

# Exhibit 3

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

NOT FOR CITATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

Perfect 10, Inc.,  
Plaintiff(s),  
v.  
Visa International Service Association, et  
al.,  
Defendant(s).

NO. C 04-00371 JW

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO DISMISS FIRST AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff Perfect 10, Inc. ("Plaintiff") brings this lawsuit against Defendants Visa International Service Association ("Visa"), First Data Corp. ("FDC"), Cardservice International, Inc., MasterCard International Incorporated ("MasterCard"), and Humboldt Bank (collectively "Defendants") claiming copyright infringement, trademark infringement, violation of right of publicity, unfair competition, and false and misleading advertising. Defendants move, pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6) (Rule 12(b)(6)), to dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (FAC). This Court conducted a hearing regarding Defendants' motion on November 15, 2004. Having considered the arguments advanced by the parties at the hearing and in their papers, this Court GRANTS Defendants' motion to dismiss with prejudice.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The general facts of this case are well-known to the parties and to this Court. See (Order

1 Granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, hereinafter August 5, 2004 Order, Docket Item No. 39, at 2-  
2 3). Generally, Plaintiff provides adult entertainment services. Plaintiff, *inter alia*, publishes  
3 PERFECT 10 Magazine and operates the website [www.perfect10.com](http://www.perfect10.com), both of which feature  
4 photographs of nude models. Plaintiff owns the copyrights to most of the images that it displays, and it  
5 attaches its registered trademark, "Perfect 10," to many of its images. Plaintiff also owns the right of  
6 publicity for many of the models that appear in its images.

7 Plaintiff alleges that a number of websites routinely and illicitly publish Plaintiff's images--and  
8 thereby infringe Plaintiff's copyrights and trademarks. Plaintiff refers to these websites as "Stolen  
9 Content Websites." *See* (FAC, Docket Item No. 40, at 2:3-6) ("Hidden in undisclosed locations  
10 around the world, thieves from every country are operating websites ('Stolen Content Websites') that  
11 routinely offer for sale to the public stolen and moving images consisting of . . . scans from Perfect 10  
12 Magazine and images from its website perfect10.com"). Plaintiff, however, is not suing the Stolen  
13 Content Websites or their operators. Instead, Plaintiff is suing Defendants, a number of financial  
14 institutions that provide financial services to the Stolen Content Websites. *See* (FAC at 1:26-2:1)  
15 ("The Defendants in this case, who are among America's most prominent financial institutions, are  
16 knowingly providing crucial transactional support services for the sale of millions of stolen photos  
17 and film clips worth billions of dollars that belong to Perfect 10 . . ."). Plaintiff's theory is that  
18 Defendants, by knowingly providing financial services to the Stolen Content Websites, materially  
19 contribute to the Stolen Content Websites' infringing activities.

### 20 III. STANDARDS

21 In ruling upon a motion to dismiss, this Court must accept all allegations of material fact as  
22 true and must construe said allegations in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Western*  
23 *Reserve Oil & Gas Co. v. New*, 765 F.2d 1428, 1430 (9th Cir. 1985). The United States Supreme  
24 Court, in *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41 (1957), set forth the strict standard for granting a Rule  
25 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. A Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss must not be granted "unless it appears  
26 beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle  
27

1 him to relief." *Id.* at 45-46. "A claim may be dismissed as a matter of law for one of two reasons: (1)  
2 lack of a cognizable legal theory or (2) insufficient facts under a cognizable legal claim." *Robertson*  
3 *v. Dean Witter Reynolds Co.*, 749 F.2d 530, 534 (9th Cir. 1984). As the Ninth Circuit has observed,  
4 "The [Rule 12(b)(6)] motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim is viewed with disfavor and is  
5 rarely granted." *Gilligan v. Jamco Develop. Corp.*, 108 F.3d 246, 249 (9th Cir. 1997).

#### 6 IV. DISCUSSION

##### 7 A. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint Does Not Materially Differ from Its Original Complaint

8 This is Plaintiff's second attempt at pleading its case. This Court dismissed Plaintiff's original  
9 complaint in its August 5, 2004 Order, but granted it leave to amend its claims for copyright  
10 infringement, trademark infringement, violation of right of publicity, unfair competition, and false and  
11 misleading advertising. In dismissing Plaintiff's original complaint, this Court noted that the nexus  
12 between Defendants' provision of financial services to the Stolen Content Websites and the Stolen  
13 Content Websites' infringing activities, as pled by Plaintiff, was too attenuated. (August 5, 2004  
14 Order at 5:24-25) ("Defendants are concerned solely with financial aspects of the [Stolen Content]  
15 [W]bsites, not their content"); (August 5, 2004 Order at 6:15-17) ("[T]here is no factual basis for the  
16 allegation that [Defendants] materially contribute to the alleged *infringing activities* of the websites");  
17 (August 5, 2004 Order at 7:25-8:2) ("Nor do Defendants have the authority to shut down the websites'  
18 servers, delete any infringing material they find, or prevent the transmission of such material");  
19 (August 5, 2004 Order at 9:8-9) ("Plaintiff has pled no facts indicating that Defendants induced the  
20 allegedly infringing websites to use Plaintiff's marks"); (August 5, 2004 Order at 9:17-19) ("The only  
21 service Defendants supply is the ability to accept certain credit cards as payment, and this service has  
22 no apparent direct link to the alleged infringing activities"); (August 5, 2004 Order at 10:1-2)  
23 ("Plaintiff has pled no facts that indicate . . . an intimate relationship between Defendants and the  
24 [Stolen Content] [W]bsites"); (August 5, 2004 Order at 10:22-23) ("Defendants did not participate in  
25 the alleged illegal activities, they merely provided financial services to merchants"). Accordingly,  
26 this Court exhorted Plaintiff that it "must establish a relationship between the financial services  
27  
28

1 provided by Defendants and the alleged infringing activity as opposed to the mere operation of the  
2 website businesses." (August 5, 2004 Order at 7:2-3.)

3 Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint is not drastically different from its original complaint. Its  
4 most noteworthy addition appears in the section titled "Defendants' Right and Ability to Control the  
5 Stolen Content Websites." See (FAC at 5:15-8:13.) There, Plaintiff fleshes out a number of  
6 Defendants' "rules and regulations," which allegedly govern the contractual relationship between  
7 Defendants and the Stolen Content Websites. Plaintiff contends that these "rules and regulations" give  
8 Defendants "the right and ability to supervise the [Stolen Content] Websites." (Plaintiff's Combined  
9 Opposition to Motions to Dismiss, hereinafter Plaintiff's Opposition, Docket Item No. 48, at 12:3-4.)  
10 But this averment does not materially differ from Plaintiff's averments in its original complaint:

11 The Stolen Content Websites[,] which receive critical support from FDC and other[s] . . . , and  
12 which display images that violate Perfect 10's copyrights, trademarks, and assigned rights of  
13 publicity, are in turn regulated by MasterCard and Visa, as more fully set forth above. ¶  
14 Plaintiff is informed and believes that MasterCard and Visa regulations require the  
15 associations to review the content of websites that accept MasterCard and Visa credit cards as  
16 a form of payment.

17 (Plaintiff's Complaint, hereinafter Complaint, Docket Item No. 1, at ¶¶ 70-71.) Thus, Plaintiff's First  
18 Amended Complaint suffers from the same infirmities as its original Complaint.

## 19 **B. Copyright Infringement**

### 20 **1. Contributory Copyright Infringement**

21 It its August 5, 2004 Order, this Court noted that, "To have engaged in contributory copyright  
22 infringement, it is not sufficient for the Defendants to merely have contributed to the general business  
23 of the infringer. To have materially contributed to copyright infringement, 'the . . . assistance must  
24 bear *some direct relationship to the infringing acts.*'" (August 5, 2004 Order at 4:17-20) (quoting 3-  
25 12 NIMMER ON COPYRIGHT § 12.04[A][2][a]). Plaintiffs have again failed to establish a direct  
26 relationship between Defendants' activities and the Stolen Content Websites' infringing acts.

27 In Fonovisa, Inc. v. Cherry Auction, Inc., 76 F.3d 259, 264 (9th Cir. 1996), the Ninth Circuit  
28 held that "providing the site and facilities for known infringing activity is sufficient to establish  
contributory liability." The Ninth Circuit also noted, parenthetically, that "Merely providing the

1 means for infringement may be sufficient' to incur contributory liability." *Id.* (quoting 2 WILLIAM F.  
2 PATRY, COPYRIGHT LAW & PRACTICE 1147). Here, Defendants provide neither the site, nor the  
3 facilities, nor the means for infringement to the Stolen Content Websites. Defendants simply operate  
4 payment systems.

5 Plaintiff argues that a series of contracts, rules, and regulations between Defendants and the  
6 Stolen Content Websites permit Defendants to "control" the content of the Stolen Content Websites.  
7 (Plaintiff's Opposition at 11:18; FAC at 5:15-8:13.) Plaintiff, however, premises his argument upon  
8 Defendants' *economic* influence over the Stolen Content Websites. The following excerpts from  
9 Plaintiff's Opposition are revealing: "Defendants' *financial* support effectively eliminates the need for  
10 any physical 'site and facilities'" (Plaintiff's Opposition at 16:28-17:1) (emphasis added); "[T]he  
11 [Stolen Content Websites] could not survive *without the ability to accept credit cards* in payment of  
12 their illegal transactions" (Plaintiff's Opposition at 17:10-12) (emphasis added); and "[W]ithout  
13 defendants' *provision of a merchant account and ability to process MasterCard and Visa charges*,  
14 the vast preponderance of infringers would lose their *ability to sell* to most consumers worldwide"  
15 (Plaintiff's Opposition at 18:5-7) (emphasis added).

16 Plaintiff's would have this Court hold that mere economic influence over a copyright infringer  
17 constitutes contributory copyright infringement. To so hold would set a dangerous precedent. Under  
18 Plaintiff's logic, private, individual web surfers who patronize the Stolen Content Websites, while  
19 knowing that they infringe others' copyrights, commit contributory copyright infringement--simply by  
20 creating demand, the preeminent economic influence, for the Stolen Content Websites' goods and  
21 services. After all, the Stolen Content Websites "could not survive without" economic demand.  
22 (Plaintiff's Opposition at 17:10-11.) Nay, without economic demand "the vast preponderance of  
23 [Stolen Content Websites] would lose their ability to sell to most consumers worldwide." (Plaintiff's  
24 Opposition at 18:6-7.)

25 In any event, the caselaw in this area holds that liability for contributory copyright infringement  
26 scarcely attaches beyond the actual provision of physical sites and physical facilities for infringing  
27

1 activities. In Fonovisa, the Ninth Circuit held that, in the physical world, the provision of space,  
2 utilities, parking, advertising, plumbing, and customers is sufficient to constitute a material  
3 contribution to the infringing activity. Cases arising out of the cyber-world are not that different. They  
4 generally hold that a contributory copyright infringer must provide the actual vehicle of infringement.  
5 See A&M Records v. Napster, 239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2001) (finding that the provision of software,  
6 servers, and server-side software to copyright infringers constituted a "material contribution" to  
7 copyright infringement); Sega Enters. v. MAPHIA, 948 F. Supp. 923 (N.D. Cal. 1996) (finding that the  
8 operation of an electronic bulletin board system which distributed unauthorized copies of video game  
9 software constituted a "material contribution" to copyright infringement); and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer  
10 Studios v. Grokster, Inc., 380 F.3d 1154 (9th Cir. 2004) (finding that software distributors of peer-to-  
11 peer network software, which peers used to illicitly share copyrighted material, did not "materially  
12 contribute" to copyright infringement because they did not actually store the copyrighted material).  
13 Here, Defendants simply operated payment systems. They did not store or index copyrighted images,  
14 and they did not operate the Stolen Content Websites. As such, they cannot be said to have "materially  
15 contributed" to copyright infringement.

## 16 2. Vicarious Copyright Infringement

17 Plaintiff's vicarious copyright infringement claim fails for similar reasons. In order to  
18 establish a claim for vicarious copyright infringement, Plaintiff must allege that Defendants have (1)  
19 the right and ability to control the infringing activity, and (2) a direct financial benefit from the  
20 infringing activity. Ellison v. Robertson, 337 F.3d 1072, 1078 (9th Cir. 2004). Plaintiff has not  
21 satisfied the first of these two elements.

22 All that Plaintiff has alleged is that Defendants could terminate their business relationships  
23 with the Stolen Content Websites. Again, Plaintiff premises its argument upon Defendants' *economic*  
24 influence over the Stolen Content Websites. "By eliminating a Stolen Content Website's ability to *sell*  
25 stolen materials *via MasterCard or Visa cards*, defendants can stop *sales* to the vast majority of the  
26 world's *consumers*." (Plaintiff's Opposition at 13:26-14:1.) Economic influence is not the type of  
27  
28

1 "control" over infringing activity which vicarious copyright infringement addresses.  
 2 "Control" means direct control over the infringing activity. In Grokster, the Ninth Circuit held  
 3 that the defendants did not vicariously infringe because they did not have the ability to block access to  
 4 copyrighted materials. Grokster, 380 F.3d at 1165; see also Napster, 239 F.3d at 1023 ("The ability  
 5 to block infringers' access to a particular environment for any reason whatsoever is evidence of the  
 6 right and ability to supervise"). As this Court noted in its August 5, 2004 Order, "Defendants [do not]  
 7 have the authority to shut down the [Stolen Content Websites'] servers, delete any infringing material  
 8 they find, or prevent the transmission of such material." (August 5, 2004 Order at 7:25-8:2.) This  
 9 Court also noted (in the context of contributory infringement) that

10 The only service Defendants provide to the [Stolen Content Websites] is the ability to process  
 11 credit cards. The ability to process credit cards does not directly assist the allegedly  
 12 infringing websites in copying Plaintiff's works. . . . Here, the [Stolen Content Websites]  
 would be every bit as capable of copying and distributing Plaintiff's copyrighted works  
 regardless of whether they employed Defendants' services.

13 (August 5, 2004 Order at 6:17-25.) This observation is relevant in that it illuminates Defendants'  
 14 inability to directly control the infringing activity. Under the facts alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended  
 15 Complaint, Defendants simply do not "control" the infringing activity at issue.

16 **C. Trademark Infringement**

17 Like its copyright infringement claims, Plaintiff's trademark infringement claims fail to allege  
 18 facts that Defendants directly infringed Plaintiff's trademark. Instead, Plaintiff's trademark  
 19 infringement claims rest upon theories of secondary liability. However, Plaintiff's trademark  
 20 infringement claims fail for reasons similar to those stated above. This is partially because Plaintiff's  
 21 arguments for trademark infringement parallel those for copyright infringement. See, e.g., (Plaintiff's  
 22 Opposition at 18:19-20) ("Defendants are liable [for contributory trademark infringement] for the  
 23 same reasons that they are secondarily liable for copyright infringement").

24 **1. Contributory Trademark Infringement**

25 In order to be liable for contributory trademark infringement, Defendants must have either  
 26 "induce[d] a third party to infringe the plaintiff's mark or supplie[d] a product to a third party with  
 27  
 28



1 actual or constructive knowledge that the product is being used to infringe the [mark]." Lockheed  
2 Martin Corp. v. Network Solutions, Inc., 194 F.3d 980, 983 (9th Cir. 1999).

3 Again, Plaintiff rests upon the theory that economic influence over an infringer constitutes  
4 contributory infringement. "Indeed, defendants provide the ultimate inducement: payment for products  
5 and services." (Plaintiff's Opposition at 22-23.) Again, this Court notes that, under Plaintiff's logic,  
6 individual webservers who patronize the Stolen Content Websites, while knowing that they are  
7 infringing others' marks, commit contributory trademark infringement because they, too, provide the  
8 Stolen Content Websites with "the ultimate inducement: payment for products and services." Such  
9 individuals, however, can hardly be deemed contributory trademark infringers. Liability for  
10 secondary trademark infringement is narrower than that under copyright law. Sony Corp. of America  
11 v. Universal City Studios, Inc., 464 U.S. 417, 439 n.19 (1984); Hard Rock Cafe Licensing Corp. v.  
12 Concession Servs., Inc., 955 F.2d 1143, 1150 (7th Cir. 1992).

13 Likewise, Plaintiff has not satisfied this Court that Defendants have "supplied a product" to the  
14 Stolen Content Websites with knowledge that the product is being used to infringe Plaintiff's mark. To  
15 determine whether a defendant "supplies a product," this Court must "consider the extent of control  
16 exercised by the defendant over the third party's *means* of infringement." Lockheed, 194 F.3d at 984  
17 (emphasis added) (citing Hard Rock Cafe, 955 F.2d at 1148-49 (7th Cir. 1992)). As the court in  
18 Lockheed noted, "supplying a product" entails "[d]irect control and monitoring of the *instrumentality*  
19 used by a third party to infringe the plaintiff's mark[.]" Id. (emphasis added). Defendants merely  
20 operate payment systems for the Stolen Content Websites. In particular, Defendants process credit  
21 card transactions for the Stolen Content Websites. However, Defendants do not *directly control* the  
22 *instrumentalities used to infringe* Plaintiff's mark. Plaintiff avers that a series of contracts, rules, and  
23 regulations between Defendants and the Stolen Content Websites permit Defendants to control and  
24 monitor the instrumentalities used to infringe Plaintiff's mark.

25 Defendants assert the right, which the frequently exercise, to suspend merchants from the Visa  
26 and MasterCard systems, or to exclude them altogether. For example, pursuant to [a  
27 contractual provision between Defendants and the Stolen Content Websites], Defendants have  
the right to terminate Stolen Content Websites 'immediately' if [they] 'violate any term,

1 condition, covenant or warranty of this Agreement.'

2 (FAC at 6:25-7:1.) At most, Plaintiff has pled that Defendants "monitor" the instrumentalities used to  
3 infringe Plaintiff's mark. Plaintiff has not pled that Defendants "directly control" the instrumentalities  
4 used to infringe Plaintiff's mark. For example, Plaintiff does not aver that Defendants actually control  
5 the hardware and/or software that the Stolen Content Websites use to infringe Plaintiff's mark.

## 6 2. Vicarious Trademark Infringement

7 In order to be liable for vicarious trademark infringement, Defendants and the Stolen Content  
8 Websites must "have an *apparent or actual* partnership, have authority to bind one another in  
9 transactions with third parties or exercise joint ownership or control over the infringing product."  
10 Hard Rock Cafe, 955 F.2d at 1150 (9th Cir. 1992) (emphasis added). In arguing that the Defendants  
11 and the Stolen Content Websites have an apparent or actual partnership, which provides them with  
12 authority to bind each other, Plaintiff advances an anfractuous argument.

13 Defendants and the [Stolen Content] [W]ebsites have authority to bind each other in  
14 transactions with third parties. When defendants accept a charge, their agreement with the  
15 [Stolen Content] [W]ebsites binds them to process the charge and to cause the consumer's  
16 account to be debited. Defendants' acceptance of a charge binds merchants to provide  
17 promised products to third parties. It also requires merchants to adhere to the charge back  
18 system, pursuant to which merchants must refund fraudulent or otherwise improper charges.  
19 Accordingly, plaintiff has stated claims for contributory and vicarious trademark infringement.

