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 H</i> Koppenhoefer@MillerCanfield.com Katharine N. Dunn (appearing <i>Pro Hac Vice</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)			
10	120 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2750 Chicago, IL 60602				
11	Telephone: 312.781.0680 Facsimile: 312.726.1328				
12	George L. Hampton IV (State Bar No. 1444	33)			
13	ghampton@hamptonholley.com Colin C. Holley (State Bar No. 191999) cholley@hamptonholley.com				
14	HAMPTONHOLLEY LLP				
15 16	2101 East Coast Highway, Suite 260 Corona del Mar, California 92625 Telephone: 949.718.4550 Facsimile: 949.718.4580				
17	Attorneys for Plaintiff BRYAN PRINGLE				
18	BRIANTRINGLE				
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 RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT DAVID			
24	v.	GUETTA'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES			
25	WILLIAM ADAMS, JR.; STACY FERGUSON; ALLAN PINEDA; and))			
2627	JAIME GOMEZ, all individually and collectively as the music group The Black Eyed Peas, et al.,				
28	Defendants.				
28	Defendants.)			

1 PROPOUNDING PARTY: Defendant DAVID GUETTA

RESPONDING PARTY: Plaintiff BRYAN PRINGLE

SET NO.: One

Plaintiff Bryan Pringle submits this Response to Defendant David Guetta's ("Guetta") First Set of Interrogatories (the "Interrogatories").

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

- 1. Plaintiff objects to each Interrogatory insofar as it is vague, overly broad, 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.
- 2. Plaintiff objects to the extent that these Interrogatories seek information protected by the attorney/client or the work product privilege. Plaintiff will not provide any such privileged information.
- 3. The following answers are given based upon the information and documents of which Plaintiff's counsel is currently aware. Plaintiff's investigation continues and Plaintiff specifically reserves the right to supplement the following answers as this litigation proceeds. The following answers are given herein without prejudice to Plaintiff's right to supplement or change his answers or objections and to produce evidence of additional facts.
- 4. Plaintiff's answers are not an admission that any such information is relevant or admissible.
- 5. Plaintiff objects to each Interrogatory, instruction or definition that 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.

- 6. Plaintiff objects to each Interrogatory regarding "Defendants" as being in violation of Rule 33(a)(1).
- 7. Plaintiff objects to each Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information which is properly the subject of expert testimony.
 - 8. Plaintiff specifically reserves the right to assert additional objections.

DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

Plaintiff objects to each and every definition and instruction as set forth in Defendant's Interrogatories because each purports to impose an obligation greater than or different from those required under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Orders of the Court.

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Identify the specific source from which YOU obtained the sound recording that was attached as Audio Exhibit 3 ("Bryan Pringle, 'Take a Dive'--Piano Twang Sequence") to the Declaration of Mark Rubel filed in this action, and describe with particularity the circumstances under which YOU obtained said sound recording and under which said sound recording was transmitted to Mark Rubel.

RESPONSE: Objection. Plaintiff cannot identify from the statement what it is that he is being asked to describe with particularity. Until and unless he is able to review that which is being referred to specifically by the Defendants as "Audio Exhibit 3," he is unable to answer this interrogatory. Without reviewing the specific sound recording that was attached to the Declaration of Mark Rubel as Audio Exhibit 3 to which Dave Guetta is referring in Interrogatory No. 1, Plaintiff cannot accurately provide any further information as he has not compared that which was attached to the declaration of Mark Rubel as Audio Exhibit 3

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

to the data and image files which have been maintained by Dave Gallant. Plaintiff did not prepare any Mark Rubel Exhibits.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: State whether the NRG disc YOU relied upon in connection with YOUR motion for a temporary restraining order contains (i) "Take a Dive," (ii) "Take a Dive" (Dance Version) or (iii) the guitar twang sequence referenced in YOUR First Amended Complaint. If you answered in the affirmative to any portion of the preceding sentence, describe with specificity why YOU stated in connection with YOUR motion for a preliminary injunction that said NRG disc was not the correct disc and contained the "wrong file."

