1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Anthony T. Falzone (SBN 190845) Julie A. Ahrens (SBN 230170) Christopher K. Ridder (SBN 218691) STANFORD LAW SCHOOL CENTER FOR INTERNET AND SOCIETY 559 Nathan Abbott Way Stanford, California 94305-8610 Telephone: (650) 736-9050 Facsimile: (650) 723-4426 E-mail: falzone@stanford.edu William F. Abrams (SBN 88805) Sheila M. Pierce (SBN 232610) BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP 1900 University Avenue East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2223 Telephone: 650.849.4400 Facsimile: 650.849.4800 E-mail: william.abrams@bingham.com Attorneys for Plaintiff BRAVE NEW FILMS 501(c)(4) UNITED STATES DIS NORTHERN DISTRICT SAN FRANCISCO	OF CALIFORNIA
16		
17	BRAVE NEW FILMS 501(C)(4),	No. CV 08-04703 SI
18	Plaintiff, v.	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT MICHAEL WEINER
19	MICHAEL WEINER aka MICHAEL SAVAGE,	AKA MICHAEL SAVAGE'S MOTION TO DISMISS
20	and ORIGINAL TALK RADIO NETWORK, INC.,	Date: April 3, 2009
21 22	Defendants.	Time: 9:00 a.m. Place: Courtroom 10 Judge: Honorable Susan Illston
23	Defendant Michael Weiner aka Michael Sav	vage's Motion To Dismiss came on regularly
24	for hearing on April 3, 2009 before the Honorable Susan Illston. All parties received notice and	
25	were represented by counsel. The Court, having considered all papers filed in connection with	
26	this Motion To Dismiss, and the arguments of counsel, and FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN,	
27	hereby DENIES Defendant Michael Weiner aka Michael Savage's motion.	
28		
		CV 08-04703 SI

1	Defendant's Motion To Dismiss should be denied for the following reasons:		
2	1. The Court hereby takes judicial notice of the items requested by Plaintiff		
3	Brave New Films. See Reyn's Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc., 442 F.3d 741, 746 n.6 (9th		
4	Cir. 2006).		
5	2. California law is controlling over the issues regarding agency. <i>See</i>		
6	C.A.R. Transp. Brokerage Co. v. Darden Rests., Inc., 213 F.3d 474, 479 (9th Cir. 2000) (citing		
7	Mallott & Peterson v. Director, Office of Workers' Comp. Programs, 98 F.3d 1170, 1173 n.2.		
8	(9th Cir. 1996) for the proposition that generally, an agent's authority derives from state law,		
9	even where the substantive dispute concerns federal law).		
10	3. Dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is		
11	appropriate only where the complaint lacks a cognizable legal theory or sufficient facts to		
12	support a cognizable legal theory. Mendiondo v. Centinela Hosp. Med. Ctr., 521 F.3d 1097,		
13	1104 (9th Cir. 2008). Brave New Films has properly pleaded (1) a claim for knowing		
14	misrepresentation under 17 U.S.C. § 512(f); and (2) factual allegations sufficient to reasonably		
15	infer an agency relationship between defendants Savage and OTRN. See Cal. Civ. Code §		
16	2317. Moreover, the issue of agency is a question of fact. See C.A.R., 213 F.3d at 480		
17	("existence of an agency and the extent of an agent's authority is a question of fact").		
18	Questions of fact are not suited for determination on a motion to dismiss. See Rennie &		
19	Laughlin, Inc. v. Chrysler Corp., 242 F.2d 208, 212 (9th Cir. 1957).		
20	Accordingly, Defendant's motion should be DENIED.		
21			
22	IT IS SO ORDERED		
23	DATED:		
24			
25	Honorable Susan Illston		
26	United States District Court Judge		
27			
28	2 CV 08-04703 SI		
	2 CV 08-04703 SI		