

Motion for Summary Judgment (dkt. 290). At the conclusion of that hearing, the Court took Defendant's Motion under submission. The Court is mindful that the parties would like to know the Court's rulings as soon as possible in order to prepare for trial, which is set to begin in less than a month. Accordingly, the Court makes the following rulings, and will provide a detailed explanation for such rulings in a separate and subsequent order.

First, the Court finds that Antonick's contract claim for unpaid royalties is limited to
derivative works within the meaning of United States copyright law.

Second, the Court finds that, of the similarities identified by Plaintiff's expert, only
two – "field width" and "plays and formations" – are potentially protectable under copyright
law, and that a jury should determine the issue of substantial similarity. Accordingly, the
Court GRANTS the Motion as to all of the similarities other than those two.

Third, the Court DENIES the Motion as to the other contract claims.

Fourth, the Court DENIES the Motion as to the fraud claim. The Court has serious concerns about the fraud claim, but finds that it will be in a better position to rule on that claim once the evidence has been presented at trial.

Fifth, as the Court does not rely on Garry Kitchen's report in resolving the Motion for Summary Judgment, EA's Motion to Strike that report (dkt. 300) is DENIED AS MOOT; EA may re-notice the Motion to Strike in connection with trial.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: April 25, 2013

CHARLES R. BREYER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE