

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CONTEMPORARY SERVICES CORPORATION, a California corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

LANDMARK EVENT STAFFING SERVICES, INC., a Delaware corporation, PETER KRANSKE, an individual, and MICHAEL HARRISON, and individual,

Defendants.

CASE NO. SACV09-00681 BRO (ANx)

AMENDED JUDGMENT ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1 WHEREAS, on January 13, 2012, Plaintiff Contemporary Services
2 Corporation (“CSC”) filed its First Amended Complaint (Docket No. 74) against
3 Defendants Landmark Event Staffing Services, Inc. (“Landmark”), Peter Kranske
4 (“Kranske”) and Michael Harrison (“Harrison”) (collectively “Defendants”).

5 WHEREAS, CSC’s First Amended Complaint asserted claims for (1)
6 misappropriation of trade secrets, (2) violation of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act,
7 (3) violation of the California Computer Data Access and Fraud Act, (4) intentional
8 interference with prospective economic advantage, (5) civil conspiracy, (6) violation
9 of California’s Unfair Competition Law, (7) unjust enrichment, (8) aiding and
10 abetting, and (9) breach of contract.

11 WHEREAS, on July 16, 2014, Defendants filed a motion for summary
12 judgment, and alternatively for partial summary judgment (Docket No. 219), on all of
13 CSC’s claims in its First Amended Complaint.

14 WHEREAS, on August 14, 2014, CSC filed its opposition to Defendants’
15 motion (Docket No. 251).

16 WHEREAS, on August 25, 2014, Defendants filed their reply in support
17 of their motion (Docket No. 289).

18 WHEREAS, the Court heard oral argument by the parties on September
19 8, 2014.

20 WHEREAS, on September 9, 2014, the Court issued a minute order
21 granting summary judgment in Defendants’ favor on all of CSC’s claims (Docket No.
22 350) (the “Summary Judgment Order”).

23 WHEREAS, on September 15, 2014 the Court entered judgment in
24 Defendants’ favor (the “Original Judgment”) (Docket No. 355.)

25 WHEREAS, on September 29, 2014, Defendants and CSC filed a
26 stipulation in lieu of Defendants’ motion for attorneys’ fees and sanctions and
27 application to tax costs and in which in which the parties stipulated as to the amount
28 of Defendants’ attorneys’ fees and costs, both taxable and non-taxable, in the amount

1 of eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000.00) (the “Award”).

2 WHEREAS, on September 30, 2014 this Court granted the parties’
3 stipulation and ordered the Award (the “Order Awarding Fees and Costs”) (Docket
4 No. 359).

5 Pursuant to and in accordance with the Summary Judgment Order, and
6 the Order Awarding Fees and Costs, and for all the reasons stated therein and on the
7 record at the September 8, 2014 hearing, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that this
8 AMENDED JUDGMENT be entered as follows:

9 1. On CSC’s first cause of action for misappropriation of trade
10 secrets, JUDGMENT IS ENTERED IN DEFENDANTS’ FAVOR.

11 2. On CSC’s second cause of action for violation of the Computer
12 Fraud and Abuse Act, JUDGMENT IS ENTERED IN DEFENDANTS’
13 FAVOR.

14 3. On CSC’s third cause of action for violation of the California
15 Computer Data Access and Fraud Act, JUDGMENT IS ENTERED IN
16 DEFENDANTS’ FAVOR.

17 4. On CSC’s fourth cause of action for intentional interference with
18 prospective economic advantage, JUDGMENT IS ENTERED IN
19 DEFENDANTS’ FAVOR.

20 5. On CSC’s fifth cause of action for civil conspiracy, JUDGMENT
21 IS ENTERED IN DEFENDANTS’ FAVOR.

22 6. On CSC’s sixth cause of action for violation of California’s Unfair
23 Competition Law, JUDGMENT IS ENTERED IN DEFENDANTS’ FAVOR.

24 7. On CSC’s seventh cause of action for unjust enrichment,
25 JUDGMENT IS ENTERED IN DEFENDANTS’ FAVOR.

26 8. On CSC’s eighth cause of action for aiding and abetting,
27 JUDGMENT IS ENTERED IN DEFENDANTS’ FAVOR.

28 9. On CSC’s ninth cause of action for breach of contract,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JUDGMENT IS ENTERED IN DEFENDANTS' FAVOR.

10. Defendants are awarded attorneys' fees and costs, both taxable and non-taxable, in the amount of eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000.00).

11. This amended judgment supersedes and replaces the Original Judgment (Docket No. 355.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 2, 2014



HONORABLE BEVERLY REID O'CONNELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE