

Jeffrey M. Vucinich (SBN 67906)

jvucinich@clappmoroney.com

Clapp, Moroney, Bellagamba
& Vucinich

1111 Bayhill Drive, Suite 300

San Bruno, CA 94066

Telephone: 650.989.5400

Facsimile: 650.989.5499

Richard Winelander (*pro hac vice*)

rw@rightverdict.com

1005 North Calvert Street

Baltimore Maryland 21202

Telephone: 410.576.7980

Facsimile: 443.378.7503

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JOHN DOE A/K/A BRIAN SAPIENT,

Plaintiff,

v.

URI GELLER

and

EXPLOROLOGIST LTD.,

Defendants

) Case No.: **3:07-cv-02478 VRW**

)
)
)
) **REPLY TO THE PLAINTIFF'S
OPPOSITION TO THE DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO DISMISS**

) Judge: The Hon. Vaughn R. Walker

) Date: December 6, 2007

) Time: 2:30 p.m.

) Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor

INTRODUCTION

After reviewing the Plaintiff's opposition to the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss it becomes painfully clear that the Plaintiff and his lawyers will stop at nothing to keep this frivolous lawsuit alive. As the Court will see they twist the law, the facts and the rules of procedure to the breaking point. If they can't respond to an argument they ignore it. When faced with the actual (and truthful) language of the March 23, 2007 e-mail (which they continue to hide from the Court) they turn a blind eye to it and claim instead (both here and for their multiple press releases) that it is somehow an "illegal" misrepresentation. Plaintiff also uses the Defendants interchangeably in a clumsy attempt to establish personal jurisdiction that simply does not exist. Similarly they seek to pierce a corporate veil and hold Uri Geller libel for something he knew nothing about. Plaintiff's suggestion that California is the most convenient forum, because they found one witness here, is simply implausible. So too is his suggestion that the issues in the Philadelphia suit are somehow different.

I THIS COURT LACKS PERSONAL JURISDICTION

It is clear that this Court lacks personal jurisdiction over Explorologist, a foreign corporation and Uri Geller, an English resident who who did not even *know* about, let alone authorize, any act alleged to have occurred in California. In spite of the fact that a plaintiff cannot "simply rest on the bare allegations of its complaint," *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 800 (9th Cir.2004). Plaintiff chose not to contest or contravene the facts¹ supplied in support of the Defendants motion the instead Plaintiff raises several red hearings, which the Defendants will address in turn.

A Under a Due Process Analysis Uri Geller Could Not Reasonably Have Anticipated Being Haled into Court in California

¹ The Plaintiff has attached two declarations to his opposition. The Defendants hereby object to and move to strike them as they are not based on personal knowledge and are riddled with hearsay.

1 Under the undisputed jurisdictional facts Uri Geller could not reasonably have
2 anticipated being haled into court in California. It is fundamental that due process requires that a
3 defendant have “certain minimum contacts with (the forum state) such that the maintenance of
4 the suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.” *International*
5 *Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 US 310, 316 (1945). Crucial to the minimum contacts analysis is a
6 showing that the defendant “should reasonably anticipate being haled into court” *Burger King v.*
7 *Rudzewicz*, 471 U.S. 462, 476-77 (1985). Notwithstanding the Plaintiff’s practice of
8 interchanging the Defendants at will; each defendant’s contacts with the forum State must be
9 assessed individually. In other words “the requirements of *International Shoe* ... must be met as
10 to each defendant over whom a state court exercises jurisdiction.” *Rush v. Savchuk*, 444 U.S.
11 320, 332 (1980)

