- 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the States of California, New York, and Wisconsin, and before this Court. I am a partner with the law firm Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP, interim lead class counsel for plaintiffs and the class. I have personal knowledge of the following facts, and if called upon to do so, I could and would competently testify as to them.
- 2. I submit this declaration in support of the motion by plaintiffs Good Morning To You Productions Corp., Robert Siegel, Rupa Marya d/b/a Rupa & The April Fishes, and Majar Productions, LLC's ("Plaintiffs") for an order: (i) overruling Defendants' claim of privilege in documents produced by a non-party, or permitting a second rule 30(B)(6) deposition to determine the factual basis for that claim, (ii) granting relief from the discovery cut-off to conduct that deposition, and (iii) and [proposed] order thereon.

Background

- 3. Plaintiffs commenced this now consolidated class action seeking, *inter alia*, a declaration, pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, that Defendants: (i) do not own any valid copyright to the world's most popular song, *Happy Birthday to You* (the "Song"); (ii) that any copyright Defendants do own is limited in scope; and (iii) that the Song itself is in fact dedicated to public use and in the public domain (hereafter "Claim One"). *See generally* Pls.' Fourth Amend. Consol. Class Action Compl. (Dkt. 95) (the "FAC").
- 4. Pursuant to the Court's suggestion and the parties' subsequent agreement, Claim One of the FAC was bifurcated from the other claims and the scope of discovery is therefore limited to the issues raised by Claim One only. *See* Scheduling Order (Dkt. 92) annexed to the Joint Stipulation as Addendum A.

Discovery Served: Deposition Notices

5. On April 23, 2014, Plaintiffs served Plaintiffs' Notice of Taking Deposition of the Person Most Knowledgeable of Defendant Warner/Chappell

Music, Inc. pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) upon counsel for Defendants at their Los Angeles and San Francisco offices. A true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' Notice of Taking Deposition of the Person Most Knowledgeable of Defendant Warner/Chappell Music, Inc. pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

- 6. On May 19, 2014, after conferring with Defendants, Plaintiffs served an Amended Notice of Taking Deposition of the Person Most Knowledgeable of Defendant Warner/Chappell Music, Inc. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Amended Notice of Taking Deposition of the Person Most Knowledgeable of Defendant Warner/Chappell Music, Inc. is attached as Exhibit 2.
- 7. On May 22, 2014, Plaintiffs served Plaintiff's Second Notice of Taking Deposition of the Person Most Knowledgeable of Defendant Warner/Chappell Music, Inc. pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) upon counsel for Defendants at their Los Angeles and San Francisco offices. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Second Notice of Taking Deposition of the Person Most Knowledgeable of Defendant Warner/Chappell Music, Inc. pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) is attached hereto as Exhibit 5.
- 8. On May 27, 2014, Defendants served Defendant's Objections to Plaintiff's Amended Notice of Taking Deposition of the Person Most Knowledgeable of Defendant Warner/Chappell Music, Inc. A true and correct copy of Defendant's Objections to Plaintiff's Amended Notice of Taking Deposition of the Person Most Knowledgeable of Defendant Warner/Chappell Music, Inc. is attached as Exhibit 6.
- 9. Shortly after the deposition of Mr. Marcotullio, on June 5, 2014, Plaintiffs served Plaintiff's Notice of Taking Deposition of Jeremy Blietz upon counsel for Defendants at their Los Angeles and San Francisco offices. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Notice of Taking Deposition of the Jeremy Blietz is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

10. Finally, on June 30, 2014, Defendants' counsel, Melinda LeMoine, finally made Mr. Blietz available for deposition on July 10, 2014 in Los Angeles. A true and correct copy of the e-mail received by me on or about June 30, 2014 is attached here to as Exhibit 4.

Defendants' Privilege Logs

11. Defendants produced its initial privilege log on May 9, 2014, a copy of which was filed with the Court as Exhibit A (Dkt. 101-2) to Plaintiffs' previous discovery motion filed June 4, 2014 (Dkt. 101). Thereafter, Defendants amended their privilege log on June 2, 2014, which was filed with the Court as Exhibit B to the Declaration of Kelly Klaus in the parties' prior L.R. 37-2 Joint Stipulation. *See* Dkt. 104. The Defendants then amended their privilege log on June 23, 2014 adding two additional documents. The supplement privileged provided on June 23, 2014 is attached hereto as Exhibit 7. No further amendments to the privilege log have been made by Defendants.

ASCAP Motion to Quash

12. On June 4, 2014, Plaintiffs served a subpoena on ASCAP. On June 12, 2014, ASCAP moved in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York for an order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(3) to quash the subpoena served on ASACP by Plaintiffs ("ASCAP Motion to Quash"). On June 19, 2014, Plaintiffs opposed the ASCAP Motion to Quash, to which ASCAP filed a Reply in further support of the Motion to Quash. A true and correct copy of the ASCAP Motion to Quash dated June 12, 2014 and the Reply Memorandum in Further Support of the ASCAP Motion to Quash dated June 26, 2014 are attached hereto as Exhibits 8 and 11, respectively (Dkts. 1 and 9 in S.D.N.Y. Misc Case No. 14-mc-00179) A true and correct copy of the Declaration of Richard H. Reimer ("Reimer Declaration") filed in support of the ASCAP Motion to Quash (Dkt. 3), omitting all exhibits except for "Exhibit 2." "Exhibit 2" to the Reimer Declaration attaches a true and correct copy of the Rule 45 subpoena received by ASCAP.

1	13. On June 30, 2014, ASCAP withdrew its Motion to Quash and agreed to
2	appear for deposition for July 11, 2014. A true and correct copy of the letter to the
3	Honorable Jed. S. Rakoff, United States District Judge, by ASCAP withdrawing the
4	ASCAP Motion to Quash is attached hereto Exhibit 10.
5	L.R. 37-1 PRE-FILING CONFERENCE OF COUNSEL – JUNE 16, 2014
6	14. On May 16, 2014, the parties held a teleconference to discuss the
7	Plaintiffs' Notices of Deposition. The parties also discussed at length Plaintiffs'
8	position that further discovery was necessary and appropriate to develop a factual
9	record in order to resolve Defendants' claim of privilege with regard to the ASCAP
10	Documents. As to the Plaintiffs Second Notice of Deposition under Rule 30(b)(6)
11	(Ex. 5), Defendants refused to designate or produce a witness for the reasons set forth
12	in their prior Objections and took the position that Plaintiffs were not entitled to any
13	further discovery. See Ex. 6 hereto.
14	OTHER EXHIBITS
15	15. Attached hereto are true and correct copies of the following:
16	Exhibit 12: Page 1671, U.S. Copyright Office's Catalog of Copyright Entries
17	for New Musical Compositions and Renewal Registrations for the year 1962.
18	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
19	Executed this 15th day of July 2014, in the City of San Diego, State of California.
20	By:/s/Betsy C. Manifold
21	BETSY C. MANIFOLD
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	WARNER/CHAPPELL:20969.decl.bcm

27

28