4 5 6 7	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIV Michael T. Zeller (Bar No. 196417) michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 Telephone: (213) 443-3000 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100 Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151) charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151) charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com 50 California Street, 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111 Rachel Herrick Kassabian (Bar No. 1910 rachelherrick@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor)
	Redwood Shores, California 94065	
9	Attorneys for Defendant Google Inc.	
10 11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	PERFECT 10, INC., a California	CASE NO. CV 04-9484 AHM (SHx) [Consolidated with Case No. CV 05-
14	corporation,	[Consolidated with Case No. CV 05- 4753 AHM (SHx)]
15	Plaintiff,	GOOGLE INC.'S EVIDENTIARY
16	vs. GOOGLE INC., a corporation; and	OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF MARK MCDEVITT SUBMITTED IN
17	DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	SUPPORT OF PERFECT 10, INC.'S MOTION FOR EVIDENTIARY
18	Defendants.	AND OTHER SANCTIONS
19	AND COUNTERCLAIM	Hon. Stephen J. Hillman
20 21	PERFECT 10, INC., a California corporation,	Date: January 15, 2010 Time: 10:00 a.m. Place: Courtroom 550
22	Plaintiff,	Discovery Cut-off: None Set
23	vs.	Pre-trial Conference: None Set Trial Date: None Set
24	AMAZON.COM, INC., a corporation;	PUBLIC REDACTED
25	A9.COM, INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	
26	Defendants.	
27		
28		
01980,51320/3277767.1	GOOGLE'S EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO	D THE DECLARATION OF MARK MCDEVITT

Google Inc. hereby submits the following objections to the Declaration of
 Mark McDevitt submitted in support of Perfect 10, Inc.'s Motion for Evidentiary
 And Other Sanctions Against Google And/Or For The Appointment Of A Special
 Master ("Sanctions Motion") (Dkt. No. 682). The McDevitt Declaration is
 objectionable for several reasons, and should be disregarded in its entirety.

6

T.

7

8

THE MCDEVITT DECLARATION SHOULD BE STRICKEN

BECAUSE P10 FAILED TO DISCLOSE MR. MCDEVITT IN ITS RULE 26(A) DISCLOSURES OR DISCOVERY RESPONSES.

9 The McDevitt Declaration should be disregarded in its entirety because P10 10 never disclosed Mr. McDevitt in its Rule 26 Initial Disclosures or its interrogatory responses as a person having knowledge of facts relevant to this case. A party 11 12 cannot rely on evidence at summary judgment that the party failed to provide during discovery. Wolk v. Green, 2008 WL 298757, *3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 1, 2008); Guang 13 Dong Light Headgear Factory Co., Ltd. v. ACI Intern., Inc., 2008 WL 53665, *1 (D. 14 Kan. Jan. 2, 2008). P10's failure to disclose Mr. McDevitt as a witness deprived 15 Google of the opportunity to depose him prior to P10's submission of his 16 declaration. The McDevitt Declaration should be stricken in its entirety. Fed. R. 17 Civ. P. 26, 33, 37; see also Guang Dong Light Headgear Factory, 2008 WL 53665, 18 *1 (granting motion to strike affidavit because witness identity and testimony not 19 properly disclosed during discovery). 20

21

II.

22

THE MCDEVITT DECLARATION IS INADMISSIBLE UNDER THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Evidence submitted to the Court on motion practice must meet all
requirements for admissibility of evidence if offered at the time of trial. *Beyene v. Coleman Sec. Services, Inc.*, 854 F.2d 1179, 1181-82 (9th Cir. 1988); *Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. of America v. Telstar Const. Co., Inc.*, 252 F. Supp. 2d 917, 923 (D.
Ariz. 2003). *See also* Fed. R. Evid. 101 (Rules of Evidence apply to all proceedings

28

1	in the courts of the United States); Fed. R. Evid. 1101 (listing exceptions to Rule	
2	101). The McDevitt Declaration does not meet these requirements.	
3	Relevance. Evidence must be relevant to the claims and defenses of the case	
4	to be admissible. Fed. R. Evid. 401; 403. The McDevitt Declaration is not relevant	
5	to P10's Sanctions Motion because (among other things) it references only	
6	purported DMCA notices related to example . However, P10 has not served	
7	discovery requests seeking Blogger DMCA Notices, nor has P10 obtained a Court	
8	order compelling them. See Google's Opposition to P10's Motion for Evidentiary	
9	and Other Sanctions at 9-10 (Dkt. No. 647).	
10	Personal Knowledge. Testimonial evidence must be based on the personal	
11	knowledge of the witness offering the evidence. Fed. R. Evid. 602. The McDevitt	
12	Declaration contains testimony regarding	
13		
14	but fails to establish that Mr. McDevitt has drafted,	
15	reviewed, or otherwise has personal knowledge with respect to each of them.	
16		
17	DATED: January 13, 2010 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER &	
18	HEDGES, LLP	
19	Rachel Henrick Kassebian	
20	By Rachel Herrick Kassabian	
21	Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
01980.51320/3277767.1	-2-	
	GOOGLE'S EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF MARK MCDEVITT	

ŧ