12
13
14 The undisputed Jurisdictional facts are that Geller is a resident of England. See Exhibit
15 3, Declaration of Uri Geller in Support of the Motion (“GELLER Dec”), ¶ 2. His home is
16 located in Sonning-on-Thames, England and he has never been a resident of the State of
17 California. *Id.* ¶ 3. Additionally, Geller has never owned a bank account, personal or real
18 property in California. *Id.*, ¶ 4&5. He does not now, nor has he ever maintained an office, *Id.*, ¶
19 6, telephone listings, or a mailing address in California. *Id.*, ¶ 7; and Exhibit 1 attached hereto, ¶
20 3, the Second Declaration of Shimshon Shtrang in Support of Motion to Dismiss (“SHTRANG
21 Dec 2”). Geller has never placed any advertising specifically directed toward California
22 residents, nor has he advertised in any publications directed primarily toward California
23 residents. *Id.* ¶ 8. Significantly, when Shipi communicated with YouTube on behalf of
24 Explorologist, he did so without Geller’s knowledge, request, or authorization. *Id.* ¶ 9,
25 SHTRANG Dec at ¶ 17. Therefore this Court also lacks personal jurisdiction over Geller, an
26 English resident is not employed in the State of California, who owns no property in California

1 and who did not even *know* about, let alone authorize, any act alleged to have occurred in
2 California.

3 **B There is No General Jurisdiction Over the Defendant's.**

4
5 The Plaintiff's claim that there that the Court has general jurisdiction over the
6 defendants is unfounded. General personal jurisdiction (which is based on evidence of
7 continuous and systemic contacts between the defendant and the forum state) simply does not
8 exist. A nonresident defendant is subject to general jurisdiction in the forum state only if his
9 activities in that state are "substantial, continuous and systematic." *Perkins v. Benguet Mining*,
10 342 US 437, (1952). Here the Plaintiff has responded by pointing out 5 or 6 sporadic and
11 unpredictably intermittent visits to California over the past 35 years. SHTRANG Dec 2 at ¶ 7,
12 8, 9 & 10, and an unforeseen fortuitous personal appearance obligation that occurred *after*² the
13 alleged cause of action arose and the Defendants waived service of process. None of Plaintiff's
14 guesses, individually or collectively are substantial, continuous and systematic enough to
15 establishes minimum contacts with California.
16
17

18 **C Since Explorologist's Internet Activities are Targeted at a Worldwide**
19 **Audience They Cannot Serve as the Basis of Personal Jurisdiction in**
20 **California**

21 Plaintiff suggests that because Explorologist's internet activities can be accessed in
22 California it (and presumably Uri Geller) is subject to the Courts jurisdiction there. In support of
23 this proposition the Plaintiff relies heavily on *ALS Scan, Inc. v. Digital Serv. Consultants, Inc.*,
24 293 F.3d 707, 711 (4th Cir.2002). Contrary to the Plaintiff's protestations, the targeting of the
25 worldwide web does not establish personal jurisdiction on a potential defendant in every
26 conceivable country, state or municipality that receives or can access it. Rather an out-of-state
27 defendant's Internet activity must be *expressly targeted at or directed to forum state* to establish
28

² See argument *infra*, jurisdiction attaches (or does not attach) as of the time that an action is filed. *Cf. Metropolitan Life Ins. v. Robertson-Ceco Corp.*, 84 F.3d 560, 569-70 (2d Cir.1996).

1 minimum contacts necessary to support exercise of personal jurisdiction over defendant in the
2 forum state. *Young v. New Haven Advocate*, 315 F.3d 256 (4th Cir., 2002). In *Young* the Fourth
3 Circuit reviewed both this proposition and its decision in *ALS Scan*. the Court specifically
4 pointed out that *ALS Scan*:

6 held that “specific jurisdiction in the Internet context may be based only on an out-
7 of-state person's Internet activity directed at [the forum state] and causing injury
8 that gives rise to a potential claim cognizable in [that state].” *Id.* at 714. We noted
9 that this standard for determining specific jurisdiction based on Internet contacts is
10 consistent with the one used by the Supreme Court in *Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S.
11 783, 104 S.Ct. 1482, 79 L.Ed.2d 804 (1984). *ALS Scan*, 293 F.3d at 714. *Calder*,
12 though not an Internet case, has particular relevance here because it deals with
13 personal jurisdiction in the context of a libel suit. ... The Supreme Court held that
14 California had jurisdiction over the Florida residents because “California [was] the
15 focal point both of the story and of the harm suffered.” *Calder*, 465 U.S. at 789,
16 104 S.Ct. 1482. The writers' “actions were expressly aimed at California,” the
17 Court said, “[a]nd they knew that the brunt of [the potentially devastating] injury
18 would be felt by [the actress] in the State in which she lives and works and in
19 which the National Enquirer has its largest circulation,” 600,000 copies. *Calder*,
20 465 U.S. at 789-90, 104 S.Ct. 1482.

21 *Young*, 315 F.3d at 262. The *Calder* effects test requires foreseeable harm to the Plaintiff in the
22 state that he or she lives. *Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S. 783 (1984). Although a plaintiff need not be
23 a resident of the forum state, for jurisdiction to attach, the defendant must, absent that, have
24 minimum contacts there. *Keeton v. Hustler Magazine, Inc.*, 465 U.S. 770 (1984). Here the
25 Defendants do not have such contacts and California was not targeted. Therefore *Keeton* is not
26 controlling. Rather Explorologist aimed a single e-mail at the World Wide Web to lodge a
27 specific and truthful complaint. This e-mail was sent to the internet in general any effect it had
28 was on the Plaintiff was in Philadelphia. The fact that California is one of the multitude of
jurisdictions that YouTube does business in and maintains servers does not alter this fact. The
simple fact of the matter is that YouTube is not a party to this lawsuit and the Plaintiff lives, and
if he was damaged at all, in Pennsylvania.

1 **D The Court Cannot Consider Contacts by the Defendants Which Occurred**
2 **After the Complaint was Filed**

3 Plaintiff improperly seeks to use events, that occurred months after the suit was filed and
4 served, to establish jurisdiction. The central inquiries with respect to specific jurisdiction are
5 whether the Defendant's purposefully established minimum contacts with the forum state and
6 whether those contacts would make personal jurisdiction reasonable and fair under the
7 circumstances. *Burger King, supra*. "Crucial to the minimum contacts analysis is a showing that
8 the defendant 'should reasonably anticipate being haled into court' [in the forum state] because
9 the defendant has 'purposefully avail[ed] itself of the privilege of conducting activities there.' "
10 *Id.* (citations omitted).

11 The focus on whether a defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privilege of
12 conducting activities in the forum state necessarily implies that only conduct prior to the accrual
13 of the cause of action or, at the very latest, the filing of the lawsuit is relevant. In other words,
14 "purposeful availment" implies that the defendant, as shown by its activities, intended to be
15 amenable to suit in the forum state. Conduct post-dating the filing of a complaint by definition
16 cannot show that, when the defendant engaged in the post-complaint acts purportedly supporting
17 jurisdiction, it intentionally exposed itself to the possibility of an event which had already
18 occurred (the filing of a complaint in the forum state).

19 This conclusion is supported by *Sportmart, Inc. v. Frisch*, 537 F.Supp. 1254
20 (N.D.Ill.1982). In that case, Sportmart filed suit against ski and ski boot manufacturers and
21 distributors alleging a conspiracy. One of the defendants (Nordica US) did not commence
22 operations until five months after the alleged conspiracy began. Sportmart sued Nordica US
23 anyway, alleging that, after the complaint was filed, it refused to accept Sportmart's orders for
24 boots. The court found that "the relevant time period for jurisdiction and venue purposes is the
25
26
27
28

1 time that the cause of action accrued.” 537 F.Supp. at 1259. The court concluded that the post-
2 complaint allegations were “jurisdictionally irrelevant” because they went beyond the conspiracy
3 alleged in the complaint. *Id.* In other words, jurisdiction attaches (or does not attach) as of the
4 time that the law suit is filed. A court “should examine a defendant's contacts with the forum
5 state over a period that is reasonable under the circumstances-up to and including the date the
6 suit was filed-to assess whether they satisfy the ‘continuous and systematic’ standard”.
7 *Metropolitan Life Ins. v. Robertson-Ceco Corp.*, 84 F.3d 560, 569-70 (2d Cir.1996)
8

