EXHIBIT 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY, a Missouri benevolent corporation, Plaintiff, v. AVIS MEYER, Defendant.	)	Case No. 4:07CV1733 CEJ

PLAINTIFF'S ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

COMES NOW Plaintiff Saint Louis University ("SLU") and for its answers and objections to Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories states as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

All responses contained herein are based only upon such information and documents that are presently available to and known by SLU. It is anticipated that future discovery, independent investigation, legal research and analysis will supply additional facts and add meaning to known facts, as well as establish new factual conclusions and legal contentions, all of which may lead to substantial additions to, changes and variations from the contentions and answers set forth herein. The following interrogatory answers are given without prejudice to SLU's right to produce evidence of any subsequently discovered facts of which SLU may learn or become aware.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

SLU objects to the First Set of Interrogatories propounded by Avis Meyer ("Meyer") in their entirety, on the following grounds:

1. SLU objects to each Interrogatory to the extent it could be construed as encompassing communications or documents protected by any privilege, including but not limited to: (a) the attorney-client privilege; (b) the attorney work-product doctrine; (c) or any other privilege or protection afforded by law. SLU and its counsel hereby assert such privileges and immunities.

2. SLU objects to each Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to impose on SLU obligations beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

3. SLU objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that the information requested therein is not within the possession, custody or control of SLU.

4. SLU objects to each Interrogatory to the extent it is argumentative and/or calls upon SLU to interpret legal theories or to draw legal conclusions. If Meyer subsequently asserts or prevails on an interpretation of any Interrogatory which differs from that understood by SLU, SLU reserves the right to supplement and/or amend its objections.

5. SLU objects to each Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

6. SLU objects to these Interrogatories on the ground that they are overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and seek information beyond the scope of this lawsuit because of overly broad definitions.

7. SLU objects to these Interrogatories to the extent that they are overly broad and unduly burdensome in that they request the identification of documents and things unrelated to the instant proceeding in both time and subject matter.

8. SLU further objects to these Interrogatories on the ground that each contains multiple subparts and that the numbering system utilized by Meyer does not accurately reflect the number of Interrogatories contained in Meyer's First Interrogatories. By specifically objecting to or answering Meyer's Interrogatories, SLU does not waive its right to object to these or any subsequently propounded interrogatories on the ground that they exceed the limitation as set forth in FRCP Rule 33 and the orders of the Court.

9. SLU also objects in that these Interrogatories are premature because discovery and investigation are ongoing, and SLU hereby reserves the right to amend its answers herewith in light of any additional information discovered in the course of this proceeding.

10. SLU expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery and to the subject matter of such request and to the introduction into evidence of any document, thing, information or portion thereof.

INTERROGATORIES

1. Please provide the name and address of the person or persons answering these interrogatories, including all persons who provided information used in answering these interrogatories.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome and seeks irrelevant information. SLU further objects to the extent that this Interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Subject to

and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that Kenneth E. Fleischmann, Senior Associate General Counsel for SLU, answered these Interrogatories and that Louis C. Galli, Jr., Assistant General Counsel for SLU, provided information used in answering these Interrogatories.

2. As to the alleged infringement, state the date and circumstance under which SLU first learned of the Articles of Incorporation and identify the person with knowledge of such circumstance.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome. SLU further objects to the extent that this Interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. SLU further objects that this Interrogatory is vague and ambiguous in its use of the phrase "[a]s to the alleged infringement," without further specification. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that Louis C. Galli, Jr., Assistant General Counsel, "first learned of the Articles of Incorporation" in or about May of 2007 during a routine, unrelated, electronic search.

3. Identify all persons with knowledge of the Articles of Incorporation, including but not limited to those persons with knowledge of the Article of Incorporation's:

a. Formation;

b. Existence;

c. Dissolution or Termination.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects that the term "knowledge" is vague and ambiguous and subject to multiple interpretations as used herein. SLU further objects that this Interrogatory is nonsensical in that, based upon Defendant's definitions, it seeks identification of every person with knowledge of the "formation; existence; dissolution or termination" of certain paperwork submitted by Meyer to the Missouri Secretary of State, and SLU has no knowledge of the paperwork being formed or dissolved. SLU further objects on the ground that this Interrogatory seeks irrelevant and privileged information in that SLU's knowledge of the Articles of Incorporation arises out of SLU's investigation related to this litigation and is limited to that information it has learned through discovery in this case. Defendant has conceded that SLU had no knowledge of the formation of the non-profit corporation. To the extent Defendant Avis Meyer has independent and superior information regarding persons with knowledge of the Articles of Incorporation, he has not been forthcoming with that information and has accordingly limited SLU's knowledge of such. SLU further objects that this Interrogatory seeks information not in the possession, custody or control of SLU in that Defendant Meyer has caused to be publicly posted on the website of the Secretary of State the Articles of Incorporation such that any person who has accessed the website may have the knowledge referenced in this Interrogatory. SLU has no way of identifying those persons. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that Louis C. Galli, Jr. first identified for SLU the existence of the Articles of Incorporation and all subsequent knowledge gained by SLU regarding the Articles of Incorporation is protected by attorney-client and work product privileges. In addition, Avis Meyer, Diana Benanti, and those persons identified by Avis Meyer and Diana Benanti in their

respective depositions have knowledge of the Articles of Incorporation. Additional persons with knowledge may be identified in documents to be produced.

