28

1 0 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 MARGARET MORRIS, an CV 08-5321-RSWL (JCx)individual 12 Plaintiff, **ORDER** Re: Defendants' Motion for Attorney's 13 Fees [191] VS. 14 15 KENNETH ATCHITY, et al., 16 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 21 On September 14, 2011, Defendants Kenneth Atchity, 22 Atchity Entertainment International, John Reid, Sonic 23 Age, Ltd., and The Writer's Lifeline's ("Defendants") 24 Motion for Attorney's Fees [191] came on for regular 25 calendar before the Court. The Court having reviewed 26 all papers submitted pertaining to this Motion and 27 having considered all arguments presented to the Court,

NOW FINDS AND RULES AS FOLLOWS:

Defendants' Motion for Attorney's Fees is DENIED.

On April 12, 2011, a six-day trial commenced in this Action. On April 20, 2011, the jury returned its verdict [181]. The jury found that Defendants did not infringe on Plaintiff Margaret Morris's copyright; that Defendant Sonic Age had breached an implied contract with Plaintiff, awarding Plaintiff \$70,000.00 in damages arising from this breach; that Defendant The Writer's Lifeline had not breached an implied contract with Plaintiff; and that Plaintiff had defamed Defendant Kenneth Atchity, awarding Defendant Atchity \$1.00 in damages arising from this defamation.

On July 6, 2011, Defendants filed this present Motion for Attorney's Fees [191], seeking \$185,780.70 in attorney's fees.

First, as a threshold issue, the Court finds that Defendants are the prevailing party under the Copyright Act. The jury returned its verdict of non-infringement, and as such Defendants prevailed on this copyright infringement claim.

However, the Court has broad discretion in awarding attorney's fees and finds that Defendants have not established that the factors set forth by the Supreme Court in Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc., 510 U.S. 517 (1994), weigh in favor of an award of attorney's fees here.

Namely, the Court finds that there is not a sufficient showing of Plaintiff's unreasonableness, frivolousness, and improper motivation in pursuing a case against

Defendants. Also, the Court finds that the possible chilling effect on potential plaintiffs seeking to protect their copyrighted material weighs against awarding attorney's fees here. Therefore, Defendants' Motion for Attorney's Fees is **DENIED**. IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 20, 2011

RONALD S.W. LEW

HONORABLE RONALD S.W. LEW Senior, U.S. District Court Judge