9
10 Finally it must be remembered that the rules regarding personal jurisdiction are founded
11 on the Due Process Clause, which requires that an individual have “fair warning” that a
12 particular activity may subject it to the jurisdiction of the forum state. *See, e.g., Burger King*
13 *Corp.*, 471 U.S. at 472. While pre-suit activities may rise to the level of a “fair warning” that a
14 defendant may be haled into a court in the forum state, post-suit activities cannot serve to warn
15 the defendant of an event that has already occurred.
16

17 These conclusions are consistent with the decisions of other courts which have
18 specifically addressed whether the jurisdictional clock stops at the time the complaint is filed,
19 *Steel v. United States*, 813 F.2d 1545, 1549 (9th Cir.1987) (to determine whether specific
20 jurisdiction is proper, the court must examine the defendant's contacts with the forum at the time
21 of the events underlying the dispute); *Andros Compania Maritima S.A. v. Intertanker Ltd.*, 714
22 F.Supp. 669 (S.D.N.Y.1989).
23

24 **E The Defendants Have Not and Could Not Have Been Served in California**

25 The Defendants have not and could not have been served in California for four reasons.
26 First they waived service of process. Second, the attempted service occurred too late. Third the
27 NBC studio is not their usual place of business and fourth they were not served.
28

1 Because both Defendants waived service of process, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)
2 service was complete, any subsequent attempts were at best ineffective and at worse an abuse of
3 process. Next it is quite clear that Plaintiff's attempts at "re-service" (if such a thing exists) came
4 too late. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) places a time limit on service of 120 days after the filing of the
5 complaint. Here that date expired on September 5, 2007. Moreover the California Rules of
6 procedure only allow service by alternative means when "a copy of the summons and complaint
7 cannot with reasonable diligence be personally delivered to the person to be served" California
8 Code of Civil Procedure § 415.20(b). In the case *sub judice* since both Defendants waived
9 service of process several months earlier the need for alternative service was eliminated.

10
11
12 The Plaintiff was not only guessing wrongly but grasping for straws when his lawyers
13 declared the Uri Geller was staying at the Four Season Beverly Hill and the NBC studios were
14 his usual place of business. The only facts based on personal knowledge are that Uri Geller lives
15 and works in England, has no office in the NBC studio and was only at the NBC studio on 8
16 occasions during his brief contractual stay in California. *See* SHTRANG Dec 2 at ¶ 3, 4 & 7.
17 Unfortunately the Plaintiff's lawyer was also wrong when he claimed the Phenomena was
18 renewed for a second season. *Id.* at ¶ 6. As the Court can see Uri Geller was in constant motion
19 during the course of this year. He has made appearances in a minimum of ten Countries.
20 SHTRANG Dec 2 at ¶ 14. He has no usual place of business. Finally it is obvious the neither of
21 the Defendants were seen in person let alone properly served in California.

22 **II VENUE IN THIS COURT IS IMPROPER**

23
24
25 Sapien's choice of venue in this court is improper because, even if this Court had
26 jurisdiction over Defendants (which it does not), Sapien's vexatious choice of forum is solely
27 motivated by a desire to disadvantage and harass Defendants. California is about as
28 inconvenient a forum as could exist for all parties and witnesses. In fact a trial here would

1 require all of the parties to travel either across the country or the globe. Next year variations of
2 Phenomena³ will be shot in Germany, Hungary and Russia and travel and producing witnesses
3 will be made even more difficult. Plaintiff points to only one potential witness from California.
4 On the other hand the Plaintiff and Defense counsel must come from the east-coast while the
5 Uri Geller, Mr. Shtrang, at least one barrister and several corporate employees and witnesses
6 must travel from Europe. The cost of this will be staggering.
7

8 Defendants, also maintain that the case should be transferred and consolidated with the
9 suit Explorologist filed in Philadelphia under the “first to file” rule. *Alltrade, Inc. v. Uniweld*
10 *Products, Inc.*, 946 F.2d 622, 625 (9th Cir.1991). The primary purpose of the “first to file” rule
11 “is to avoid duplicative litigation, and to promote judicial efficiency” *Guthy-Renker Fitness,*
12 *L.L.C. v. Icon Health & Fitness, Inc.*, 179 F.R.D. 264, 269 (C.D.Cal.1998) and “should not be
13 disregarded lightly.” *Church of Scientology v. United States Dep't of the Army*, 611 F.2d 738,
14 750 (9th Cir.1979). The goal is the avoidance of both an unnecessary burden on the federal
15 judiciary and of conflicting judgments. *Id.* at 750. Motions and hundreds of pages of legal
16 memoranda are flying both here and in Philadelphia. Judge Polack has already spent
17 considerable judicial time and resources analyzing, applying and requesting additional British
18 law with respect to the portion of the clip Sapient uploaded to YouTube that Explorologist
19 claims a copyright in. It is that clip that lays at the center of both law suits. It is the Philadelphia
20 lawsuit, which YouTube⁴ invited Explorologist to file, that Plaintiff seeks to enjoin in Count
21 Two of the complaint in this Court. Because his Motion to dismiss the Philadelphia suit was
22 denied the Plaintiff must file his answer and any Rule13(a) counterclaim at that time. Plaintiff's
23
24
25
26
27

28 ³ The when the format was developed in Israel it was titled “The Successor” in the future it will be called “The Next Uri Geller.” It is also interesting to note that the first episode of Phenomena featured the Jonny Carson clip Sapient and his lawyers say the Defendants are trying to suppress.

⁴ After receipt of Sapient's counter notification.

1 contention that Explorologist suit in Plaintiff was forum shopping is mystifying, since no one
2 would have for seen that Plaintiff would have filed suit on the other side of the country.

3 **III ABSENT FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS OF FRAUD THE COMPLAINT**
4 **FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM UPON WHICH RELIEF CAN BE BASED.**

5
6 This case should be dismissed for failure to comply with, Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b) for two
7 reasons: first, the allegations in the Complaint are based only on “information and belief” and
8 second, the Complaint fails to aver the circumstances that constitute fraud as required by this
9 rule. Plaintiff after ignoring the first argument claims that it is not required to allege the text of
10 what it claims was a fraudulent misrepresentation because the issue has not previously been
11 addressed and because it would be burdensome on the Plaintiff.

12 There is no doubt that a violation of 17 U.S.C. § 512(f), like any other misrepresentation,
13 constitutes fraud. What is in doubt is how Plaintiff and his lawyers can deny it in good faith. This
14 is especially troubling in light of the Plaintiff’s constant reliance on the case of *Online Policy*
15 *Group v Diebold, Inc.*, 337 F.Supp.2d 1195 (N.D. Cal. 2004) a case that clearly states the
16 opposite. It is such a fundamental truth that the West Key Number Digest repeatedly points out
17 the obvious and classifies 17 U.S.C. § 512(f) as fraud⁵. As such the Plaintiff was obliged to
18 provide the statement it claims was a misrepresentation as required by Rule 9(b).

19 Plaintiff’s claim that would be burdensome to comply with Rule 9(b) because “Plaintiff
20 they do not always have the “luxury of having a copy of the take down notice,” flies in the face
21 of the facts of this case and Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. First on May 4, 2007 counsel for the Defendants

22 ⁵ [13] KeyCite Notes

23 ☞ 184 Fraud

☞ 184I Deception Constituting Fraud, and Liability Therefor

☞ 184k18 k. Materiality of Matter Represented or Concealed. Most Cited Cases

24 Party “materially” misrepresents that copyright infringement has occurred, within meaning of Digital Millennium
25 Copyright Act’s (DMCA’s) liability provision, if misrepresentation affected Internet service provider’s (ISP’s)
response to party’s DMCA letter. 17 U.S.C.A. § 512(f).

