, headshots for actors, actresses, and models. 13

Plaintiff Crowder has produced three short firms, entitled "Niche," "Boy 15. 14 Called Fish," and "Hank and Edgar" under the Six Reel Pictures banner, the first two of 15 which he also wrote. All three short films had extensive festival runs, and "Niche" went 16 on to win several awards including: Best Film Award - Image Fest, April 2003; Best 17 Film and People's Choice Award - Florida Film Festival, Ft. Myers Beach; Best Film 18 and The Remi Award - Houston World Fest, May 2003; Best Film Award - Newport 19 Beach Film Festival, May 2003; Best Comedy Short Award - HD International Film 20 Festival, May 2003; Best Film/Best Actor Awards - Method Fest, 2003. 21

16. In or about June of 2004, Plaintiff Crowder wrote a screenplay entitled
"Truth Tells No Lies." In January of 2005, he registered "Truth Tells No Lies" with the
Writers Guild of America ("WGA"). A true and correct copy of the Documentation of
Registration from the WGA is attached hereto as Exhibit "A," and is incorporated herein
by this reference as though set forth in full.

17. In or about May of 2005, Plaintiff Crowder collaborated with Plaintiff
Freitas in rewriting "Truth Tells No Lies." When the script was rewritten, Plaintiffs

decided to change the title of the script to "Truth" (hereinafter "Plaintiffs' Screenplay").
Plaintiffs' Screenplay was registered with the U.S. Copyright Office on August 20, 2009,
Registration No. PAu 3-404-651. A true and correct copy of the Certificate of
Registration for Plaintiffs' Screenplay is attached hereto as Exhibit "B," and is
incorporated herein by this reference as though set forth in full.

18. Plaintiff Crowder is currently in the process of obtaining financing and 6 attachments for two of the feature length screenplays that he has written or co-written, 7 entitled "Cactus" and "The Family." "Cactus" was initially optioned by Wild Bear 8 Films, LLC for two years, and was shopped with acclaimed director Eitan Gorlin 9 attached. Plaintiff Crowder is currently producing "Cactus" himself, with Rene Bastian 10 ("TransAmerica," "A Guide To Recognizing Your Saints," and "Funny Games") of 11 Belladonna Productions, and Jeff Rice ("The Watcher," "Irene Sindler," and "Slightly 12 Single In L.A.") of Jeff Rice Films, executive producing, and with Rick Pagano ("Hotel 13 Rwanda," "X-Men The Last Stand," "88 Minutes," and "24" (season six)) set as the 14 casting director. "The Family" is currently being shopped to independent financiers, 15 mini-majors, and major studios for consideration. 16

On May 24, 2006, as part of his work as a professional photographer, 19. 17 Plaintiff Crowder was photographing a young actress named Shannon Hand. Ms. Hand 18 told him that she was dating Scott Bernstein, who was, at the time, the Vice President of 19 Production for Universal Pictures, which Plaintiffs are informed and believe is a division 20 of Defendant Universal. During their conversations, Ms. Hand mentioned that, if there 21 were any projects or screenplays that Plaintiff Crowder felt would be appropriate for 22 Universal or Rogue Pictures (which, at the time, was also owned by Universal), that she 23 would read them and, if she thought that Mr. Bernstein might be interested, she would 24 pass them on to him. 25

26 20. Plaintiff Crowder gave her two screenplays to read and pass on, Plaintiffs'
27 Screenplay and one entitled "Deep South." Ms. Hand read the screenplays, and
28 ultimately gave both of them to Mr. Bernstein. On or about June 1, 2006, Ms. Hand

- 5 -

subsequently contacted Plaintiff Crowder, and told him that Mr. Bernstein wanted to
 meet with him, and wanted to invite him and his fiancee to a premiere of a Universal
 film. At the premiere, Mr. Bernstein asked Plaintiff Crowder to come into his office for
 a meeting to discuss both projects.

21. On July 11, 2006, Plaintiff Crowder and his manager went to Mr.
Bernstein's office, and met with him regarding Plaintiffs' Screenplay. At that time, Mr.
Bernstein reiterated that he really liked Plaintiffs' Screenplay, and asked about the origin
of the project.