4. Identify all persons with whom you have communicated regarding the Articles of Incorporation, including but not limited to those persons with knowledge of the Article of Incorporation's:

a. Formation;

b. Existence;

c. Dissolution or Termination.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU additionally incorporates herein by reference its objections and response to Interrogatory No. 3 above. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that SLU has communicated with Avis Meyer and Diana Benanti regarding the Articles of Incorporation, and that additional persons with whom SLU has communicated regarding the Articles of Incorporation may be identified in documents to be produced.

5. State whether SLU obtained any advice of counsel or opinion of counsel as to potential infringement or violation of any rights of SLU, and if so, state for each such opinion or advice of counsel: who rendered it and the date of the opinion or advice was rendered; and identify all documents that show, discuss, or relate to the opinion or advice.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it is not limited to the subject matter of this litigation. SLU further objects to the extent that this

Interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

6. Indicate all acts of MEYER which SLU contends constitute an act of trademark infringement by MEYER.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the ground that this Interrogatory calls for a legal conclusion. SLU further objects on the ground that investigation and discovery are ongoing. Namely, to the extent Meyer has exclusive and superior knowledge of his own acts and has not been forthcoming in discovery with regard to those acts or has destroyed evidence of his conduct, SLU cannot at this time identify each and every act of Meyer that constitutes an act of trademark infringement. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that the following acts, when considered in conjunction with the strength of SLU's intellectual property rights, the fact that Meyer incorporated SLU's intellectual property in virtually identical form to, among other things, compete directly with SLU's own campus newspaper, and the fact that Meyer had the specific intent to lead the public to believe that the newly created newspaper was in fact that same newspaper that had been published by SLU for many decades, constitute trademark infringement:

(1) Meyer improperly registered a non-profit corporation which incorporates SLU's valuable intellectual property with the intent to trade off the good will of Saint Louis University and its student newspaper;

(2) Meyer used SLU's valuable intellectual property for purposes of raising funds and leasing space to publish a newspaper to be distributed to the Saint Louis University community;

(3) Meyer advertised the non-profit corporation's operations as publishing a student newspaper that would be distributed to and among the Saint Louis University community in competition with any campus paper published by Saint Louis University;

(4) Meyer placed in the public record documents which give the impression that Saint Louis University was affiliated with, approved of, or sponsored the dissolution of the non-profit corporation, giving the false and confusing impression that SLU had abandoned its rights; and

(5) Other acts not yet revealed by Avis Meyer or for which evidence has been destroyed.

7. Set forth all categories and amounts of damages specifying the documents or other evidentiary materials upon which such damages are based or bearing on the nature and extent of such damages and indicate how such damages were calculated.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the ground that investigation and discovery are ongoing. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that it believes it may have suffered damage to the value of its intellectual property in an amount unknown at this time due to the confusing and deceptive manner in which Meyer created, used and dissolved the wrongful non-profit corporation. SLU additionally believes it may have suffered damage to its reputation and ability to obtain and retain students and faculty due to Meyer's wrongful use of SLU's benevolent name and

intellectual property and unfair competition. SLU has additionally incurred attorneys' fees which it will seek to recover, along with interest and costs.

8. Identify all facts that you contend support your allegation that the alleged wrongdoings by MEYER were willful.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome. SLU further objects on the ground that this Interrogatory calls for a legal conclusion. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that the depositions of Avis Meyer and Diana Benanti are responsive to this interrogatory. In addition, investigation has revealed that Meyer was aware prior to registration and use of the non-profit corporation that his actions might be improper. Rather than inform SLU of his intent to "own" rights in the name of the paper that SLU had been publishing for many decades, prior to registration of the non-profit corporation Meyer deviously proposed an unrelated hypothetical in an attempt to get tacit approval (unbeknownst to SLU) in the event he was caught misusing SLU's intellectual property. Meyer then made specific efforts to keep the fact of his actions secret. Meyer additionally failed to dissolve the wrongfully created and used entity when the students accepted the new Charter proffered by the University and later intentionally dissolved the non-profit corporation in a confusing manner in order to diminish the value of SLU's intellectual property rights, potentially hamper its ability to protect its intellectual property in the future, and apparently in an attempt cover up his wrongful acts. Meyer additionally failed to respond to SLU's request for assurances as to the extent of Meyer's use and/or future use of SLU's intellectual property. Meyer also intentionally frustrated SLU's ability to investigate the use of its intellectual property by

misrepresenting to the press and under oath his claimed creation and delivery of correspondence to counsel for SLU regarding the requested assurances. The full extent of Meyer's willful conduct may not be discoverable due to Meyer's destruction of evidence and failure to otherwise comply with his discovery obligations, and SLU therefore specifically reserves the right to supplement this response if and when additional information becomes available.

9. Identify all facts that you contend support your allegation that the alleged wrongdoings by MEYER were willful and deliberate, designed especially to trade upon alleged goodwill associated with SLU.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU additionally incorporates herein by reference its responses to Interrogatory Nos. 6 and 8.

10. Identify all facts that you contend support your allegation that the alleged wrongdoings by MEYER result in SLU suffering and continuing to suffer irreparable harm.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the ground that this Interrogatory calls for a legal conclusion. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that Meyer's actions may leave SLU open to attacks on its intellectual property that SLU may not be able to fully defend absent an injunction or order setting forth the wrongful nature of Meyer's conduct.

11. Provide the name, employer, title, business and home addresses and telephone numbers for each person with operational or maintenance responsibility for SLU's computer system(s), including, but not limited to, the person(s) who maintain the hardware on the

system(s); the person(s) responsible for installing software on the system(s); the person(s) responsible for the day-to-day operation of the system(s); the person(s) responsible for making backups or archiving files and data on the system(s); and the person(s) who can provide any passwords that may be necessary to access the appropriate computer system(s) or files.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome and seeks irrelevant information. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that Tim L. Brooks is the head of SLU's IT Department and has operational or maintenance responsibility for SLU's computer systems.

12. If not the same person(s) as identified in your answer to the immediately preceding interrogatory, identify by job title, job description, and business address and telephone number, the person(s) employed by SLU who is/are the most knowledgeable about the policies, procedures and actual practices for retention and destruction of documents at SLU.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome and seeks irrelevant information. SLU further objects to the phrase "retention and destruction of documents" in that the phrase is vague, ambiguous and subject to multiple interpretation. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU states that at this time, Tim L. Brooks is likely the most knowledgeable about such policies, procedures and actual practices at SLU, to the extent the interrogatory is understood.

13. Describe all efforts and procedures taken by SLU for this litigation to gather and secure documents, including, but not limited to, electronically generated or stored word processing files, spreadsheets or other electronic documents, electronic mail, and backup copies of information that may be relevant to the facts of this case. Describe the manner in which the notice of such efforts or procedures was communicated to SLU's employees.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome and seeks irrelevant information. SLU further objects to the extent that this Interrogatory seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SLU undertook a litigation hold and notified the relevant persons of such hold.

14. Describe all record retention and destruction policies and procedures followed by SLU including, but not limited to, the date the policy was adopted; the types of documents covered and the respective retention periods; the frequency of document destruction; whether any record is kept or what documents were destroyed, the manner and frequency with which the policy is communicated to SLU's employees; and the identity of all employees with responsibility for implementing and executing the policy.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome and seeks irrelevant information

15. Identify any data that has been deleted, physically destroyed, discarded, damaged (physically or logically), or overwritten, whether pursuant to a document retention policy or otherwise, since the commencement of this litigation. Specifically identify those documents that relate to or reference the subject matter of this litigation.

ANSWER: SLU restates and incorporates its General Objections. SLU further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is overly broad and unduly burdensome and seeks irrelevant information in that it is not limited in time or subject matter with regard to this litigation. Subject to the foregoing objections, SLU is not aware of any individual deleting, destroying, discarding, damaging, or overwriting any documents related to this litigation except Defendant Meyer.

16. For each witness who may be used by you at trial to present evidence under Federal Rules of Evidence 702, 703, or 705 provide all information described in or required by Rule 26(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

ANSWER: No such witnesses have been identified at this time.

VERIFICATION

Kenneth E. Fleischmann, being first duly sworn, states as follows:

That I have read the foregoing responses and knows the contents thereof; that said responses were prepared with the assistance and advice of counsel, that the responses set forth herein, subject to inadvertent or undiscovered errors, are based on and therefore necessarily limited by the records and information still in existence, presently recollected and thus far discovered in the course of the preparation of these responses; that consequently, that SLU reserves the right to make any changes in the responses if it appears at any time that omissions or errors have been made therein or that more accurate or additional information is available; and subject to the limitations set forth herein, the said responses are true to the best of SLU's knowledge, information and belief.

Kenneth E. Fleischmann

Kenneth E. Fleischmann
Senior Associate General Counsel for
Saint Louis University

STATE OF MISSOURI)
) SS.
CITY OF ST. LOUIS)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of August, 2008.

Lynette L. Murphy

Notary Public

My commission expires: 6-29-2010

LYNETTE L. MURPHY
Notary Public - Notary Seal
State of Missouri
St. Louis City
My Commission Expires June 29, 2010
Commission # 06431619

Respectfully submitted,

LEWIS, RICE & FINGERSH, L.C.

By: _____
Frank B. Janoski, #3480
Bridget Hoy, #109375

500 North Broadway, Suite 2000
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
Telephone: (314) 444-7600
Facsimile: (314) 241-6056

Attorneys for Plaintiff
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing document was served by email and first class mail, postage prepaid, upon counsel of record this 18th day of August, 2008 addressed as follows:

Nelson D. Nolte
Scott A. Smith
Brian J. Gill
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200
St. Louis, MO 63131-3615
nnolte@patpro.com
bgill@patpro.com
ssmith@patpro.com

_____