Exhibit K

McKool Smith

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION • ATTORNEYS

Lew LeClair
Direct Dial: (214) 978-4984
lleclair@mckoolsmith.com

300 Crescent Court
Suite 1500
Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 978-4000
Telecopier: (214) 978-4044

May 22, 2008

VIA E-MAIL

David Greenspan, Esq.
Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP
1301 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019-6092

Re: Bernard Paul Parrish, et al. v. National Football League Players Association and Players Inc, Case No. C07-0943 WHA

Dear David;

I am writing in response to your letter to Ron Katz of May 14, 2008 responding to Mr. Katz's email of May 13, 2008, responding to your letter of May 9, 2008, responding to Laura Franco's letter of May 7, 2008. Our extensive exchange has illuminated our disagreement, but does not appear to have moved the parties to an amicable resolution.

As a threshold matter, we note that it was defendants who opposed Plaintiffs efforts to set the deposition limit at 20 depositions and insisted that the number of depositions be limited to no more than ten because the case was not "complex." Having convinced the Court to limit the number of depositions, defendants proceeded to list a vast number of witnesses with little or no helpful information about their specific knowledge and failed to comply with Judge Alsup's standing order with respect to such disclosures. Amazingly, defendants now complain that Plaintiffs have failed to pursue discovery with diligence even though defendants have fully used all of the available deposition slots available under the Court's existing order and have served extensive written discovery.

The reality is that the problem in this case is entirely of the defendants' making. Had defendants properly disclosed the information required, or had the defendants agreed to a reasonable number of depositions based on the number of persons with knowledge that they intended to disclose, none of this would be an issue. Even with the disclosure of a horde of witnesses with questionable relevance, defendants have seen fit to disclose two additional witnesses who were not previously deposed at the very end of discovery (Berthelsen and Saxon).

Given the exigencies of the current situation, Plaintiffs have made two entirely reasonable proposals to solve the problem. We initially suggested that defendants pare down their list of persons with knowledge based on the denial of certification of the Parrish class and based on your current knowledge of the case that is certified, and then allow Plaintiffs to depose the limited number of remaining witnesses who Plaintiffs had not yet deposed. Defendants refused to do that and insist on maintaining the complete list of persons with knowledge. After

that proposal was rejected, Plaintiffs proposed that we agree not to pursue additional depositions at this time, but agree that if an undeposed witness were going to be called at trial by a party, then the other party would be entitled to a half day deposition before such testimony. It is unlikely that that proposal would lead to more than one or two depositions and would be both efficient and cost-effective. Nonetheless, Defendants rejected it.

Under the circumstances, Plaintiffs have no choice but to object to the defendants attempt to call any witness at trial for whom proper disclosure was not timely made in accordance with Judge Alsup's order. For that reason, further depositions will not be necessary. In addition to objecting to all other witnesses for whom the disclosure was either not timely or not adequate under the rules, we will specifically object to testimony from Steve Saxon, whom you have obviously known about since the start of the case, but who was disclosed at the very end of discovery with no explanation or reason for the failure to disclose him at an earlier time.

Sincerely,



Lewis T. LeClair

LTL:GR