

# **EXHIBIT 15**

**Case No. C 07 0943 WHA**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP

BERNARD PAUL PARRISH, HERBERT, )  
ANTHONY ADDERLEY, WALTER ROBERTS, )  
III, )

PLAINTIFFS )

VS. )

NO. C 07-00943 WHA )

NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS )  
ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL FOOTBALL )  
LEAGUE PLAYERS INCORPORATED DBA )  
PLAYERS INC., )

DEFENDANTS )

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA )  
WEDNESDAY )  
JUNE 11, 2008 )

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

**FOR PLAINTIFFS**

MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP  
1001 PAGE MILL ROAD, BUILDING TWO  
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94304

**BY: RYAN HILBERT, ESQUIRE**

MCKOOL SMITH  
300 CRESCENT COURT, SUITE 1500  
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201

**BY: LEWIS T. LECLAIR, ESQUIRE**

**FOR DEFENDANTS**

DEWEY & LEBOEUF, LLP  
1301 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019

**BY: DAVID G. FEHER, ESQUIRE**

**REPORTED BY:**

JOAN MARIE COLUMBINI, CSR 5435, RPR  
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

1 THE REASON IT'S DENIED IS THAT THE SALARY PAID TO  
2 UPSHAW IS SO FAR REMOVED FROM THE ISSUES IN THIS CASE, THAT I  
3 DON'T SEE ANY REASON TO INVADE HIS PRIVACY AND TRY MAKE HIM THE  
4 ISSUE IN THIS CASE.

5 I CANNOT IMAGINE A SCENARIO WHERE WE SAY TO THE  
6 JURY, YOU GO AND DECIDE WHETHER UPSHAW EARNS HIS MONEY OR NOT.  
7 EITHER THE CONTRACT THAT YOU SHOWED ME THE OTHER DAY GIVES THE  
8 PLAYERS SOME RIGHTS OR IT DOESN'T. WE CERTIFIED A CLASS IN  
9 ORDER TO FIND OUT IF THE PLAYERS HAVE SOME RIGHTS UNDER THAT  
10 AGREEMENT AND THAT THEY'RE JUST BEING TOTALLY SCREWED BY THE  
11 PLAYERS ASSOCIATION. I CAN'T IMAGINE ANY SCENARIOS WHERE  
12 UPSHAW'S SALARY TIES INTO THAT SOMEHOW, EVEN LESS SO WHETHER HE  
13 EARNS IT OR NOT.

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

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

25 OKAY. THANK YOU, COUNSEL.