20 (Plaintiff's Opposition at 19:17-24.)

21 Defendants' mere processing of credit card transactions does not bind the Stolen Content  
22 Websites to "provide promised products" to their patrons. It is the Stolen Content Websites  
23 themselves, who, by accepting patrons' funds, bind themselves to "provide promised products" to their  
24 patrons. Defendants merely provide financial services that assist in the exchange of consideration  
25 between the Stolen Content Websites and their patrons. Notably, the Stolen Content Websites would  
26 be equally bound to "provide promised products" to their patrons if Defendants never entered a  
27 transaction. That is, if, instead of accepting credit cards, the Stolen Content Websites only accepted  
28 cash via mail, the Stolen Content Websites would *still* be bound to "provide promised products" to its  
patrons. Plaintiff conflates the "ability" to bind with the "authority" to bind. The law requires the

1 latter. Defendants, who process credit card transactions, do not bind the Stolen Content Websites to  
2 their patrons any more than the United States Government, who prints legal tender, binds parties to a  
3 cash transaction. Thus, it cannot be said, based upon Plaintiff's attenuated argument, that Defendants  
4 and the Stolen Content Websites "have an *apparent or actual* partnership" wherein each has the  
5 "*authority* to bind one another in transactions with third parties[.]"

6 **C. Plaintiff's State Trademark Claims**

7 Plaintiff's Fourth Claim for Relief is brought under CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 14335. Section  
8 14335 applies to "[a]ny person who uses or unlawfully infringes upon a mark registered under this  
9 chapter or under Title 15 of the United States Code." CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 14335(a). Plaintiff  
10 fails to allege that Defendants have ever used Plaintiff's marks. Moreover, since this Court has  
11 already found Plaintiff's trademark infringement claims are insufficient, § 14335 is simply  
12 inapplicable here.

13 **D. Plaintiff's Remaining Claims: Violation of Right of Publicity, Unfair Competition, and False  
and Misleading Advertising**

14 Plaintiff supports its remaining claims by reiterating its theme: Defendants' contracts with the  
15 Stolen Content Websites, Defendants' internal rules and regulations, and Defendants' economic  
16 influence over the Stolen Content Websites render Defendants complicit in the Stolen Content  
17 Websites' illicit activities. (Plaintiff's Opposition at 19:28-20:2) ("Defendants aid and abet Stolen  
18 Content Websites' theft of plaintiff's rights of publicity for the same reasons that they are liable for  
19 vicarious and contributory copyright infringement"); (Plaintiff's Opposition at 20:14-16) ("Defendants  
20 are liable for unfair competition under California Business and Professions Code section 17200, et  
21 seq. because they participate directly in the Stolen Content Websites' illegal activity and aid and abet  
22 that activity"); (Plaintiff's Opposition at 20:19-21) ("Defendants aid and abet the [Stolen Content  
23 Websites' illicit] activity by providing the financial services, and imposing the myriad of attendant  
24 rules and regulations, that allow the [Stolen Content] [W]ebsites to survive"). For the reasons stated  
25 above, and for the reasons set forth in its August 5, 2004 Order, this Court concludes that Plaintiff, at  
26 most, has pled that Defendants provided arms-length financial services to the Stolen Content Websites.  
27

1 However, Plaintiff has failed to plead that Defendants actually aided and abetted the Stolen Content  
2 Websites in their illicit activities in any way.

3 **V. CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, this Court GRANTS Defendants' Motion to Dismiss First Amended  
5 Complaint. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint is dismissed in its entirety, with prejudice.

