I. 1 ENTRY OF JUDGMENT WOULD BE PREMATURE BECAUSE THE PARTIES HAVE NOT YET COMPLETELY BRIEFED THE POST-VERDICT ISSUES THAT 2 THE COURT REQUESTED 3 4 5 additional briefing. 6 7 8 9 10 Defendants preliminarily respond: 11 12 1. 13 2. 14 15 16 17 Dated: September 4, 2009 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

During Jury deliberations, the Court requested additional briefing about whether (and if so, to what extent) the United States copyright and trademark laws applied to acts of infringement that occurred outside the United States. The Court listed several discrete questions on which it desired

The Court indicated that it would issue a briefing schedule for the issues raised. But before the Court provided one, on September 3, 2009 Plaintiff suddenly filed a "Supplemental Brief Re Applicability of U.S. Copyright and Trademark Laws to California Based Web Hosting Defendants," combined with a one-sentence "Request for Entry of Judgment." [Docket No. 237].

- Judgment should not be entered until the Court has issued its briefing schedule, the parties complete their briefing and the Court decides the issues briefed.¹
- Judgment also should not be entered until the parties complete their briefing on the scope and language of the permanent injunction that Plaintiff seeks.

GAUNTLETT & ASSOCIATES

By: /s/ James A. Lowe David A. Gauntlett James A. Lowe Brian S. Edwards

Attorneys for Defendants Akanoc Solutions, Inc., Managed Solutions Group, Inc., and Steve Chen

27 28

25

26

166014.1-10562-002-9/4/2009

¹By submitting their prejudgment briefs in accordance with the Court's directives, Defendants do not waive their rights to submit additional post-judgment briefing, if necessary, on the subjects pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b) or 59 should they deem it necessary to do so.