1	GLENN D. POMERANTZ (SBN 112503)	ROBERT H. ROTSTEIN (SBN 72452)
2	Glenn.Pomerantz@mto.com BART H. WILLIAMS (SBN 134009)	rxr@msk.com ERIC J. GERMAN (SBN 224557)
3	Bart.Williams@mto.com KELLY M. KLAUS (SBN 161091)	ejg@msk.com MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP
4	Kelly.Klaus@mto.com MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP	11377 West Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90064-1683
5	355 South Grand Avenue Thirty-Fifth Floor	Tel: (310) 312-2000; Fax: (310) 312-3100
6	Los Ángeles, CA 90071-1560 Tel: (213) 683-9100; Fax: (213) 687-3702	
7		
8	GREGORY P. GOECKNER (SBN 103693) gregory_goeckner@mpaa.org	
9	DANIEL E. ROBBINS (SBN 156934) dan_robbins@mpaa.org	
10	15301 Ventura Boulevard, Building E Sherman Oaks, California 91403-3102	
11	Tel: (818) 995-6600; Fax: (818) 285-4403	
12	Attorneys for Motion Picture Studio Plaintiffs Declaratory Relief Claim Defendants	s/
13		
14	I DUTED OT AT	EG DICTRICT COLIDT
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	NORTHERN DIS	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17	REALNETWORKS, INC., et al.,	CASE NO. C 08-4548-MHP
18	Plaintiffs,	REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION PICTURE STUDIOS' MOTION IN LIMINE
19	VS.	TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY
20	DVD COPY CONTROL ASSOCIATION, INC., et al.,	
21	Defendants.	Date: April 24, 2009 Time: 9:00 a.m.
22		Ctrm: 15 (Hon. Marilyn Hall Patel)
23	UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS PRODUCTIONS LLLP, et al.,	CASE NO. C 08-4719-MHP
2425	Plaintiffs,	PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION
	VS.	
2627	REALNETWORKS, INC., et al.,	
28	Defendants.	
40		REPLY ISO STUDIOS' MOTION IN LIMINE RE
		CASE NOS. C08-4548-MHP/C08-4719-MHP

1	Real's arguments for excluding what plainly were
2	are meritless:
3	First, Real paints a misleading picture that it had "more than a half dozen business
4	conversations with the Studios regarding RealDVD between mid-August [2008] and
5	. Opp. at 2:24-25 (emphasis added). In fact, Real had a discussion in
6	. Real then approached
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	What Real is saying is that, because it contacted before
12	launching RealDVD – and before doing so – Real thereby
13	demonstrated its "good faith" "intent" "to explore mutual business opportunities, and address the
14	Studios' concerns." Opp. at 6:26-28. That is self-evidently wrong. If Real had been genuinely
15	seeking cooperation Real
16	would have instituted these discussions earlier than the eve of unveiling RealDVD. Real had
17	numerous discussions with multiple third parties going back more than
18	product launch. See, e.g., Reply Declaration of Kelly M. Klaus, Ex. A
19	; <u>id.</u> , Ex. B
20	. Indeed, the very third parties that Real approached made it clear that
21	Real should have been talking with the Studios. That is completely unsurprising, given that Real
22	was planning to release a product that circumvents the Studios' access- and copy-controls and
23	copies their copyrighted content. This was, for instance, reaction when Real
24	presented it with its plans for RealDVD:
25	
26	
27	
28	<u>Id.</u> , Ex. C at 1.
- 1	1 REPLY ISO STUDIOS' MOTION <i>IN LIMINE</i> RE

1	Second, Real's claim that the Studios "repeatedly" breached and waived any rights under
2	the Tolling Agreement, is factually false and, in any event, a complete non-sequitur. Opp. at 3:6.
3	
4	1
5	Third, Real's claim that it only intends to introduce evidence of
6	to show "Real's intent, good faith, and credibility," and
7	Opp. at 6:1, 28, is wrong. The whole point of this self-serving
8	testimony is to try to rebut the Studios' showing on irreparable harm and balance of harms with
9	the pious claim that Real "really, truly" wants to deal with rent-rip-return. Such use is squarely
10	within the scope of . See Seroctin Research & Tech, Inc. v. Unigen Pharm., Inc., 541 F.
11	Supp. 2d 1238, 1239 n.1 (D. Utah 2008) (granting a motion to strike evidence
12	was offered as proof on "any fact bearing on
13	[plaintiffs'] prima facie case for a preliminary injunction, including balancing the harms").
14	Fourth, and finally, Real continues to pretend that the "only" possible harm from
15	Real's "breach/waiver" arguments are wrong. Real claims that it "never made any
16 17	contention" in the Central District that the Studios had engaged in undue delay in seeking a TRO (something the Tolling Agreement precluded either side from arguing). <u>Id.</u> at 3:17-18 (underscoring Real's). This is Real's first paragraph to the Court in the Central District in opposition to a TRO:
18	Plaintiffs filed a complaint and sought a TRO today seeking to disrupt
19	Real's in-progress launch of RealDVD this morning. Plaintiffs have known since the first week of September that Real was planning to launch the RealDVD
20	product by today, and as is evident from the volume and content of Plaintiffs' ex parte papers (comprising a 25-page brief and four inches of supporting
21	documents), they have been preparing their papers for quite some time. Yet, they chose not to share those papers with Real until approximately 10:00 am this morning, in an apparent effort to block any possibility of a response from Real.
22	Williams Decl., Ex. G at 1:5-12. This argument – the first in Real's brief in response to a TRO
23	motion – plainly is inviting the Court to find that the Studios delayed not just serving Real with papers but filing a motion for a TRO.
24	Real also claims that Studio counsel asked Elizabeth Coppinger
25	. In fact, Ms. Coppinger
26	
27	See Williams Decl., Ex. B (Dunn. Depo.) at 192:21-193:4. Of course, by stopping the questioning of Studio witnesses – but
28	sitting by while Ms. Coppinger and Mr. Wolpert offered — Real has created a one-sided and misleading record .
	- 2 - REPLY ISO STUDIOS' MOTION IN LIMINE RE

Case3:08-cv-04548-MHP Document301 Filed04/24/09 Page4 of 4

1	RealDVD is the copying of rental discs. Real apparently hopes that if it says "rent-rip-return"
2	enough times, it can ignore the numerous other harms that its product causes. RealDVD allows
3	for the unlawful copying not only of rental discs, but also of discs that are purchased or borrowed
4	from a friend, neighbor or fellow dorm resident. Real's supposed "good faith" invitation to the
5	Studios to incur significant expense to mark their rental discs would do nothing to resolve these
6	harms, or the manifold other harms RealDVD inflicts on the Studios' established and developing
7	businesses. And, of course, if Real actually believed in "good faith" that marking rental discs was
8	some sort of panacea to solve the ills of its product, Real would have raised the idea with the
9	Studios more than just three days (or even three weeks) before releasing that product to the
10	public. Real's approach to the Studios was a transparent effort to paper a false record of
11	cooperation that the Studios cannot rebut without violating or the Tolling Agreement.
12	The Studios' motion should be granted.
13	DATED: April 24, 2009 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
14	DATED: April 24, 2009 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
15	Dru /a/Valla M. Vlaus
16	By: /s/ Kelly M. Klaus KELLY M. KLAUS
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	\ddot{a}

CASE NOS. C08-4548-MHP/C08-4719-MHP