

## **THE AP'S DESIGNATION OF PRIOR DEPOSITION TESTIMONY**

Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the AP designates the following witnesses whose testimony the AP expects to present by deposition and the pertinent parts of each witness deposition.

### **I. Deposition of Amanda Fairey (September 18, 2009)**

6:11 - 24  
11:5 - 14  
16:6 - 17  
17:4 - 22  
19:6 - 20:8  
93:4 - 18  
95:9 - 19  
135:24 - 142:16  
148:23 - 151:9  
152:3 - 7

### **II. Deposition of Amanda Fairey (March 28, 2010)**

463:18 - 464:18

### **III. Deposition of Amanda Fairey (July 27, 2010)**

560:17 - 561:3  
567:5 - 573:12  
588:13 - 593:13  
599:13 - 19  
601:24 - 606:7  
607:10 - 16  
610:14 - 611:17

### **IV. Deposition of Mannie Garcia (March 4, 2010)**

12:12 - 13:2  
14:11 - 22:2  
22:15 - 26:1  
26:11 - 41:10  
41:19 - 20  
41:24 - 46:21  
47:7 - 15  
47:23 - 50:1  
114:15 - 22

**V. Deposition of Mannie Garcia (March 5, 2010)**

24:17 - 25:3  
36:2 - 39:5  
52:8 - 22  
160:19 - 161:5  
162:11 - 163:19  
166:2 - 167:9  
172:9 - 174:12  
176:21 - 177:21  
211:3 - 212:7  
225:2 - 227:5  
241:9 - 242:5  
348:4 - 352:6

**VI. Deposition of Brad Grossman (August 24, 2010)**

7:14 - 8:9  
9:15 - 10:13  
12:17 - 13:23  
14:25 - 16:14  
21:16 - 23:16  
50:2 - 12  
54:16 - 55:10  
151:8 - 153:18  
205:8 - 206:4  
212:25 - 213:5  
234:10 - 239:24

**VII. Deposition of Olivia Perches (September 22, 2009)**

6:16 - 20  
17:25 - 18:13  
22:2 - 9  
37:8 - 19  
46:4 - 7  
69:18 - 70:6  
75:20 - 76:16

**VIII. Deposition of Olivia Perches (September 23, 2009)**

454:12 - 458:19  
514:24 - 518:13

**THE AP’S OBJECTIONS AND COUNTER-DESIGNATIONS TO  
DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF OBEY CLOTHING**

Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the AP submits its Objections and Counter-designations to the Deposition Designations of Obey Clothing.

In addition to the objections and counter-designations set forth below, the AP will bring to the pre-trial conference as a courtesy to the Court a bound set of appendices with the relevant portions of the deposition testimony designated by Obey Clothing with the AP’s objections set out in the margin.

**I. James Danziger – July 7, 2009 (see Appendix A to the AP’s courtesy copy to the Court)**

The AP objects to Obey Clothing’s deposition designations on hearsay grounds because Mr. Danziger is available to testify at trial, and because Obey Clothing appears to be offering Mr. Danziger in violation of Rule 26 as an undisclosed expert on photography and licensing who has not submitted an expert report. The AP further objects as follows:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Page 22:11-19	Relevance; unfairly prejudicial; foundation; calls for speculation.
Pages 22:23-23:7	Relevance; unfairly prejudicial; foundation; calls for speculation.
Pages 38:18-39:16	Relevance; hearsay; foundation.
Pages 45:2-46:16	Relevance; hearsay.
Pages 47:5-48:11	Relevance; hearsay.
Pages 49:9-50:12	Relevance; hearsay; calls for speculation; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 50:13-14, 51:4 and 51:6.
Page 52:18-21	Relevance; hearsay; calls for speculation.
Page 52:24-53:17	Relevance; hearsay; calls for speculation.
Pages 53:20-54:1	Relevance; hearsay; calls for speculation; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 54:16-55:1.
Pages 55:2-56:24	Relevance; hearsay; foundation; unfairly prejudicial; calls for speculation; improper opinion testimony.

