TABLE OF CONTENTS

					Page				
Tabl	la Of Au	thorities			T 7				
iaui	ic Of Au	mornics	*********	······································	V				
beaut.	FINDINGS OF FACT								
	Α.								
	B.	Creati	on of	the Harry Potter Books	1				
	C.	Companion Guides and Other Harry Potter-related Properties							
	D.	Ms. Rowling's Planned Encyclopedia							
	E.	The Harry Potter Films and Related Merchandising							
	F.	Plaintiffs' Intellectual Property Protection Strategy							
	G.	Interest in Harry Potter Spawns Numerous Books and Websites							
	H.	The Harry Potter Lexicon Website							
	I.	Mr. Vander Ark's Awareness of Ms. Rowling's Plans 11							
	J.	Mr. Vander Ark Seeks A Meeting with Ms. Rowling's Literary Agent							
	K.	Development of the Lexicon Book							
	L.	Marketing the Lexicon Book1							
	M.	Plaintiffs Learn of Defendant's Plans19							
	N.	RDR Continues to Stall Plaintiffs							
	O.	Plaintiffs File Suit And Seek to Obtain A Copy of the Lexicon Manuscript 25							
	P.	The Lexicon Manuscript Copies Plaintiffs' Works Extensively							
	Q.	Use of Illegal Electronic Copies of Ms. Rowling's Works							
	R.	The Lexicon is Virtually Exclusively Drawn From Ms. Rowling's Works 28							
	S.	Types of Copying of Ms. Rowling's Works							
		1.	Verb	patim Copying of Songs and Poems	30				
•				ct Quotations Without Quotation Marks and Extensive phrasing	30				
		3.	37						
			a.	Use of Fictional Facts from the Harry Potter Novels	38				
			b.	Use of Fictional Facts from the Companion Books	43				
			c.	Use of Fictional Facts from other Harry Potter Works.	49				
			d.	Fictional Facts Taken from the Famous Wizard Cards	50				

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

					Page	
	W.	Credibility of Witnesses.				
		1.	Defen	dant's Witnesses Lack Credibility	77	
			a.	Roger Rapoport Was Not Credible Given His Deliberate Misrepresentations and Inconsistent Testimony	77	
			b.	Steven Vander Ark's Trial Testimony and Declaration Were Not Credible	79	
			c.	Prof. Sorensen's Trial Testimony and Declaration Were Not Credible	79	
II.	CON	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW				
	A.	Partie	es And J	urisdiction	81	
	В.	Сору	fringement	81		
		1. 2.		en of Proof Eiffs Can Establish Copyright Infringement		
			a.	Plaintiffs Have Submitted Evidence Showing Ownership of Valid Copyrights		
			b.	There Is Direct Evidence of Copying of Ms. Rowling's Works	85	
			c.	Plaintiffs Have Proven Access and Substantial Similarity	86	
			d.	The Lexicon Is An Unauthorized Derivative Work	88	
	C.	Defendant's Affirmative Defenses Are Unavailing				
			a.	First Factor - Purpose and Character of the Use	92	
			b.	Second Factor - Nature of the Copyrighted Work	103	
			c.	Third Factor - The Amount and Substantiality of the Portion Used	104	
			d.	Fourth Factor - Harm to the Market	107	
			e.	Defendant Has Acted With Willfulness And In Bad Faith	117	
			f.	Defendant's Case Citations Are Inapposite	120	
		2.	Defe	ndant Cannot Establish Copyright Misuse	126	
		3.	Defe	ndant's Unclean Hands Defense is Unavailing	130	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

			Page				
D.	Plaintiffs Are Entitled To An Injunction Preventing Defendant's Publication Of The Book.						
	ruoi	ication Of The Book.	131				
	1.	Plaintiffs Are Entitled to a Presumption of Irreparable Injury	131				
	2.	The Evidence Shows That If Defendant's Book is Published,					
		Plaintiffs Will Suffer Irreparable Injury	133				
	3.	Plaintiffs Have Shown That The Balance of Hardships Favors					
		Them.	137				
	4.	Issuing a Permanent Injunction Would Best Serve the Public					
		Interest	138				
E.	Plair	ntiffs Are Entitled to Statutory Damages	140				