26 [14] KeyCite Notes

☞ 184 Fraud

☞ 184I Deception Constituting Fraud, and Liability Therefor

☞ 184k8 Fraudulent Representations

☞ 184k13 Falsity and Knowledge Thereof

☞ 184k13(2) k. Knowledge of Defendant. Most Cited Cases

Diebold, Inc., 337 F.Supp.2d at 1196.

1 sent a letter which contained the exact language of Mr. Shtrang's March 23, 2007 e-mail to
2 YouTube to Plaintiffs lawyers. (See Exhibit 2). Second, and more importantly, Plaintiff was
3 under a duty pursuant to Rule 11 to:

4 certify that they have conducted a reasonable inquiry and have determined that any
5 paper filed with the Court are well-grounded in fact, legally tenable and not
6 interposed for any improper purpose. The attorney who signs the paper without
7 such a substantial belief shall 'be penalized' by an appropriate sanction.

8 *Cooter & Gell v. the Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 387 (1990). Instead Plaintiff and his lawyers
9 filed an ungrounded suit, without investing or worse hide the text of the Mr. Shtrang's e-mail, so
10 the attack against the Defendants could be prolonged. Either way Plaintiff is not relieved of his
11 obligations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b).

12 **IV There can be no liability for a DMCA takedown without a knowing misrepresentation**

13 Plaintiff continues to ignore the standard announced, by the Supreme Court, that a
14 district court should not accept as true legal conclusions or unwarranted factual inferences. *Bell*
15 *Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, -- U.S. --, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (2007). He urges this Court to ignore the fact
16 that there is no allegation in the Complaint that Uri Geller personally made knew about or
17 directed that a complaint be made to YouTube, let alone a knowing misrepresentation. The
18 only allegation in the Complaint is that “[o]n information and belief, on March 23, 2007, an
19 agent of Explorologist Ltd. and Geller demanded that YouTube takedown the NOVA Video
20 pursuant to the DMCA, 17 U.S.C. § 512...” (Complaint ¶ 15). There is no allegation, nor could
21 there be, that Uri Geller personally communicated or knew about Explorologist's e-mail. In fact,
22 when Shipi communicated with YouTube, he did so without Geller's knowledge, request or
23 authorization. SHTRANG Dec at *Id.* ¶ 9 and ¶ 17. Without actual knowledge of a
24 misrepresentation there can be no liability under 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

25 Of course the facts contained in the declaration of Shipi Shtrang (to the extent they
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 a motion for summary judgment. *Id.* The Plaintiff may have contested these facts but did not
2 (and could not) because they are true. The net effect is that there is no liability on the part of Uri
3 Geller because he made no representation to YouTube. *Rossi v Motion Picture Ass'n of America*
4 *Inc.*, 391 F.3d 1000 (9th Cir. 2004), *Cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 1018 (2005) this is true even under
5 the relaxed (and overruled) standard contained in *Diebold, supra*.
6

7 Dated: November 26, 2007

8
9 _____
/s/

10 Richard Winelander, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)
rw@rightverdict.com
11 1005 North Calvert Street
Baltimore Maryland 21202
12 Telephone: 410.576.7980
Facsimile: 443.378.7503

13
14 _____
/s/

15 Jeffrey M. Vucinich, Esq. (SBN 67906)
jvucinich@clappmoroney.com
16 Clapp, Moroney, Bellagamba
& Vucinich
17 1111 Bayhill Drive, Suite 300
San Bruno, CA 94066
18 Telephone: 650.989.5400
Facsimile: 650.989.5499

19
20 Attorneys for Defendants,
Uri Geller and Explorologist, Ltd.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28