

JUDGE GRIESA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

11 CIV 8407

UMG RECORDINGS, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

ESCAPE MEDIA GROUP INC.,
SAMUEL TARANTINO, JOSHUA
GREENBERG, PAUL GELLER,
BENJAMIN WESTERMANN-CLARK,
JOHN ASHENDEN, CHANEL
MUNEZERO, NIKOLA ARABADJIEV

Defendants.

No. _____

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff UMG Recordings, Inc. ("UMG"), by and through its undersigned attorneys,
alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This case relates to a business that is engaged in the willful infringement of a massive number of copyrights over the Internet. Defendant Escape Media Inc. ("Escape") owns and operates a pirate website, www.grooveshark.com (the "Grooveshark website"), through which it provides anyone with an Internet connection with free and unfettered access to infringing copies of "any song in the world."

2. Escape publicly touts the fact that it has a catalog of 15 million sound recordings available on demand including the most popular sound recordings by top commercial artists such as The Jackson Five, Bob Marley, Elton John, Jay-Z, the Black Eyed Peas, and Lady Gaga. Critically, however, Escape does not have a license or other authorization from UMG or from the owners of the copyrights on the vast majority of the sound recordings contained on the site.

3. Escape has braashly acknowledged the unauthorized and infringing nature of its business. Escape’s senior director readily admitted that Escape “*bet the company on the fact that it is easier to beg forgiveness than ask permission*” from record labels to exploit their copyrighted sound recordings. *See* Exhibit A (emphasis added). The same director bragged that Escape’s meteoric growth is sustained without “paying a dime to any of the [record] labels.” *See* Exhibit B. Escape knows that its conduct is unlawful. Indeed, in an email to UMG, Escape openly admitted that it “owes UMG for the use of its valuable content.” *See* Exhibit C.

4. Escape’s brazen decision to infringe UMG’s copyrighted sound recordings is driven by its awareness that the life-blood of its business is its ability to offer users all of the most popular copyrighted sound recordings. *Accordingly, to ensure that all recordings are available, Escape’s senior officers personally have illegally uploaded thousands of infringing sound recordings to the Grooveshark website and have instructed their employees to do the same.* Escape’s business records establish unequivocally that the sound recordings illegally copied by Escape’s executives and employees include thousands of well known sound recordings owned by UMG—and it is these sound recordings that form the basis of this lawsuit.

5. In a recent blog posting, a Grooveshark employee freely acknowledged that Escape’s senior officers have personally participated in, directed, and authorized these acts of infringement:

We are assigned a predetermined amount of weekly uploads to the system and get a small extra bonus if we manage to go above that (not easy). The assignments are assumed as direct order for the top to the bottom, we don’t just volunteer to “enhance” the Grooveshark database . . . Are the above legal or ethical? Of course not . . . If the labels or their lawyers can’t figure out how to stop it, then I don’t feel bad for having a job. It’s tough times.

See <http://www.digitalmusicnews.com/stories/101311cc>, a copy of which attached hereto as Exhibit D (emphasis added).

6. These flagrant acts of infringement by Escape and its senior officers and employees reflect the essence of Escape's business and culture. Escape and its management have adopted a business model that is premised on massive willful copyright infringement. As a direct result of this egregious and willful conduct, thousands of UMG's most popular sound recordings are infringed daily on a massive scale. The harm to UMG, which invests millions of dollars and enormous creative energies to produce and exploit its copyrighted works, is manifest and irreparable.

THE PARTIES

7. UMG is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Santa Monica, California. UMG is registered to do business in New York and maintains an office in New York City. Indeed, several of UMG's record label divisions are headquartered in New York.

8. Escape is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Gainesville, Florida. Escape is registered to do business in New York and maintains an office in New York City.

9. Samuel Tarantino is a co-founder and the Chief Executive Officer of Escape. Upon information and belief, Tarantino lives and works in Florida.

10. Joshua Greenberg is a co-founder and the Chief Technology Officer of Escape. Upon information and belief, Greenberg lives and works in Florida.

11. Paul Geller is the Senior Vice President for External Affairs at Escape, and a senior executive officer. Upon information and belief, Geller lives and works in New York, New York.

