The Court, having considered Defendants' Motions in Limine Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and Plaintiffs' Motions in Limine Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, in addition to other matters raised by the parties at the Pretrial Conference held on October 15, 2008, hereby orders as follows:

MOTIONS IN LIMINE

The parties preserve their rights to approach the Court outside the presence of the jury or to submit further briefing to the Court to obtain permission to admit evidence that was excluded, as a preliminary matter, by the rulings made by the Court at the pretrial conference. In particular, in the event one party opens the door to evidence preliminarily excluded at the pretrial conference, the other party may approach the Court outside the presence of the jury to obtain permission to admit such evidence. In addition, the parties preserve their rights to object to the admissibility of any evidence, document or testimony for reasons not before the Court at the pretrial conference.

DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS IN LIMINE

Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 1. Granted in part and denied in part. Evidence relating to the compensation of Gene Upshaw shall be excluded. Evidence relating to Defendants' economic wealth shall be excluded unless and until any supplemental jury proceeding on punitive damages. Evidence relating to the specific salaries or economic wealth of individual employees of the Defendants or of active NFL players shall also be excluded, subject to the terms and preservation of rights in the parties' Stipulation Regarding Motions in Limine (Paragraph 3). Plaintiffs may submit evidence regarding any flow of funds from licensees through Defendants to active players, retired players, and anyone else, subject to Rule 403.

Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 2. Denied.. Gene Upshaw's statements in the July 28, 2006 Charlotte Observer article shall not be excluded.

Defendants have submitted additional briefing on the issue of whether Mr. Upshaw's statements in that newspaper article related solely to the representation of retired players in collective bargaining and should, on that basis, be excluded. The Court has not ruled on this supplemental submission.

Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 3. Granted. Plaintiffs may not introduce evidence relating to Plaintiffs' complaints about ad hoc license agreements, including but not limited to such evidence relating to the license agreement between Electronic Arts, Inc. ("EA"), the Pro Football Hall of Fame, and Players Inc.

1	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 4. Granted in part and denied in part. Plaintiffs' expert economist, Dr. Daniel A. Rascher, will be permitted to offer his opinion
2 expressly disclosed on pag	expressly disclosed on pages 4 and 5 of his expert report. Dr. Rascher's opinion that the share of
3	the gross licensing revenue ("GLR") pool retained by Defendants exceeds a "customary" amount shall be permitted. Dr. Rascher's opinion that the "custom" is for group licensing revenues to be
shared equally by organizations other than the NFL	shared equally by organizations other than the NFLPA shall be excluded. Dr. Rascher's opinion that Defendants have leverage akin to market power shall be permitted.
5	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 5. Denied Plaintiffs' expert, Mr. Phillip Y.
	Rowley, shall be permitted to testify as to his arithmetic calculation of different damages
	amounts based upon various assumptions provided to him as to liability.
8	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 6. The Court reserves ruling and will hold an evidentiary hearing at a date to be determined to decide whether Mr. Rhee may testify. The
	Court will separately determine whether Mr. Rhee's Trial Exhibit 1240 ("Samples of 'Scrambled'
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 7. Denied. Plaintiffs will be permitted to
12	introduce evidence with respect to the alleged "scrambling" of GLA Class members in EA's Madden NFL video games.
Defendants plan to submit a proposed curative instruction directing the such alleged "scrambling" of GLA Class members did not violate any retired player property rights.	Defendants plan to submit a proposed curative instruction directing the jury that such alleged "scrambling" of GLA Class members did not violate any retired player's intellectual
	1
15	PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS IN LIMINE
16	Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 1. Granted. Evidence and testimony regarding
17 Bernard Parrish, including deposition testimony, documents authored by Mr	Bernard Parrish, including deposition testimony, documents authored by Mr. Parrish, and communications authored or received by Mr. Parrish, shall be excluded
18	Communication of 1999/1997 of Marie 1997/1997
19	Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 2. Denied. Evidence regarding the possibility or propriety of Plaintiffs suing additional parties for relief shall not be excluded.
20	20
21	Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 3. Granted in part and denied in part. Defendants shall not refer to payments to RPFPJ allegedly withheld by Mr. Parrish. In all other
22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
22 23	Defendants shall not refer to payments to RPFPJ allegedly withheld by Mr. Parrish. In all other respects, the motion is denied and evidence relating to Herbert Adderley's relationship with RPFPJ shall not be excluded. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 4. The Court reserves ruling and the parties
22	Defendants shall not refer to payments to RPFPJ allegedly withheld by Mr. Parrish. In all other respects, the motion is denied and evidence relating to Herbert Adderley's relationship with RPFPJ shall not be excluded.
22 23 24 25	Defendants shall not refer to payments to RPFPJ allegedly withheld by Mr. Parrish. In all other respects, the motion is denied and evidence relating to Herbert Adderley's relationship with RPFPJ shall not be excluded. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 4. The Court reserves ruling and the parties submitted further briefing on October 17, 2008. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 5. Granted. References to the putative class
22 23 24 25 26	Defendants shall not refer to payments to RPFPJ allegedly withheld by Mr. Parrish. In all other respects, the motion is denied and evidence relating to Herbert Adderley's relationship with RPFPJ shall not be excluded. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 4. The Court reserves ruling and the parties submitted further briefing on October 17, 2008.
22 23 24 25	Defendants shall not refer to payments to RPFPJ allegedly withheld by Mr. Parrish. In all other respects, the motion is denied and evidence relating to Herbert Adderley's relationship with RPFPJ shall not be excluded. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 4. The Court reserves ruling and the parties submitted further briefing on October 17, 2008. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 5. Granted. References to the putative class
22 23 24 25 26	Defendants shall not refer to payments to RPFPJ allegedly withheld by Mr. Parrish. In all other respects, the motion is denied and evidence relating to Herbert Adderley's relationship with RPFPJ shall not be excluded. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 4. The Court reserves ruling and the parties submitted further briefing on October 17, 2008. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 5. Granted. References to the putative class