6 Dated: December 3, 2004

/s/James Ware  
JAMES WARE  
United States District Judge

7 04cv371mtd-fac

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

2 Andrew P. Bridges [abridges@winston.com](mailto:abridges@winston.com)  
3 Jeffrey Neil Mausner [jeffmausner@bmrllaw.com](mailto:jeffmausner@bmrllaw.com)  
4 Mark T. Jansen [mtj@townsend.com](mailto:mtj@townsend.com)  
5 Michael H. Page [mhp@kvn.com](mailto:mhp@kvn.com)  
6 Robert James Slaughter [rjs@kvn.com](mailto:rjs@kvn.com)  
7 Stephen Davids Rothschild [Rothschild@khpblaw.com](mailto:Rothschild@khpblaw.com)

8 **Dated: December 3, 2004**

**Richard W. Wieking, Clerk**

9 **By: /s/JWchambers**

**Ronald L. Davis**  
**Courtroom Deputy**

**Tan, Linda M.**

---

**From:** ECF-CAND@cand.uscourts.gov  
**Sent:** Friday, December 03, 2004 10:25 AM  
**To:** efiling@cand.uscourts.gov  
**Subject:** Activity in Case 5:04-cv-00371-JW Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa International Service Association et al "Order on Motion to Dismiss"

\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\* You may view the filed documents once without charge. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

U.S. District Court  
Northern District of California

Notice of Electronic Filing or Other Case Activity

---

NOTE: Please read this entire notice before calling the Help Desk. If you have questions, please email the Help Desk by replying to this email; include your question or comment along with the original text.

Please note that these Notices are sent for all cases in the system when any case activity occurs, regardless of whether the case is designated for e-filing or not, or whether the activity is the filing of an electronic document or not.

---

The following transaction was received from jwlc2, COURT STAFF on 12/3/2004 at 10:24 AM PST

Case Name: Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa International Service Association et al  
Case Number: 5:04-cv-371 <https://ecf.cand.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?17337>

Document Number: 51

Copy the URL address from the line below into the location bar of your Web browser to view the document: [https://ecf.cand.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show\\_case\\_doc?51,17337,,1867574,](https://ecf.cand.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show_case_doc?51,17337,,1867574)

---

NOTE: In both e-filing and non-e-filing cases, e-mail notices are sent whenever docket activity occurs in a case. If there are TWO URL (web) addresses above, the first will lead to the docket for the case and the second will lead to an e-filed document.

If there is NO second URL (web) address for the document, either the filing was done on paper (and should have been served on paper as well), or the entry was made by a court clerk and no document was involved. If there is no second URL (web) address, there is NO electronic document available.

See the FAQ posting 'I have a Notice of Electronic Filing that was e-mailed to me but there's no hyperlink...' on the ECF home page at <https://ecf.cand.uscourts.gov>

---

Docket Text:

ORDER by Judge James Ware granting [41], [44], [45] Defendants' Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint. (jwlc2, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 12/3/2004)

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description: Main Document

Original filename: G:\JWALL\ARCHIVEDORDERS\orders2004\04cv371mtd-fac.pdf

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP CANDStamp\_ID=977336130 [Date=12/3/2004] [FileNumber=1577319-0]  
[3f4d5700fa1b2282b935ca6100884cdd420a016804151ab0907e43519293e9ba4c48dae178320c540864ddf67  
7a7f32c37f9d66e4b79cb15c6dbff8f20228ede]]

Notice will be electronically mailed to:  
Andrew P. Bridges  
jbrittis@winston.com;efranko@winston.com

abridges@winston.com,

Mark T. Jansen  
ltan@townsend.com;nghafari@townsend.com

mtj@townsend.com,

Jeffrey Neil Mausner

jeffmausner@bmlaw.com,

Michael H. Page

mhp@kvn.com, sjr@kvn.com

Stephen Davids Rothschild

Rothschild@khpblaw.com,

Robert James Slaughter

rjs@kvn.com, mls@kvn.com

5:04-cv-371 Notice will NOT be electronically mailed to:

Howard E. King  
King, Holmes, Paterno & Berliner, LLP  
1900 Avenue of the Stars  
25th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90067

John R. Yates  
Berman, Mausner & Resser  
11601 Wilshire Boulevard  
Suite 600  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1742