12. Escape's business records confirm that Tarantino, Greenberg and Geller, ("collectively referred to herein as the "Executive Defendants") have personally uploaded

thousands of infringing copies of copyrighted sound recordings including hundreds of infringing copies of UMG's copyrighted sound recordings to the Grooveshark website. In addition, these Executive Defendants have directed the uploading of tens of thousands of additional recordings including thousands of UMG recordings, have exercised control over the infringing activities described herein and have personally benefitted from this infringing activity through their ownership interest in the company.

13. Benjamin Westermann-Clark is the Vice President of Public Relations at Escape, and a senior executive officer. Upon information and belief, Westermann-Clark lives and works in Florida.

14. John Ashenden is Creative Director and Vice President of Product Development at Escape, and a senior executive officer. Upon information and belief, Ashenden lives and works in Florida.

15. Chanel Munezero is employed by Escape as a software developer. Upon information and belief, he lives and works in Florida.

16. Nikola Arabadjiev is employed by Escape in the "quality assurance" department. Upon information and belief, he lives and works in Florida.

17. Escape's business records confirm that Ashenden, Westermann-Clark, Munezero and Arabadjiev (the "Employee Defendants") have engaged in systematic and widespread illegal uploading of UMG's copyrighted content to the Grooveshark website. Acting pursuant to the direction of Escape and the Executive Defendants, the Employee Defendants have copied tens of thousands of sound recordings, including thousands of sound recordings belonging to UMG, and uploaded them to the Grooveshark website.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

18. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all of the defendants. Escape does

continuous and systematic business in New York and is thus subject to the jurisdiction of this Court pursuant to N.Y.C.P.L.R. § 301. It is registered to do business in New York and maintains an office at 254 West 31st Street, New York, NY 10001. Escape also transacts business in New York, and contracts to supply goods and services in New York in connection with the matters giving rise to this suit. *See id.* § 302(a)(1). Specifically, Escape has entered into contracts and other arrangements with residents of New York which enable New York residents to access infringing files, technical support, and other services through the Grooveshark website. Escape is also subject to jurisdiction pursuant to C.P.L.R. § 302(a)(2) since it has committed numerous tortious acts within the State of New York, including by encouraging its New York employees to upload infringing content to the Grooveshark website as well as distributing and performing infringing copies of sound recordings to New York residents.

19. The Court also has personal jurisdiction over the Executive Defendants. Each of the Executive Defendants exercises control over, and benefits from Escape's infringing activities. The Executive Defendants have personally participated in developing the infringing features of the Grooveshark website and business. In addition, each of the Executive Defendants has entered New York repeatedly for purposes of transacting business on behalf of Escape. The Court also has personal jurisdiction over Paul Geller because he lives and works in New York and directs infringing activities from within the state.

20. The Court also has personal jurisdiction over the Employee Defendants and the Executive Defendants pursuant to C.P.L.R. § 302(a)(3) because *inter alia* (i) these defendants have committed tortious acts outside of the State of New York that have caused damage inside the State of New York and (ii) these defendants reasonably should have expected their actions to have consequences in New York.

21. Venue in this District is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a). On information and belief, a substantial part of the acts of infringement complained of herein occurs or has occurred in this District.

UMG'S BUSINESS

22. UMG is among the world's largest and most respected companies in the music business operating a diverse collection of record labels, such as Interscope, Geffen, A&M, Island Def Jam Music Group, Universal Republic Records, Motown, Universal Music Group Nashville, The Decca Label Group and The Verve Music Group.

23. UMG is the owner or exclusive United States licensee of sound recordings containing the performances of some of the most popular and successful recording artists of all-time, such as Bob Marley, Elton John, and Lady Gaga. UMG has invested and continues to invest significant money, time, effort, and creative talent to create, promote, sell, and license its sound recordings.

24. UMG distributes, sells, and/or licenses its sound recordings in the form of CDs, cassettes, and other tangible media throughout the United States, including in New York. UMG also sells, distributes, and/or licenses its sound recordings in the form of digital audio files through legitimate and authorized Internet services, such as iTunes, Amazon, MySpace, Rhapsody, and Spotify.

