1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dean A. Dickie (appearing <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) Dickie@MillerCanfield.com Kathleen E. Koppenhoefer (appearing <i>Pro I</i> Koppenhoefer@MillerCanfield.com Katharine N. Dunn (appearing <i>Pro Hac Vic</i> Dunn@MillerCanfield.com MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND S 225 West Washington Street, Suite 2600 Chicago, IL 60606 Telephone: 312.460.4200 Facsimile: 312.460.4288  Ira Gould (appearing <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) Gould@igouldlaw.com Ryan L. Greely (appearing <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) Rgreely@igouldlaw.com GOULD LAW GROUP	e)	
-	120 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2750 Chicago, IL 60602 Telephone: 312.781.0680		
10			
11	Facsimile: 312.726.1328		
12	George L. Hampton IV (State Bar No. 1444 ghampton@hamptonholley.com	-33)	
13	Colin C. Holley (State Bar No. 191999) cholley@hamptonholley.com HAMPTONHOLLEY LLP 2101 East Coast Highway, Suite 260 Corona del Mar, California 92625		
14			
15			
16	Telephone: 949.718.4550 Facsimile: 949.718.4580		
17	Attorneys for Plaintiff BRYAN PRINGLE		
18	Bittin (322		
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
20	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
21	SOUTHERN DIVISION		
22	BRYAN PRINGLE, an individual,	Case No. SACV 10-1656 JST(RZx)	
23	Plaintiff,	) PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED	
24	v.	ANSWERS TO DEFENDANT HEADPHONE JUNKIE	
25	WILLIAM ADAMS, JR.; STACY	PUBLISHING, LLC'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES	
26	WILLIAM ADAMS, JR.; STACY FERGUSON; ALLAN PINEDA; and JAIME GOMEZ, all individually and collectively as the music group The Black		
27	collectively as the music group The Black Eyed Peas, <i>et al.</i> ,		
28	Defendants.		
		)	

**PROPOUNDING** 

Defendant HEADPHONE JUNKIE PUBLISHING,

PARTY:

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**RESPONDING PARTY:** 

Plaintiff BRYAN PRINGLE

**SET NO.:** 

One

Plaintiff Bryan Pringle ("Pringle" or "Plaintiff") submits these Amended Answers to Defendant Headphone Junkie Publishing, LLC's ("Headphone Junkie" or "Defendant") First Set of Interrogatories (the "Interrogatories"):

## **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

- Pringle objects to each interrogatory insofar as it is vague, overly broad, 1. not limited in time and scope, oppressive, harassing or vexatious, imposes burden or expense that outweighs the likely benefit, seeks legal conclusions, and/or seeks information not relevant to the lawsuit nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- Pringle objects to the extent that these interrogatories seek information 2. protected by the attorney/client or the work product privilege. Pringle will not provide any such privileged information.
- The following answers are given based upon the information and 3. documents of which Pringle's counsel is currently aware. Pringle's investigation continues and Pringle specifically reserves the right to supplement the following answers as this litigation proceeds. The following answers are given herein without prejudice to Pringle's right to supplement or change his answers or objections and to produce evidence of additional facts.
- Pringle's answers are not an admission that any such information is relevant or admissible.
- Pringle objects to each interrogatory, instruction or definition that 5. purports to impose any obligation greater than or different from those required under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Orders of the Court.

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

expert, for the purpose of demonstrating how to use the ASR-10 Plaintiff further states that he had telephonic and email keyboard. contact with Dave Gallant but does not recall the dates of such contact.

INTERROGATORY NO. 24: Provide the date when Mr. Pringle allegedly placed his musical equipment in the storage unit reflected in his police report produced in this case.

> ANSWER: Objection. Plaintiff objects to Interrogatory No. 24 because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and not likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence. Without waiving said objections, Plaintiff states that his music equipment was placed in the storage unit sometime during 2000 and prior to October 2000. Plaintiff does not recall the specific date or dates on which his music equipment was placed in storage.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 25:** If you contend that any Defendant has infringed any copyright of Plaintiff Bryan Pringle other than Take A Dive or Take A Dive (Dance Version), provide a complete factual basis for contending that they Defendant had access and that the accused work is substantially similar.

> ANSWER: Objection. Plaintiff objects to Interrogatory No. 25 because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and not likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence. Without waiving said objections, at this particular time, Plaintiff states that David Guetta's song "Love is Gone" contains the guitar twang sequence of "Take a Dive" and as stated in his deposition, the Defendants may have infringed "If We Ever," "One Love," "Meet Me Halfway," "Someday," "Where Them Girls At,"

1	"Best One Yet," "On	ne More Chance," "Invisible," and "Showdown."	
2	Investigation continues.		
3 4	K	Dean A. Dickie (appearing Pro Hac Vice) Kathleen E. Koppenhoefer (appearing Pro Hac Vice)	
5	K M P	Katharine N. Dunn (appearing Pro Hac Vice) MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND STONE, L.C.	
6 7	·	ra Gould (appearing Pro Hac Vice) Ryan L. Greely (appearing Pro Hac Vice) GOULD LAW GROUP	
8			
9	G C H	George L. Hampton IV (State Bar No. 144433) Colin C. Holley (State Bar No. 191999) IAMPTONHOLLEY LLP	
10		Jan HA 1.	
11	B	By: Attorneys for Plaintiff Bryan Pringle	
12		Audineys for Flamuit Dryan Filigle	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

## **VERIFICATION**

I, Bryan Pringle, state that the answers made to Defendant Headphone Junkie Publishing, LLC's First Set of Interrogatories are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I declare the foregoing to be true under penalty of perjury.

Bryan Pringle

November 2, 2011