9 22. Plaintiff Crowder went into great detail about how Plaintiffs' Screenplay
10 was written from Plaintiff Crowder's feeling that a self help guru with a secret past, but
11 with a great message, could really be a winning script, to which a mass audience would
12 be drawn, especially in trying times.

Mr. Bernstein indicated that Plaintiffs' Screenplay was a very well written
screenplay, but that it was too small for Universal to produce. He further indicated that
the typical budget for films that get made by Universal was \$25 Million and above. He
also stated that, although he liked the script very much, it was a little dark in tone, and
that, if it were rewritten to be a romantic drama or a romantic comedy with a budget in
the range of \$25 - \$40 Million, Universal would be interested in producing the film.

24. Plaintiff Crowder and his manager advised Mr. Bernstein that, if Universal
was willing to purchase the project or pay for a rewrite, Plaintiff Crowder would be
willing to discuss the project further. At that point, Mr. Bernstein said that he would
think about the project and get back to them.

23 25. Plaintiff Crowder and Mr. Bernstein went out for a few dinners together to
24 discuss Plaintiffs' Screenplay and other project ideas that Plaintiff Crowder had for
25 possible films. Mr. Bernstein again reiterated how much he liked Plaintiffs' Screenplay,
26 and that it was a smart, well-crafted script, but that Universal would not be interested in
27 it as long as it maintained its dark tone. However, because Universal would not agree to
28 purchase the project or pay for the rewrite, there were no further communications

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 between Universal and Plaintiff Crowder concerning Plaintiffs' Screenplay.

26. Approximately three years later, Plaintiff Crowder submitted Plaintiffs'
Screenplay to Eleven Eleven Films. On August 2, 2009, Plaintiff Crowder received a
call advising him that one of the representatives of Eleven Eleven Films was concerned
that Plaintiff Crowder might have stolen a project entitled "Traveling" (the title of which
was later changed to "Love Happens") (hereinafter the "Infringing Film"), which was
about to be released by Universal, and which was produced by Defendant Stuber, and
produced and purportedly written by Defendants Camp and Thompson.

27. Since the date of creation, Plaintiffs have not transferred or conveyed any rights whatsoever with respect to Plaintiffs' Screenplay to any of the Defendants (or anyone else) for any purpose.

28. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and belief, allege that, commencing in or about 2008, Defendants, and each of them, produced the Infringing Film, and are about to release the film internationally on September 18, 2009. The Infringing Film was copied from Plaintiffs' Screenplay.

29. Defendants' copying of Plaintiffs' Screenplay, and their distribution of the Infringing Film, constitute wilful copyright infringement within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. Section 504(c)(2).

30. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' infringement of Plaintiffs'
copyright, as alleged herein, Plaintiffs have been damaged in the amount of at least \$2
Million, together with interest thereon at the legal rate. When Plaintiffs ascertains the
exact amount of said damages, they will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to
set forth said amount.

31. In accordance with 17 U.S.C. Section 504, as a further direct and proximate
result of the foregoing copyright infringement by Defendants, and each of them,
Plaintiffs are also entitled to recover all profits earned by Defendants, and each of them,
that are attributable to the infringement of the copyright of Plaintiffs' Screenplay, which
profits Plaintiffs expect to be in excess of One Hundred Million Dollars

- 7 -

1 || (\$100,000,000.00).

13

14

15

16

17

28

32. As a further direct and proximate result of the foregoing copyright
infringement by Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs have been compelled to retain
the services of an attorney in order to prosecute their rights under the Copyright Act. As
a result, Plaintiffs have incurred and will continue to incur substantial attorneys' fees. In
accordance with 17 U.S.C. Section 505, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their
reasonable attorneys' fees.

33. In accordance with 17 U.S.C. Section 504(c)(2), as a further direct and
proximate result of Defendants' wilful acts of copyright infringement, Plaintiffs are
alternatively entitled to an award of the maximum statutory damages under that Section,
in the sum of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00) for each act of
infringement.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(For Violation Of Lanham Act – Against All Defendants)

34. Plaintiffs adopt, reallege, and by this reference incorporate, Paragraph 1 through 12, inclusive, and 14 through 29, inclusive, hereinabove.

The release and distribution of the Infringing Film by Defendants, and each 35. 18 of them, along with their representation that they have the rights to own, copy, 19 disseminate, and distribute the Film, constitute a willful and deliberate false designation 20 of origin and a false representation, and is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or 21 deception by inducing the impression among purchasers, potential purchasers, and the 22 public in general that the Infringing Film was authored by Defendants, or that the release 23 and/or distribution of the Infringing Film was and is in some manner approved, licensed, 24 or sponsored by Plaintiffs. 25

36. Defendants, and each of them, by engaging in the foregoing acts, among
others, have violated the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 1125(a).

37. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts of the

Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs have been damaged in an amount which has yet 1 to be ascertained, including consequential and incidental damages, costs and interest, 2 which amount is in excess of Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000.00). When Plaintiffs 3 ascertain the exact amount of said damages, they will seek leave of Court to amend this 4 Complaint to set forth said amount. 5

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

6

7

8

19

(For Breach Of Implied Contract – Against Defendant Universal)

Plaintiffs adopt, reallege, and by this reference incorporate, Paragraph 1 38. 9 through 12, inclusive, and 14 through 29, inclusive, hereinabove. 10

Plaintiffs submitted Plaintiffs' Screenplay and disclosed their ideas 39. 11 concerning the production of a film based upon Plaintiffs' Screenplay to Defendant 12 Universal, pursuant to an oral agreement, an implied term of which was that Plaintiffs 13 would disclose Plaintiffs' Screenplay and their ideas concerning the production of a film 14 to Defendant Universal, and Defendant Universal would accept such disclosure on the 15 condition that, prior to any use being made of Plaintiffs' Screenplay and Plaintiffs' ideas, 16 Defendant Universal would seek and obtain the permission therefor from Plaintiffs. 17

40. In addition, a further implied term of such oral agreement was that, if any 18 use of Plaintiffs' Screenplay and/or Plaintiffs' ideas were made by the Defendant Universal, it would compensate Plaintiffs for such use, both monetarily (including, but 20 not limited to, writing fees, producing fees, and profits) and with customary and required 21 screen credits. 22

41. Plaintiffs submitted Plaintiffs' Screenplay and disclosed their ideas to 23 Defendant Universal subject to said custom, and subject to the implied contractual 24 obligation that Defendant Universal would compensate Plaintiffs, and would give to 25 Plaintiffs the appropriate and customary credits regarding the creation of the film. 26

Defendant Universal knew, or should have known, the conditions upon 42. 27 which the submission and disclosure were being made before the submission and 28

-9-

disclosure were made. Defendant Universal voluntarily accepted the submission of
Plaintiffs' Screenplay and the disclosure of Plaintiffs' ideas concerning the production of
a film on Plaintiffs' terms, and thereby impliedly agreed to pay Plaintiffs for any of their
ideas that they might use, and provide compensation and credit in accordance with
custom and practice in the industry.

43. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and
belief, allege that Defendant Universal has breached its obligations under the
aforementioned implied oral agreement by using, appropriating, and copying Plaintiffs'
Screenplay and their ideas without the permission of Plaintiffs, and by failing to
compensate Plaintiffs for the use of Plaintiffs' Screenplay and ideas, as well as failing to
afford any screen credits to Plaintiffs, thus constituting a further breach of the implied
oral agreement.

44. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, based upon such information and
belief, allege that Defendant Universal has actually used Plaintiffs' Screenplay and their
ideas in the Infringing Film; that is, Defendant Universal based said Infringing Film
substantially on Plaintiffs' Screenplay and the ideas that were submitted by Plaintiffs, as
alleged hereinabove, rather than basing the Infringing Film on Defendants' own ideas or
ideas from other sources.

45. Plaintiffs have performed all of the covenants, conditions, and obligations
that were required on their part to be performed under the aforementioned implied, oral
agreement, except insofar as such performance was waived, prevented, or excused by the
acts or omissions of Defendant Universal.

46. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned breaches by
Defendant Universal, as alleged herein, Plaintiffs have been damaged in the amount
which has yet to be ascertained, including consequential and incidental damages, costs
and interest, which amount is in excess of Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000.00), together
with interest thereon at the legal rate of ten percent (10%) per annum. When Plaintiffs
ascertain the exact amount of said damages, they will seek leave of Court to amend this

1 Complaint to set forth said amount.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(For Preliminary and Permanent Injunction – Against All Defendants)

47. Plaintiffs adopt, reallege, and by this reference incorporate, Paragraph 1 through 12, inclusive, 14 through 29, inclusive, 35 through 36, inclusive, and 39 through 45, inclusive, hereinabove.

48. The wrongful acts and conduct of Defendants, and each of them, constitute a serious and substantial violation of Plaintiffs' rights under the laws of the United States and the State of California.

49. Plaintiffs is informed and believes and, based upon such information and belief, alleges that Defendants' conduct, including, but not limited to, the foregoing, has caused and will cause irreparable injury to Plaintiffs, which injury will continue as long as Defendants continue to exploit the Infringing Film. Such injury will be severe, substantial and continuing, and cannot be reasonably or adequately measured or compensated for by money damages alone.

50. Unless Defendants, and each of them, are preliminarily and permanently enjoined from any further exploitation of the Infringing Film, and unless the release of the Infringing Film is immediately enjoined, Plaintiffs will be irreparably and permanently injured by the irretrievable loss of the value of their copyrights, and by the loss of the ability to control the exploitation thereof.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(For Declaratory Relief – Against All Defendants)

51. Plaintiffs adopt, reallege, and by this reference incorporate, Paragraph 1
through 12, inclusive, 14 through 29, inclusive, 35 through 36, inclusive, and 39 through
45, inclusive, hereinabove.

52. An actual controversy has arisen between Plaintiffs and Defendants, and

-11-

2

3

4

5

each of them, in that Defendants contend, and Plaintiffs denies, that Defendants own all
 rights, title, and interest in and to the copyright of the Infringing Film, and otherwise
 have the legal right to exploit the same.

4

18

21

53. Plaintiffs desires a judicial determination that:

(a) Plaintiffs own all rights, title, and interest in and to the copyright to
Plaintiff's Screenplay;

7 (b) Those rights were never sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to
8 Defendants, or any of them;

9 (c) Defendants have no present or future rights to sell, distribute, or
10 otherwise exploit Plaintiffs' Screenplay, or any portions or derivative works thereof;

(d) Defendants have no present or future rights to license, distribute, sell
 copies of, or otherwise exploit Plaintiffs' Screenplay, or any portions or derivative works
 thereof;

14 (e) The Infringing Film is a derivative work of Plaintiffs' Screenplay;15 and

(f) Plaintiffs own all rights, title, and interest in and to the copyright tothe Infringing Film.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs prays for judgment against Defendants, and each ofthem, as follows:

22 AS TO THE FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

For compensatory damages in an amount to be proved at trial, which
 Plaintiffs have sustained and will sustain as a consequence of Defendants' infringement
 of Plaintiffs' copyright, which damages are in excess of \$2 Million, together with
 interest thereon at the maximum legal rate;

27 2. For an accounting by Defendants, and each of them, of all gains, profits and
28 advantages derived by them, based upon their infringement of Plaintiffs' copyright;

- 12 -

3. For all profits earned by Defendants, and each of them, that are attributable
 to the infringement of the copyright of Plaintiffs' Screenplay, which profits are expected
 to be in excess of \$100 Million.

For an Order requiring Defendants, and each of them, to deliver up to be
 impounded during the pendency of this action, or to be destroyed, all copies of the
 Infringing Film, in all configurations, as well as any and all advertising, marketing,
 and/or promotional materials, posters, or packaging which refer to the Infringing Film;

5. In the alternative, for \$150,000.00 in statutory damages per violation for a
wilful infringement, in accordance with 17 U.S.C. Section 504(c)(2).