Pages 59:19-60:2	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 60:3-8; irrelevant; foundation; prejudicial, calls for speculation
Pages 60:18-61:7	Relevance; foundation; unfairly prejudicial; calls for speculation.
Page 61:10-11	Relevance; foundation; calls for speculation.
Pages 61:20-66:12	Relevance.
Pages 66:23-68:1	Relevance; foundation; calls for speculation.
Pages 68:10-12	Relevance; foundation; calls for speculation.
Page 68:16-17	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 68:18-20 and 68:23-69:10; relevance; foundation; calls for speculation.
Pages 71:3-72:11	Relevance.
Page 72:14-19	Relevance.
Page 73:11-17	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 73:18-22; relevance.
Pages 73:23-74:12	Relevance; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 73:18-22 and 80:3-14.
Page 74:19-23	Relevance.
Pages 75:1-76:1	Relevance.
Pages 77:7-78:4	Relevance; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of page 80:3-14.
Page 82:7-10	Relevance; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 82:13 and 82:20-22; irrelevant; calls for speculation.
Page 83:1-3	Relevance; lack of personal knowledge; unfairly prejudicial; calls for speculation.
Page 83:7	Relevance; lack of personal knowledge; unfairly prejudicial; calls for speculation.
Pages 96:4-99:1	Relevance; incomplete under Rule 106; would also

	require designation of page 104:12-19.
Page 101:8-20	Relevance.

Subject to its objections, the AP submits the following counter-designations:

1. Page 27:10-16
2. Page 27:23-28:9
3. Page 33:17-23
4. Page 50:13-14
5. Page 51:4
6. Page 51:6
7. Pages 54:16-55:1
8. Page 60:3-8
9. Page 68:18-20
10. Pages 68:23-69:10
11. Page 73:18-22
12. Page 80:3-14
13. Pages 81:14-82:6
14. Page 82:13
15. Page 82:20-22
16. Page 85:6-20
17. Page 86:13-89:14
18. Page 104:12-19

**II. Farah DeGrave – March 23, 2010 (see Appendix B to the AP’s courtesy copy to the Court)**

The AP objects to Obey Clothing’s deposition designations on hearsay grounds because Ms. DeGrave is available to testify at trial. The AP further objects as follows:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 134:23–135:12	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 134:5–134:22; incomplete hypothetical; calls for speculation.

Pages 179:25–180:24	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 180:25–181:9; foundation.
Pages 202:5–202:13	None.

Subject to its objections, the AP submits the following counter-designations:

1. Pages 61:18–63:12
2. Pages 67:11–67:22
3. Pages 198:2–200:14

**III. Mannie Garcia Vol. 1 – March 4, 2010**

The AP does not object to the designated testimony.

**IV. Mannie Garcia Vol. 2 – March 5, 2010 (see Appendix C to the AP’s courtesy copy to the Court)**

The AP objects as follows:

1. The designated testimony constitutes inadmissible hearsay within hearsay as Mr. Garcia was asked about prior, out of court statements, that he made to the media, and Obey Clothing is offering such statements for the truth of the matter asserted.

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 64:4-65:18	Hearsay; form; foundation.
Pages 68:16-69:8	Hearsay; form; foundation.
Pages 70:13-16	Hearsay; form; foundation; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 69:10-70:12; misleading as the testimony pertains to earlier statements that are not designated and are not relevant; vague and ambiguous.
Pages 70:17-71:21	Hearsay; form; foundation.
Pages 76:21-78:4	Hearsay; form; foundation; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 76:3-76:20.

2. The designated testimony is irrelevant because it relates to claims or defenses that are no longer in the case, such as Mannie Garcia’s work-for-hire claim that he was the owner of the copyright in the Obama Photo, Mr. Garcia’s licensing deal

with a New York art gallery, and Mr. Garcia's claims as to Mr. Fairey and his companies. Such testimony is also reasonably likely to confuse the jury.

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 80:8-14	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's work for hire claim is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Pages 80:19-81:4	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's work for hire claim is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Pages 81:9-15	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's as to Mr. Fairey is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Pages 86:16-17	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's claims is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Pages 87:7-12	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's claims is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Pages 277:6-278:16	Not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case; unfairly prejudicial; testimony is likely to confuse the jury.
Pages 279:5-9	Not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case; testimony is likely to confuse the jury.
Pages 284:6-19	Not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial.
Pages 300:1-21	Incomplete under Rule 106; vague and ambiguous; not relevant to the remaining issues in the case as the designated testimony pertains to Mr. Garcia's claims as to Mr. Fairey; unfairly prejudicial; testimony is likely to confuse the jury.
Pages 302:16-22	Incomplete under Rule 106; vague and ambiguous; not relevant to remaining issues in the case.
Pages 312:21-316:6	Not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case.

