- 1:30 p.m.
- 3. The Complaint alleges that Defendants received and displayed a pay per view television event on June 12, 2010 in a Round Table Restaurant without obtaining the necessary license from Plaintiff. Based on that allegation, the Complaint includes causes of action under 47

425/07/0019.2

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

U.S.C. §§ 605 and 553, California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq., and for conversion.

- 4. Defendants' Answer denied the Complaint's essential allegations, and plead the following affirmative defenses: statute of limitations, other parties' fault, laches, failure to mitigate, and failure to give notice and opportunity to cure.
- 5. Plaintiff's motion to strike asserts that Defendants' five affirmative defenses are subject to being stricken as "immaterial" or "impertinent matter" under FRCP Rule 12(f). Specifically, Plaintiff asserts as to each affirmative defense as follows:
 - a. Statute of limitations the shortest statutory period applicable to the claims in the Complaint is one year. The Complaint was filed within one year of the broadcast of the pay per view event, thus under the set of facts alleged in the Complaint, there is no defense available based on any statute of limitations;
 - Fault of Others Plaintiff asserts that alleging the claimed damage to be the fault of others merely negates the element of causation, and thus is not an "affirmative defense."
 - c. Laches Plaintiff asserts that laches is a defense only to claims in equity (thus only potentially applicable to the California State law claim), that the statute of limitations on that claim is four years, and that there is a strong presumption that laches will not apply where a claim was brought within the analogous limitation period.
 - d. Failure to Mitigate Plaintiff asserts that failure to mitigate is inapplicable to claims brought for statutory damages.
 - e. Failure to Give Notice of Violation or Opportunity to Cure Plaintiff asserts that there is no requirement that a defendant be provided with notice before being sued under 47 USC §§ 605 or 553.

//

Case3:11-cv-02817-JSW Document18 Filed09/29/11 Page3 of 4

	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
3	11
AW OFFICE OF BRUCE NAPELL 84 Woodbine Drive, San Rafael, CA 94903 (707) 291-2245 (415) 785-2857 Fax	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
AW OFFICE OF BRUCE NAPELL 84 Woodbine Drive, San Rafael, CA 9490 (707) 291-2245 (415) 785-2857 Fax	13
UCE Rafae 785-2	14
F BR e, San (415)	15
CE O Driv 2245	16
OFFI odbine) 291-	17
AW (4 Wo)	18
L 158	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28

6.	The parties have agreed, rather than require further argument and a hearing on the
matter, that	Defendants will withdraw their affirmative defenses for the reasons set out above, and
file an Ame	nded Answer (proposed Amended Answer attached as Exhibit A).

7. The parties therefore agree, and request the Court's approval, that Defendants'
affirmative defenses are withdrawn, that Plaintiff's Motion to Strike is withdrawn, and that
Defendants' Amended Answer (in the form attached as Exhibit A to this Stipulation) will be filed
within five days of the date of the Court's Order.

STIPULATION

2

3

4

5

1

The parties, through their respective counsel, hereby stipulate that, subject to Court approval and for the reasons set out in Paragraph 5 above, Defendants' affirmative defenses are withdrawn, that Plaintiff's Motion to Strike is withdrawn, and that Defendants' Amended Answer will be filed within five days of the date of the Court's Order.

7

8

6

Dated: September 28, 2011

Dated: September 28, 2011

Law Office of Bruce Napell

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Bruce Napell 584 Woodbine Drive San Rafael, Calif. 94903 707-291-2245 Attorney for Defendants

Law Office of Thomas P. Riley, P.C.

By:_____/s/

Thomas P. Riley
First Library Square
1114 Fremont Avenue
South Pasadena, Calif. 91030
626-799-9797
Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: September <u>30</u>, 2011 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

JUDGE

United States District Court Northern District of California