RESPONSE: Objection. See Answer to Interrogatory No. 1. further answer to Interrogatory No. 2, Plaintiff states that he has not compared the disc referenced by his attorneys in the Motion for Temporary Restraining Order with the image files maintained by Dave Gallant and therefore is unable to answer the question presented accurately. At the time the Preliminary Injunction Motion was filed, Plaintiff relied upon counsel to use the image file maintained by Dave Gallant. Until and unless he has an opportunity to compare that to which Dave Guetta has referenced with that which has been maintained by Dave Gallant, Plaintiff is unable to provide a specific detailed response to the question. Plaintiff is in the process of securing a copy of what was filed with the Court and referenced in this interrogatory in order to perform the comparison. Defendant Guetta did not attach to this Interrogatory the specific sound recording to which he refers and as a consequence, Plaintiff is unable to state with particularity anything factual regarding the sound recording referred to in these two Interrogatories.

		D . 1	NI1. 14 0011	December 11 (1) Post William
HAMPTON HOLLEY LLP 2101 East Coast Highway, Suite 260 Corona dei Mar, California 92625	1 2	Dated:	November 14, 2011	Dean A. Dickie (appearing Pro Hac Vice) Kathleen E. Koppenhoefer (appearing Pro Hac Vice) Katharine N. Dunn (appearing Pro Hac Vice) MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND STONE,
	3			MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND STONE, P.L.C.
	4			
	5			Ira Gould (appearing Pro Hac Vice) Ryan L. Greely (appearing Pro Hac Vice) GOULD LAW GROUP
	6			
	7			George L. Hampton IV (State Bar No. 144433) Colin C. Holley (State Bar No. 191999) HAMPTONHOLLEY LLP
	8			Man & the ki-
	9			By: Attorneys for Plaintiff Bryan Pringle
	10			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	11			
	12			
	13			
	14			
	15			
	16			
210	17			
	18			
	19 20			
	20			
	22			
	23			
	24			
	25			
	26			
	27			
	28			
		Ī		

28

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 I am employed in the County of Cook, State of Illinois. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 225 West Washington Street, Suite 2600, Chicago, Illinois 60606. 4 On this date, I served **PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT** DAVID GUETTA'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES on all interested parties in this action listed on the attached Service List as follows: 6 (BY MAIL) - I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Chicago, Illinois in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing on affidavit. (BY FACSIMILE) - By transmitting a true copy thereof by facsimile from facsimile number 312.460-4201 to the facsimile number(s) shown on the attached Service List, for which electronic confirmation was received from the 11 facsimile machine that said document was successfully transmitted without error. 12 (BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) - By depositing the above document(s) in a box or other facility regularly maintained by FedEx in an envelope 13 or package designated by FedEx with delivery fees paid. 14 (BY EMAIL) - By causing a true copy of the document(s) to be served by electronic mail transmission at the time shown on each transmission, to each 15 interested party at the email address shown on the attached Service List. Each transmission was reported as complete and without error. 16 (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of 17 California that the foregoing is true and correct. 18 (Federal) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. 19 Executed on November 14, 2011, at Chicago, Illinois. 20 21 Jeoney Buth State 22 Merry Beth Seaton 23 24 25 26

1801 Century Park East, 24th Floor

Email: trane@mcphersonrane.com

Email: emcpherson@mcphersonrane.com

Los Angeles, CA 90067

310-553-8833 Fax: 310-553-9233 **Service List**

Bryan Pringle v. William Adams, Jr. et al. Case Number: 8:10-cv-01656-JST –RZ

Counsel for Defendants: William Adams, Jr., Allan Pineda, Jaime Gomez,

1

2

VERIFICATION

I, Bryan Pringle, state that I have knowledge of the foregoing events, and that the answers made to **Defendant David Guetta'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 14, 2011