

1 GLENN D. POMERANTZ (State Bar No. 112503)
 glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
 2 KELLY M. KLAUS (State Bar No. 161091)
 kelly.klaus@mto.com
 3 MELINDA E. LeMOINE (State Bar No. 235670)
 melinda.lemoine@mto.com
 4 ADAM I. KAPLAN (State Bar No. 268182)
 adam.kaplan@mto.com
 5 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
 355 South Grand Avenue
 6 Thirty-Fifth Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90071-1560
 7 Telephone: (213) 683-9100
 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

8 Attorneys for Defendants
 9 Warner/Chappell Music, Inc. and
 Summy-Birchard, Inc.

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 12 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
WESTERN DIVISION

13 GOOD MORNING TO YOU
 PRODUCTIONS CORP.; et al.,
 14
 Plaintiffs,
 15
 v.
 16 WARNER/CHAPPELL MUSIC, INC.,
 17 et al.,
 18 Defendants.

Lead Case No. CV 13-04460-GHK
 (MRWx)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION [1] FOR
 RECONSIDERATION OF
 COURT'S MEMORANDUM AND
 ORDER RE CROSS-MOTIONS
 FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
 (DKT. NO. 244) OR,
 ALTERNATIVELY, [2] TO
 CERTIFY ORDER FOR
 INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL
 UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b)**

Date: November 16, 2015
 Time: 9:30 a.m.
 Courtroom: 650
 Judge: Hon. George H. King,
 Chief Judge

1 After considering all of the arguments and briefing presented by the parties in
2 connection with Defendants’ Motion [1] for Reconsideration of Court’s
3 Memorandum and Order Re Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 244)
4 (the “Order”) Or, Alternatively, [2] to Certify Order for Interlocutory Appeal Under
5 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), the Court hereby GRANTS Defendants’ Motion as follows.

6 [ALTERNATIVE 1:

7 Defendants’ Motion for Reconsideration is Granted. The Court reconsiders
8 the Order and rules that [Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED
9 and Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED] OR [the Parties’
10 Motions for Summary Judgment are both DENIED].]

11 [ALTERNATIVE 2:

12 In accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 5(a)(3), the Court hereby amends the
13 Order to add the following paragraph at page 43, line 5:

14 “The Court finds that this Order involves controlling questions of law
15 as to which there are substantial grounds for differences of opinion, and
16 that an immediate appeal from the Order may materially advance the
17 ultimate termination of this litigation. 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).”]
18
19
20

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 DATED: _____

23 THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. KING
24 CHIEF JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
25
26
27
28

1 Respectfully submitted by:

2

3 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

4

By: /s/ Kelly M. Klaus
5 KELLY M. KLAUS

6 Attorneys for Defendants Warner/Chappell
7 Music, Inc. and Summy-Birchard, Inc.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28