Pages 320:1-321:6	Not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case.
Pages 321:15-322:4	Not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case.

3. The designated testimony is not relevant to the extent it relates to Mr. Garcia's membership in the National Press Photographer's Association and the guidelines propounded by that organization.

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 117:22-118:22	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 115:6-116:20; foundation; relevance.
Pages 119:3-22	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 119:1-2; foundation; relevance.
Pages 121:21-122:3	Incomplete under Rule 106; foundation; relevance.
Pages 122:10-12	Incomplete under Rule 106; foundation; relevance.
Pages 188:8-16	Incomplete under Rule 106; foundation; relevance; the same questions were also previously asked and answered in portions designated by Obey Clothing and are therefore unduly cumulative.

4. The designated testimony is misleading and vague and ambiguous because Obey Clothing failed to designate the portion of the testimony laying a proper foundation, even designating answers without the accompanying questions. Also, the designated testimony is not relevant to any of the remaining issues in the case.

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 165:2-11	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading and irrelevant as the testimony pertains to the dimensions and size of the room in which the deposition was held; vague and ambiguous.
Pages 169:1-4	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading and irrelevant as it is unclear what room the designated testimony pertains to; vague and ambiguous.
Pages 221:6-7; 221:22-222:1	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require



	designation of pages 221:10-11; misleading as the witness states that he thought he was answering a different question; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 223:13-17	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what elements are being referred to; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 224:6-12	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what elements are being referred to; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 224:15-225:1	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what elements are being referred to; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 232:6-8	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what the witness is being asked to look at; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 238:16-239:5	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what the witness is referring to; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 285:6-13	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what events are being discussed; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 325:10-16	Incomplete under Rule 106; misstates prior testimony; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 337:7-17	Incomplete under Rule 106; misstates prior testimony; asked and answered and duplicates earlier testimony that was designated by Obey Clothing; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 338:12-339:20	Incomplete under Rule 106; misstates prior testimony; asked and answered and duplicates earlier testimony that was designated by Obey Clothing; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 340:19-341:22	Incomplete under Rule 106; vague and ambiguous as testimony is incomplete and not clear what Mr. Garcia is referring to; incomplete hypothetical and asks witness to speculate; form and foundation; relevance.
Pages 346:17-347:8	Incomplete under Rule 106; misstates prior testimony; vague and ambiguous as it asks the witness to assume and does not identify what the assumption is; incomplete hypothetical; form and foundation; relevance.

5. The designated testimony is misleading and not relevant as it pertains to Mr. Garcia making photographs that are not at issue in this case. The testimony is unclear, and

would likely confuse the jurors who may reasonably not understand which photograph Mr. Garcia is testifying about.

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 169:1-4	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading and irrelevant as it is unclear what room the designated testimony pertains to; vague and ambiguous.
Pages 207:19-209:6	Misleading and irrelevant as the testimony pertains to photographs made by Mr. Garcia that are not at issue. The testimony would also be likely to confuse or mislead the jury.
Pages 215:18-218:2	Misleading and irrelevant as the testimony pertains to photographs made by Mr. Garcia that are not at issue. The testimony would also be likely to confuse or mislead the jury.

Subject to its objections, the AP submits the following counter-designations:

1. Pages 138:16-143:2
2. Pages 149:10-150-16
3. Pages 172:6-8
4. Pages 181:22-182:6
5. Pages 183:6-8
6. Pages 218:21-219:3
7. Pages 219:8-9
8. Pages 222:9-17
9. Pages 230:12-14
10. Pages 232:22-233:3
11. Pages 233:14-234:21
12. Pages 239:11-14
13. Pages 239:22-240-13
14. Pages 259:15-19
15. Pages 329:10-12
16. Pages 347:10-19

**V. Gregory Payan – April 6, 2010 (see Appendix D to the AP’s courtesy copy to the Court)**

The AP objects to Obey Clothing’s deposition designations on hearsay grounds because Mr. Payan is available to testify at trial. The AP further objects as follows:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 13:3–13:9	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 13:10–14:4; relevance.
Pages 14:5–14:22	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 13:10–14:4; relevance.

