1	STEWART KELLAR (SBN 267747)	
2	stewart@etrny.com E-ttorney at Law	
2	148 Townsend Street, Suite 2 San Francisco, California 94107	
3	Telephone: (415) 742-2303	
4	JACK C. PRAETZELLIS (SBN 267765)	
5	jack@mbvlaw.com MBV LAW LLP	
6	855 Front Street	
7	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 781-4400	
8	Facsimile: (415) 989-5143	
	YASHA HEIDARI (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) heidari@heidariplank.com	
9	HEIDARI POWER LAW GROUP LLC	
10	Post Office Box 79217 Atlanta, Georgia 30357	
11	Telephone: (404) 518-6668 Facsimile: (404) 601-7852	
12		
13	Attorneys for Defendant George Hotz	
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	SAN FRANC	ISCO DIVISION
17		
18	SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT	Case No. 11-cv-000167 SI
19	AMERICA LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	DEFENDANT GEORGE HOTZ'S OB-
20	Plaintiff,	JECTIONS TO DECLARATION OF RYAN BRICKER IN SUPPORT OF
	Flamum,	PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DE-
21	V.	FENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS
22	GEORGE HOTZ, et al.,	Date: April 8, 2011 Time: 9:00 a.m.
23	Defendants.	Place: Courtroom 10, 19th Floor
24		
25	Defendant George Hotz objec	ts to the following paragraphs in the Declara-
26	tion of Ryan Bricker in support of Sony Cor	mputer Entertainment America LLC's
27	("SCEA") opposition to Mr. Hotz's Motion	to Dismiss.
28		

1	Paragraphs 2-5; Exhibits A-D.	Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule ("FRE") 403. Mr. Bricker's description of SCEA's overbroad, burdensome and oppressive,
2		discovery is not relevant to California's personal jurisdiction over Mr. Hotz. Fur-
3		ther, an examination of Mr. Hotz's discovery responses shows that they were
4		straightforward and clear. SCEA cannot claim his discovery responses were insuffi-
5		cient simply because Mr. Hotz does not have responsive documents.
6		FRE 1001-1008. Best Evidence Rule. Mr.
7		Bricker's characterizations of the parties'
8		communications and Mr. Hotz's discovery responses are improper. The documents
9	Demonstrate C. Call it is E	speak for themselves. FRE 403. Mr. Law (who identified the
10	Paragraph 6; Exhibit E.	GameStop store the Playstation was allegedly purchased from) did not provide a
11		declaration under penalty of perjury. Those statements are inadmissible as evi-
12		dence. Mr. Bricker's follow-up on the inadmissible evidence is similarly tainted.
13		FRE 403. Confusion of issues, misleading,
14		and waste of time. Presenting information on where the Playstation was purchased is
15		confusing, misleading and a waste of time since it is not an issue in this case.
16		The manner in which information is presented is misleading.
17		FRE 602. No personal knowledge/ foundation. Mr. Bricker does not have person-
18		al knowledge of the Gamestop store number or its alleged sale of the Playsta-
19		tion.
20		FRE 802. Hearsay. SCEA's representations to Mr. Bricker regarding the Games-
21		top store are hearsay. They are not admissible for truth.
22	Paragraph 7; Exhibit F	FRE 403. Not relevant, misleading. Information Mr. Bricker found on the Inter-
23	0 1 //	net is not relevant to whether California has personal jurisdiction over Mr. Hotz or
24		not. Further, the forum that "blickmaniac" posted in is a separate thread from the
25		posts from the "geohot" user. The time be-
26		tween the posts was 18 months. Mr. Bricker's inclusion of both threads in the same exhibit is misleading.
27 28		FRE 803. Hearsay. The items Mr. Bricker
۷2		found on the Internet are inadmissible as

1		hearsay. Further they have not been authenticated and have no foundation.
2	Paragraph 8.	FRE 403. Not relevant. The Terms of Ser-
	Taragraph o.	vice for Google and Twitter are not relevant to jurisdiction over Mr. Hotz for the
3		present action. SCEA cannot piggyback off the terms of service published by Google
4		and Twitter. Further, SCEA has not made
5		any showing that Mr. Hotz is even subject to those particular terms of service.
6	Paragraph 9.	FRE 403. Not Relevant. SCEA does make the Playstation Computer, SCEA does not
7		make the firmware, therefore, SCEA does
		not control the security of the Playstation Computer. Thus, this comment could not
8		have been directed at SCEA. Moreover, the rule of completeness requires that the en-
9		tire statement be quoted, "If you want your
10		next console to be secure, get in touch with me. <i>any of you 3.</i> " Emphasis added.
11	Paragraph 10.	FRE 403. Needless presentation of cumu-
12	Turugruph 10.	lative evidence already presented by Andrew Pierce.
13		FRE 403. Confusion of issues, misleading, and waste of time.
14		Misleading. Code 304 does <i>not</i> indicate a successful download. Stamos Dec. ¶ 11.
15		Further, there is no foundation for the so-
16		called "geolocation" software used by eLit. Additionally, the total number of down-
		loads of the jailbreak.zip file while it was available was 323,518. This makes the
17		number of California downloads paltry in
18		comparison. Stamos Dec. ¶ 8. Information as presented is prejudicial to
19		Defendant.
20		FRE 602. The eLit declaration is inad-
21		missible for lack of foundation. (See Objections to the Declaration of Andrew
22		Pierce filed herewith). Therefore, the reci-
		tation of what eLit did is irrelevant. Further, Declarant claims he did what Andrew
23		Pierce also claimed he did. eLit's work is
24		not Declarant's personal knowledge.
25		FRE 702. Inadmissible lay opinion. The
26		summation of information regarding Unique IP Address visits to <geohot.com></geohot.com>
27		requires an expert. Mr. Bricker is not qualified as an expert.
	Danaganh 44	FRE 402. Not relevant. What SCEA's at-
28	Paragraph 11	torneys have done relating to the jailbreak

