EXHIBIT 15

Case No. C 07 0943 WHA

Parrish v. National Football League Players Association, et al.

1	PAGES 1 - 12
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP
5	BERNARD PAUL PARRISH, HERBERT,)
6	ANTHONY ADDERLEY, WALTER ROBERTS,) III,)
7) PLAINTIFFS)
8	vs.) NO. C 07-00943 WHA
)
9	NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS) ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL FOOTBALL)
10	LEAGUE PLAYERS INCORPORATED DBA) PLAYERS INC.,)
11) SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA DEFENDANTS) WEDNESDAY
12) JUNE 11, 2008
13	/
14	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15	APPEARANCES:
16	FOR PLAINTIFFS MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
17	1001 PAGE MILL ROAD, BUILDING TWO PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94304
	BY: RYAN HILBERT, ESQUIRE
18	MCKOOL SMITH
19	300 CRESCENT COURT, SUITE 1500 DALLAS, TEXAS 75201
20	BY: LEWIS T. LECLAIR, ESQUIRE
21	FOR DEFENDANTS DEWEY & LEBOEUF, LLP 1301 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
22	NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019
23	BY: DAVID G. FEHER, ESQUIRE
24	REPORTED BY: JOAN MARIE COLUMBINI, CSR 5435, RPR
25	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

THE REASON IT'S DENIED IS THAT THE SALARY PAID TO

UPSHAW IS SO FAR REMOVED FROM THE ISSUES IN THIS CASE, THAT I

DON'T SEE ANY REASON TO INVADE HIS PRIVACY AND TRY MAKE HIM THE

ISSUE IN THIS CASE.

I CANNOT IMAGINE A SCENARIO WHERE WE SAY TO THE

JURY, YOU GO AND DECIDE WHETHER UPSHAW EARNS HIS MONEY OR NOT.

EITHER THE CONTRACT THAT YOU SHOWED ME THE OTHER DAY GIVES THE

PLAYERS SOME RIGHTS OR IT DOESN'T. WE CERTIFIED A CLASS IN

ORDER TO FIND OUT IF THE PLAYERS HAVE SOME RIGHTS UNDER THAT

AGREEMENT AND THAT THEY'RE JUST BEING TOTALLY SCREWED BY THE

PLAYERS ASSOCIATION. I CAN'T IMAGINE ANY SCENARIOS WHERE

UPSHAW'S SALARY TIES INTO THAT SOMEHOW, EVEN LESS SO WHETHER HE

EARNS IT OR NOT.

THE FACT IS THAT THEY NEGOTIATED A DEAL. THAT'S
WHAT THEY'RE PAYING HIM. THAT'S A CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION THAT
THEY GOT TO MEET. SO IF YOUR CASE DEPENDS UPON SHOWING THAT
UPSHAW IS GETTING OVERPAID, I THINK YOU'RE IN TROUBLE. I WOULD
ADVISE YOU TO COME UP WITH A BETTER THEORY.

SO THIS MOTION IS DENIED. I'M HANDING BACK THESE
THINGS YOU ASKED ME TO LOOK AT. I DID REVIEW THEM IN CHAMBERS,
AND THEY HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THE ROYALTIES THAT ARE AT
STAKE IN THIS CASE. IT DOES, FOR THE RECORD, LIST WHAT HIS
SALARY IS; THAT PART IS TRUE. FOR THE REASONS STATED, THAT'S
NOT RELEVANT ENOUGH TO GET INTO.

OKAY. THANK YOU, COUNSEL.