Fahmy v. Jay-Z et al

Doc. 7

Defendant Roc-A-Fella Records, LLC ("Defendant"), answers the Complaint of Osama Ahmed Fahmy ("Plaintiff") as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The allegations contained in paragraph 1 are legal conclusions to which a response is not required. To the extent the allegations in paragraph 1 are factual in nature, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

PARTIES

- 2. Answering the first and second sentences of paragraph 2, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein; and answering the third sentence of paragraph 2, denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 3. Answering paragraph 3, Defendant admits the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 3; lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second sentence of paragraph 3, and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein; and denies each and every remaining allegation set forth in paragraph 3.
- 4. Answering paragraph 4, Defendant admits that Rob Bourdon, Brad Delson, Mike Shinoda, Dave Farrell, Joseph Hahn, and Chester Bennington are entertainers who record, produce, and perform music as members of the band "Linkin Park," but lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of paragraph 4 and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 5. Defendant admits that it is a corporate entity that has been identified in product packaging as having participated in the release of an album entitled *Collision Course*, which contained a track entitled "Big Pimpin'/Papercut," but denies each and every remaining allegation set forth in the first sentence of paragraph 5. Answering the second sentence of paragraph 5, Defendant lacks

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

- 6. Defendant admits that it is a corporate entity that has been identified in product packaging as having participated in the release of the album entitled *Vol.*3...Life and Times of S. Carter. Answering the remaining allegations in paragraph 6, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 7. Answering paragraph 7, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS

- 8. Answering the final sentence of paragraph 8, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein. Answering the remainder of paragraph 8, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 9. Answering paragraph 9, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 10. Answering paragraph 10, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 11. Answering paragraph 11, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 12. Answering paragraph 12, Defendant admits that the album *Vol.*3...Life and Times of S. Carter, which contains a sound recording entitled "Big Pimpin," was released in or about December 1999. Answering the remaining allegations in paragraph 12, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief

as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

- 13. Answering the first sentence of paragraph 13, Defendant admits that distribution of the album *Vol. 3...Life and Times of S. Carter* has continued from its original release through the present. Defendant denies each and every remaining allegation set forth in paragraph 13.
- 14. Answering paragraph 14, Defendant admits that, in or about July 2004, Linkin Park and Jay-Z performed a concert at the Roxy Theater in West Hollywood; that, during said concert Jay-Z and Linkin Park performed a song entitled "Big Pimpin'/Papercut;" and that, in approximately late November 2004, a work entitled *Collision Course*, which jointly packaged a DVD recording of said concert and a CD containing an in-studio recording of "Big Pimpin'/Papercut," was released, which continues to be distributed today. Defendant denies each and every remaining allegation set forth in paragraph 14.
- 15. Answering paragraph 15, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 16. Answering the first sentence of paragraph 16, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein. Answering the second sentence of paragraph 16, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 17. The allegations contained in paragraph 17 are legal conclusions to which a response is not required. To the extent the allegations in paragraph 17 are factual in nature, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 18. The allegations contained in paragraph 18 are legal conclusions to which a response is not required. To the extent the allegations in paragraph 18 are

and every allegation set forth therein. Answering the second sentence of paragraph

- 40, Defendant lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of said allegations and on that basis denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 41. Answering paragraph 41, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 42. Answering paragraph 42, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

ANSWER TO FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 43. This claim for relief has been dismissed pursuant to the Court's Order of March 20, 2008, and as such no answer to paragraph 43 is required. To the extent any answer is required, Defendant incorporates by reference its answers to paragraphs 1 through 37 above, as if set forth in full herein.
- 44. This claim for relief has been dismissed pursuant to the Court's Order of March 20, 2008, and as such no answer to paragraph 44 is required. To the extent any answer is required, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 45. This claim for relief has been dismissed pursuant to the Court's Order of March 20, 2008, and as such no answer to paragraph 45 is required. To the extent any answer is required, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 46. This claim for relief has been dismissed pursuant to the Court's Order of March 20, 2008, and as such no answer to paragraph 46 is required. To the extent any answer is required, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein.
- 47. This claim for relief has been dismissed pursuant to the Court's Order of March 20, 2008, and as such no answer to paragraph 47 is required. To the extent any answer is required, Defendant denies each and every allegation set forth therein.

1	PRAYER FOR RELIEF					
2	48. Defendant denies that Plaintiff is entitled to recover any of the					
3	damages, injunctive or other relief sought in his Prayer for Relief, and denies each					
4	and every allegation contained therein.					
5						
6	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
7	(Failure to State a Claim for Relief)					
8	49. The Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to state a claim upon					
9	which relief may be granted.					
10						
11	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
12	(Statute of Limitations)					
13	50. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part by the applicable					
14	statute(s) of limitations.					
15						
16	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
17	(Standing)					
18	51. Plaintiff lacks standing to bring this action or any claim against					
19	Defendant for the relief sought herein.					
20						
21	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
22	(Failure to Join Necessary and Indispensable Parties)					
23	52. The Complaint fails to name necessary or indispensable parties,					
24	including persons and entities that own the allegedly infringed works, as alleged in					
25	the Complaint.					
26						
27						
28						

Mitchell Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP

1	FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
2	(Independent Creation)					
3	53. Defendant's works were the result of Defendant's independent					
4	creation.					
5						
6	SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
7	(Adequate Remedy at Law)					
8	54. Plaintiff's causes of action, and each of them, and his injunctive and					
9	restitution remedies, are barred in light of the fact that Plaintiff has an adequate					
10	remedy at law.					
11						
12	SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
13	(Attorneys' Fees Not Recoverable)					
14	55. Plaintiff is barred from any recovery of attorneys' fees, because, in					
15	bringing this action, Plaintiff has not alleged any basis upon which attorneys' fees					
16	are recoverable.					
17						
18	EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
19	(Laches)					
20	56. Plaintiff is barred by the doctrine of laches from asserting any of his					
21	claims for relief.					
22						
23	<u>NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>					
24	(Waiver)					
25	57. Plaintiff has, through his actions, conduct, delay, and failure to act,					
26	waived any right to relief.					
27						
Mitchell Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP						

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

1777039.1

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
(Estoppel)					
58.	Plaintiff is estopped by his own acts and omissions from asserting any				
claims in	this action.				
ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
(De Minimis)					
59.	To the extent any copyrightable elements from any of the allegedly				
infringed works were used in allegedly infringing works and were not					
independently created, such use is <i>de minimis</i> and not actionable.					
TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
(Authorization, License, Acquiescence, Ratification, Consent)					
60.	To the extent any of the acts or omissions averred in the Complaint				
occurred, those acts were authorized, licensed, acquiesced in, ratified, or consented					
to it, expressly, by implication, or by conduct.					
	THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
	(Lack of Willfulness)				
61.	Defendant has not willfully infringed any alleged copyright in the				
Plaintiff's purported work.					
FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
	(Failure to Comply with Statutory Requirements)				
62.	Plaintiff has failed to comply with the registration, deposit, and other				
statutory requirements that are conditions precedent to maintaining this action					
and/or to the recovery of statutory damages and attorneys' fees.					
and/or to	o the recovery of statutory damages and attorneys flees.				
	59. infringed independed independent inde				

Mitchell Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP

1	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
2	(Work for Hire)				
3	63. To the extent Baligh Hamdy wrote or contributed to "Khosara				
4	Khosara," such contribution was a work made for hire.				
5					
6	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
7	(Unclean Hands)				
8	Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.				
9					
10	SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
11	(Good Faith)				
12	65. To the extent Defendant engaged in any act averred by Plaintiff, it did				
13	so innocently and in good faith.				
14					
15	EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
16	(Lack of Originality)				
17	66. Plaintiff's causes of action are barred as the portion of the Plaintiff's				
18	work alleged to have been infringed is not original.				
19					
20	NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
21	(Lack of Protectability)				
22	67. Plaintiff's causes of action are barred as the portion of the Plaintiff's				
23	work alleged to have been infringed is not protectable.				
24					
25	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
26	(Forfeiture by General Publication)				
27	68. Plaintiff's works are in the public domain by reason of the alleged				
_{&} 28	author's sale of said works without affixing any copyright notice thereto.				
)	10				

Mitchell Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP

1	TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
2	(Fair Use)					
3	69.	To the extent a	ny copyrightable elements from the allegedly infringed			
4	work was	used in allegedly	infringing works and were not independently created,			
5	such use constituted fair use.					
6						
7	TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
8	(Not Copyrightable Expression)					
9	70.	70. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because there is no				
10	infringement of copyrightable expression.					
11						
12	WHEREFORE, Defendant prays:					
13						
14	1.	That Plaintiff take nothing by the Complaint, and that the Complaint,				
15	and each claim for relief therein, be dismissed with prejudice;					
16						
17	2.	For Defendant'	's attorneys' fees and full costs incurred herein; and			
18						
19	3. For such other i		relief as the Court deems just and proper.			
20						
21	DATED: April 3, 2008		RUSSELL J. FRACKMAN ALEXA L. LEWIS			
22			MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP			
23						
24	By: <u>/s/ Alexa L. Lewis</u> Alexa L. Lewis					
25	Attorneys for Defendant Roc-A-Fella					
26						
27						
Mitchell Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP						

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

1777039.1