1		is irrelevant to whether California has personal jurisdiction over Mr. Hotz.
2		FRE 602. No personal knowledge/ foundation regarding law firm's actions.
3		FRE 403. Confusion of issues, misleading,
4		and waste of time. Declarant misleadingly implies that action taken by law firm was
5		result of Defendant's actions. Information as stated has a probative value
6 7		that is substantially outweighed by its prejudice to Defendant Hotz.
		FRE 803. Hearsay.
8	Paragraph 12.	FRE 402. Not relevant. What SCEA's attorneys have done relating to the jailbreak is irrelevant to whether California has per-
10		sonal jurisdiction over Mr. Hotz.
11		FRE 602. No personal knowledge/ foundation regarding law firm's actions.
12		FRE 403. Confusion of issues, misleading,
13		and waste of time. Declarant misleadingly implies that actions taken by law firm was
14		result of Defendant's actions. Information as stated has a probative value
15		that is substantially outweighed by its prejudice to Defendant Hotz.
16		FRE 803. Hearsay.
17	Paragraph 13; Exhibit I.	FRE 402. Not relevant to personal jurisdiction.
18		FRE 803. The article is hearsay and inad-
19		missible as are the alleged quotes because they are used for the "truth" of the matter asserted.
20	Paragraph 14; Exhibit J.	FRE 402. Not relevant to personal jurisdiction.
21		
22		FRE 602. No personal knowledge/ foundation regarding law firm's actions.
23		FRE 403. Confusion of issues, misleading, and waste of time. Declarant misleadingly
24		implies that action taken by law firm was result of Defendant's actions.
2526		Information as stated, is prejudicial to Defendant without any relevancy.
		FRE 803. All of the articles cited and quo-
27		tations are hearsay without an exception. They are clearly not admissible for truth.
28		

1	Paragraph 15; Exhibit K.	FRE 402. Not relevant to personal jurisdiction.
2		FRE 803. Articles are hearsay.
3	Paragraph 16; Exhibits L-N.	FRE 402. Not relevant to personal jurisdiction.
4		FRE 403. Not relevant and misleading be-
5		cause it implies that Mr. Hotz's code in and of itself allows for playing pirated games. Exhibit M claims to be a "guide" but no
6 7		such guide is present in the Exhibit. Further, Exhibit N to the Bricker declaration shows that only 2 of 6 steps involve Mr.
8		Hotz's software.
9		FRE 602. No personal knowledge/ foundation regarding information.
10		FRE 403. Confusion of issues, misleading,
11		and waste of time. Information as stated has a probative value
12		that is substantially outweighed by its prejudice to Defendant Hotz.
13		FRE 803. Hearsay.
14	Paragraph 17; Exhibit O.	FRE 803. Article is hearsay and not admissible for truth.
15	Paragraph 18; Exhibit P.	FRE 403. Not relevant. The post from us.playstation.com including the terms of
16		service states that it was posted approximately 6 days before March 18, 2011. In
17		other words, it was posted nearly two months after SCEA sued Mr. Hotz. Fur-
18		ther, the SCEA terms of service are on the 221st page of 224 pages of comments on
19		the blog. It is beyond reason to expect that Mr. Hotz looked at all of these comments,
20		and further, even if we assume that he saw a block cut/paste from SCEA that cannot
21		somehow subject him to personal jurisdiction in California.
22		FRE 602. No personal knowledge/ foun-
23		dation FRE 403. Not relevant. Mr. Hotz was
24	Paragraph 19.	forced to seek donations because SCEA sued him. The donations he received, or
25		lack thereof, cannot create a basis for California's jurisdiction over him.
26	Paragraph 20.	FRE 403. Not relevant. What the Playstation website says is irrelevant to personal
27		jurisdiction. SCEA never alleged that Mr. Hotz has been to that page on the Playsta-
28		tion website, or for that matter, any other page on the Playstation website.
		page on the riaystation website.

1	Paragraph 21.	FRE 403. Not relevant.
2	Paragraph 22; Exhibit T.	FRE 403. Not relevant.
3		FRE 803. Hearsay.
4	Paragraph 23; Exhibit U.	No foundation for author of post. FRE 403. Not relevant.
5 6	Turugruph 2 0, Zimion 01	FRE 803. The comments on Mr. Hotz's blog are clearly hearsay and not admissible for truth.
7	///	
8	///	
9	For the foregoing reasons, Plainti	ff respectfully requests the Court to sustain
10	these objections and to strike the testimo	ony referred to above.
11		
12	Dated: March 25, 2011.	
13		MBV LAW LLP
14		
15		By/s/ Stewart Kellar
16		Stewart Kellar Attorneys for Defendant George Hotz
17		
18		
19		
20		4810-8628-0969, v. 2
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		