6. For reasonable attorneys' fees in an amount to be proved at trial, in
accordance with 17 U.S.C. Section 505;

13 AS TO THE SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

7. For compensatory damages in an amount to be proved at trial, which
Plaintiffs have sustained as a consequence of Defendants' violation of the Lanham Act,
which damages are in excess of \$2 Million, together with interest thereon at the
maximum legal rate;

8. For an accounting by Defendants, and each of them, of all gains, profits and
advantages derived by them, based upon their violation of the Lanham Act.

9. For all profits earned by Defendants, and each of them, that are attributable
to Defendants' violation of the Lanham Act, which profits are expected to be in excess of
\$100 Million.

23

24

12

AS TO THE THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

10. For compensatory damages in an amount to be proved at trial, which
Plaintiffs have sustained and will sustain as a consequence of Defendant Universal's
breach of implied contract, which damages are in excess of \$2 Million, together with
interest thereon at the maximum legal rate;

- 13 -

1 AS TO THE FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

11. For a temporary, preliminary and permanent injunction precluding
Defendants, and each of them, and their agents, servants, employees, subsidiaries,
affiliates, officers, directors, representatives, attorneys, successors, and assigns, and
anyone acting in concert with them, from:

(a) Selling, attempting to sell, causing to be sold, offering for sale,
copying, reproducing, publishing, disseminating, distributing, circulating, promoting,
marketing, manufacturing copies of, and/or advertising, the Infringing Film and/or any
portions thereof;

(b) Permitting others to sell, attempt to sell, cause to be sold, offer for
 sale, copy, reproduce, publish, disseminate, distribute, circulate, promote, market,
 manufacture copies of, and/or advertise, the Infringing Film and/or any portions thereof;

(c) Copying, reproducing, publishing, disseminating, distributing, or
 circulating advertising, promotional material, or packaging referring to the Infringing
 Film and/or any portions thereof;

(d) Permitting others to copy, reproduce, publish, disseminate, distribute,
and/or circulate advertising, promotional material, or packaging referring to the
Infringing Film and/or any portions thereof;

(e) Taking orders for any copies of the Infringing Film and/or any
portions thereof;

(f) Shipping copies of the Infringing Film and/or any portions thereof to
 anyone; and

(g) To make all reasonable efforts to retrieve from wholesale and retail
purchasers any and all copies of the Infringing Film, and immediately to deliver the same
to the U.S. Marshal or other person designated by the Court to be impounded and
maintained in a designated place during the pendency of this action.

27 ///

28 ///

AS TO THE FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF: 1 12. 2 For a judicial determination that: (a) Plaintiffs own all rights, title, and interest in and to the copyright to 3 Plaintiff's Screenplay; 4 Those rights were never sold, assigned, or otherwise transferred to (b) 5 Defendants, or any of them; 6 (c) Defendants have no present or future rights to sell, distribute, or 7 otherwise exploit Plaintiffs' Screenplay, or any portions or derivative works thereof; 8 Defendants have no present or future rights to license, distribute, sell (d)9 copies of, or otherwise exploit Plaintiffs' Screenplay, or any portions or derivative works 10 thereof; 11 The Infringing Film is a derivative work of Plaintiffs' Screenplay; (e) 12 and 13 (f) 14 Plaintiffs own all rights, title, and interest in and to the copyright to the Infringing Film. 15 16 **AS TO ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF:** 17 13. For costs of suit herein incurred; and 18 For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 14. 19 20 DATED: September 14, 2009 Edwin F. McPherson 21 Pierre B. Pine McPHERSON RANE LLP 22 23 By: 24 McPHERSON fornevs for Plaintiffs GREG D. 25 CROWDER and TONY FREITAS 26 27 28

Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney.com

.

1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
2	Plaintiffs GREG CROWDER and TONY FREITAS hereby demand a trial by jury
3	in this case.
4	
5	DATED: September 14, 2009 Edwin F. McPherson
6	Pierre B. Pine McPHERSON RANE LLP
7	
8	By:
9 10	EDWINF. McPHERSON Attorneys for Plaintiffs GREG CROWDER and TONY FREITAS
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	