Dallas 267412v1

1	Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 6. Denied. Testimony by Mr. Adderley regarding how he signed his GLA and the circumstances, as well as his expectations as to t
2 GLA, shall not be excluded.	
3	
4	Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 7. Granted in part and denied in part Defendants may not introduce into evidence any document responsive to Document Request No.
5	31 to Players Inc and/or Document Request No. 33 to the NFLPA, other than the document responsive thereto that Defendants produced (i.e., the NFL Sponsorship and Interne
6	Agreements). Exclusion of any testimony is denied.
7 8	Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 8. Pursuant to the attached stipulation evidence and argument about Plaintiffs' counsel's contingent interest shall not be admissible Exhibits 160, 307, and 321 shall be redacted to remove references to counsel and their law firms.
9	Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 9. Pursuant to the attached stipulation
10	evidence or testimony by any party relating to the Justin v. Players Inc lawsuit shall be excluded.
11	
12	Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 10. Granted. Evidence of homages to General Plants and Market Motion and Market No. 10. In the No. 10. In th
13	Upshaw, including the "GU 63" patches, shall be excluded.
14	OTHER RULINGS
15 16	Joint binder of exhibits. The parties shall provide a joint binder to the Court with the exhibits they believe would be most helpful to the Court, including samples of the most significant contracts. Plaintiffs shall highlight portions of the documents in pink, defendants in
17	yellow.
18	Trial brief on parol evidence. Each side provided further briefing on Motion in Limine No. 4 by Friday, October 17, at noon.
19	Doug Allen. Mr. Allen shall appear on Wednesday, October 22, at 7:30 am. Mr.
20	Allen's testimony shall start early enough that day so that it concludes on October 22 with both sides having a full and fair opportunity to examine Mr. Allen. Either party may seek to interrupt the pending witness's examination if that party believes that putting Mr. Allen on at the
21 22	beginning of the day is necessary in order to assure that Mr. Allen's testimony will be completed on that day.
	Number of Jurors. The Court will seat ten jurors.
23	Time for evidence. The Court will allow eighteen hours of evidence per side
24	(which excludes the time for openings and closings, and any sidebars not in the presence of the jury).
25	Time for opening statement. The Court will allow forty-five minutes per side.
26	Original Exhibits. The parties must use the original trial exhibits filed with the
27	Court for examination of each witness.
28	-3-
	Summary of Rulings Made at the Pretrial Conference Held on October 15, 2008 Civ. Action No. C07 0943 WHA

Dallas 267412v1

. 1	Statement of the Case. The parties shall provide a joint, one-page Statement of the Case to the Court on the first day of trial.
2	Trial Exhibit 1184. Plaintiffs shall not be permitted to introduce or refer to unreducted Trial Exhibit 1184 unless and until the Court rules otherwise.
3	Plaintiffs will submit a brief to the Court as to the admissibility an unredacted
4	Trial Exhibit 1184.
5	Trial Exhibit 1320. The Court stated that Trial Exhibit 1320 constitutes an admission of a party-opponent, and that there is a foundation for it.
6	Defendants plan to make further submissions to the Court regarding the
7	admissibility of Trial Exhibit 1320.
. 8	Respectfully Submitted,
9	Date: Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP
10	By:/s/
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	IT IS SO ORDERED.
18	TI IS SO ORDERED.
19	Dated:
20	HON. WILLIAM H. ALSUP
21	United States District Court
22	Judge
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	-4-
20	Summary of Rulings Made at the Pretrial Conference Held on October 15, 2008 Civ. Action No. C07 0943 WHA
]	Dallas 267412v1