Subject to its objections, the AP submits the following counter-designations:

1. Pages 13:10–14:4
2. Pages 21:23–22:15
3. Pages 70:14–70:22

**THE AP'S OBJECTIONS A TO OBEY CLOTHING'S  
COUNTER-DESIGNATIONS TO THE AP'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS**

Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the AP submits its Objections to Obey Clothing's Counter-designations to the AP's deposition designations.

The AP objects to Obey Clothing's counter-designations to the extent that they duplicate Obey Clothing's own designations. In particular, Obey Clothing counter-designations of Mr. Garcia's deposition are substantially the same as its original designations. The counter-designations are therefore unduly cumulative and duplicative. The AP requests that the Court rule that Obey Clothing's unobjectionable designations be played for the jury only once. The AP also objects to the extent that the counter designations are outside the scope of proper cross-examination testimony to the AP's designations.

**I. Amanda Fairey Vol. 1 -- September 18, 2009 (see Appendix E to the AP's courtesy copy to the Court))**

The AP objects as follows:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 151:10-152	Relevance; lack of foundation; incomplete under Rule 601.

**II. Amanda Fairey Vol. 3 -- July 27, 2010 (see Appendix F to the AP's courtesy copy to the Court)**

The AP objects as follows:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 790:22-794:17	Relevance; outside the scope of proper cross-examination; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 790:11-790:22.
Pages 794:3-794:17	Relevance; lack of foundation.

**III. Brad Grossman – August 24, 2009 (see Appendix G to the AP's courtesy copy to the Court)**

The AP objects as follows:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Pages 23:22-25:5	Relevance; unfairly prejudicial; outside the scope of proper cross-examination.
Pages 28:21-30:16	Relevance; unfairly prejudicial; outside the scope of proper cross-examination.

Pages 150:25-151:6	Lack of foundation.
Pages 154:3-154:11	Hearsay; irrelevant; unfairly prejudicial.
Pages 198:4-200:16	Relevance as to Mr. Grossman's opinion or what he thought; lack of foundation; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 200:17-201:5, 201:18-204:8.
Pages 204:9-205:7	Relevance as to Mr. Grossman's opinion or what he thought; lack of foundation; unfairly prejudicial.
Pages 211:21-212:24	Relevance as to Mr. Grossman's opinion or what he thought; lack of foundation; unfairly prejudicial.
Pages 213:6-213:24	Relevance as to Mr. Grossman's opinion or what he thought; lack of foundation; unfairly prejudicial.
Pages 231:21-233:3	Relevance as to Mr. Grossman's opinion or what he thought; lack of foundation; unfairly prejudicial.

**IV. Mannie Garcia Vol. 1 – March 4, 2010 (see Appendix H to the AP's courtesy copy to the Court)**

The AP objects as follows:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Page 26, Lines 2 - 10	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination.

**V. Mannie Garcia Vol. 2 – March 5, 2010 (see Appendix I to the AP's courtesy copy to the Court)**

The AP objects as follows:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Page 19, Lines 2 - 13	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; relevance as it pertains to Mr. Garcia's claims that are no longer at issue in the case.
Page 68, Line 16 - Page 69, Line 9	Misstates actual portion counter-designated; outside scope of proper cross-examination; hearsay; form; foundation.
Page 70, Line 13 - Page 71, Line 21	Hearsay; form; foundation; incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 69:10-70:12; misleading as the testimony pertains to earlier statements that are not designated and are not relevant; vague and ambiguous.
Page 76, Line 21 - Page 78, Line 4	Hearsay; form; foundation; incomplete under

	Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 76:3-76:20.
Page 80, Lines 8 - 14	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's work for hire claim is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Page 80, Line 19 - Page 81, Line 4	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's work for hire claim is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Page 81, Lines 9 - 15	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's as to Mr. Fairey is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Page 86, Lines 16 - 17	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's claims is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Page 87, Lines 7 - 12	Incomplete under Rule 106; testimony regarding Mr. Garcia's claims is not relevant; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial; foundation.
Page 117, Line 22 - Page 118, Line 22	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 115:6-116:20; foundation; relevance.
Page 119, Lines 3 - 22	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 119:1-2; foundation; relevance.
Page 121, Line 21 - Page 122, Line 3	Incomplete under Rule 106; foundation; relevance.
Page 122, Lines 10 - 12	Incomplete under Rule 106; foundation; relevance.
Page 165, Lines 2 - 9	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading and irrelevant as the testimony pertains to the dimensions and size of the room in which the deposition was held; vague and ambiguous.
Page 167, Line 10 - Page 168, Line 4	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; objects to the exhibits referenced as not authentic and hearsay.
Page 169, Lines 1 - 4	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading and irrelevant as it is unclear what room the designated testimony pertains to; vague and ambiguous.
Page 188, Lines 8 - 16	Incomplete under Rule 106; foundation; relevance; the same questions were also previously asked and answered in portions

	designated by Obey Clothing and are therefore unduly cumulative.
Page 207, Line 19 - Page 209, Line 6	Misleading and irrelevant as the testimony pertains to photographs made by Mr. Garcia that are not at issue. The testimony would also be likely to confuse or mislead the jury.
Page 215, Line 18 - Page 218, Line 20	Misleading and irrelevant as the testimony pertains to photographs made by Mr. Garcia that are not at issue. The testimony would also be likely to confuse or mislead the jury.
Page 221, Line 22 - Page 222, Line 1	Incomplete under Rule 106; would also require designation of pages 221:10-11; misleading as the witness states that he thought he was answering a different question; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 223, Lines 10 - 17	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what elements are being referred to; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 224, Lines 6 - 12	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what elements are being referred to; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 224, Line 15 - Page 225, Line 1	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what elements are being referred to; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 232, Lines 6 - 8	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what the witness is being asked to look at; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 238, Line 16 - Page 239, Line 5	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what the witness is referring to; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 277, Line 6 - Page 278, Line 16	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case; unfairly prejudicial; testimony is likely to confuse the jury.
Page 279, Lines 5 - 9	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case; testimony is likely to confuse the jury.

Page 284, Lines 6 - 19	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case; testimony is likely to confuse the jury; unfairly prejudicial.
Page 285, Lines 6 - 13	Incomplete under Rule 106; misleading as it is unclear what events are being discussed; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 300, Lines 1 - 21	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; incomplete under Rule 106; vague and ambiguous; not relevant to the remaining issues in the case as the designated testimony pertains to Mr. Garcia's claims as to Mr. Fairey; unfairly prejudicial; testimony is likely to confuse the jury.
Page 302, Lines 16 - 22	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; incomplete under Rule 106; vague and ambiguous; not relevant to remaining issues in the case.
Page 312, Line 21 - Page 316, Line 6	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case.
Page 320, Line 1 - Page 321, Line 6	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case.
Page 321, Line 15 - Page 322, Line 4	Outside the scope of proper cross-examination; not relevant to any remaining claims or defenses in this lawsuit as Mr. Garcia's efforts to license or exploit the copyright are no longer at issue in the case.
Page 325, Line 10 - Page 326, Line 5	Incomplete under Rule 106; misstates prior testimony; vague and ambiguous; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 337, Line 7 - Page 338, Line 2	Incomplete under Rule 106; misstates prior testimony; asked and answered and duplicates earlier testimony that was designated by Obey Clothing; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 338, Line 8 - Page 339, Line 20	Incomplete under Rule 106; misstates prior testimony; asked and answered and duplicates earlier testimony that was designated by Obey Clothing; form and foundation; relevance.



Page 340, Line 19 - Page 341, Line 22	Incomplete under Rule 106; vague and ambiguous as testimony is incomplete and not clear what Mr. Garcia is referring to; incomplete hypothetical and asks witness to speculate; form and foundation; relevance.
Page 346, Line 17 - Page 347, Line 8	Incomplete under Rule 106; misstates prior testimony; vague and ambiguous as it asks the witness to assume and does not identify what the assumption is; incomplete hypothetical; form and foundation; relevance.