DEFENDANTS' INFRINGING CONDUCT

25. Escape and the Executive Defendants designed and operate the Grooveshark website. At all relevant times, Escape's business plan was to attract a substantial user base for the site using the allure of a massive library of free copyrighted sound recordings. Escape entices users to its website by proclaiming that it will enable them to "listen to any song in the world" for free. Escape boasts that the Grooveshark website "is the world's largest on-demand

and music discovery service” with over 15 million songs available. *See* webpages printed from www.grooveshark.com on November 10, 2011, attached hereto as **Exhibits E & F**.

26. However, Defendants have no license for the overwhelming majority of the sound recordings available through the Grooveshark website, and have no license from UMG for any of its sound recordings. Rather, Defendants decided to create equity value for Escape and the Executive Defendants by exploiting those sound recordings without authorization from or payment to copyright owners.

27. While the Grooveshark website purports to allow users to upload content, it is of critical importance to Escape that all popular recordings are available to its users. Accordingly, Escape’s own CEO, officers and employees took on the direct responsibility for “seeding” (*i.e.*, uploading) a significant volume of infringing content to make sure it was available to users of the Grooveshark website.

28. As noted above, an Escape employee has publicly admitted that the most popular sound recordings available on the Grooveshark website regularly are uploaded by Escape’s employees at the direction of Escape and the Executive Defendants. According to this Escape employee, employee compensation is tied directly to the number of major label sound recordings uploaded by employees each week. *See Exhibit D supra*.

29. Escape’s business records provide irrefutable confirmation of this employee’s allegations. As shown below, records of user uploads maintained by Escape demonstrate that the Executive and Employee Defendants, together with other Escape employees, have uploaded more than 100,000 sound recordings to the Grooveshark website in order to boost Escape’s library of infringing content and to make the service more attractive to prospective users:

Employee	Title	Min. Number of Uploads
Samuel Tarantino	CEO	1,791
Paul Geller	Senior Vice President	3,453
Benjamin Westermann-Clark	Vice President	4,654
John Ashenden	Vice President	9,195
Chanel Munezero	Software Engineer	20,756
Nikola Arabadjiev	Quality Assurance	40,243
Other Employees		33,685
Total		113,777

30. The recordings uploaded by Escape's own officers and employees include thousands of recordings owned by UMG, including popular sound recordings featuring UMG artists such as Bob Marley, Eminem, Guns N' Roses, Jay-Z, and the Black Eyed Peas. The Employee Defendants have engaged in this activity at the direction, for the benefit, and under the control of Escape and the Executive Defendants. Once uploaded by the Defendants herein, a sound recording becomes available to all users of the Grooveshark website who visit the website and search for the name of the song. A non-exhaustive representative list of UMG's sound recordings that have been infringed by the Defendants is attached hereto as **Exhibit G**.

31. The direct infringement by Escape's own officers and employees has contributed materially to the ability of the Grooveshark website to attract millions of visitors each month, thereby allowing Defendants to profit directly from their unlawful activities by, among other things: (a) selling advertisements that are displayed in conjunction with the sound recordings it unlawfully copies and distributes; (b) selling monthly subscriptions to users with the promise of greater access to infringing music; and (c) increasing venture capital investment and the value of its company to potential purchasers.

32. Defendants' use and exploitation of the sound recordings at issue in this case has never been authorized or licensed by UMG and deprives UMG and recording artists of compensation for their unique works. Defendants' use of these recordings is a blatant violation

of UMG's rights under federal copyright law.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Federal Copyright Infringement (Against All Defendants)

33. UMG repeats and realleges every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 32 as if fully set forth herein.

34. Without authorization, Defendants are exploiting UMG's copyrighted sound recordings in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106 and 501, including but not limited to the representative list of copyrighted sound recordings listed in Exhibit G hereto.

35. Defendants' acts of infringement are willful, intentional and purposeful, in disregard of and indifference to UMG's rights.

36. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' infringement of UMG's copyrights and exclusive rights under copyright, UMG is entitled to maximum statutory damages, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c), in the amount of \$150,000 with respect to each work infringed, or such other amounts as may be proper under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c). Alternatively, at UMG's election, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), UMG shall be entitled to its actual damages, including Defendants' profits from infringement, as will be proven at trial.

37. UMG is entitled to its costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.

38. Defendants' conduct is causing and, unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause UMG great and irreparable injury that cannot be fully compensated or measured in money damages. UMG has no adequate remedy at law. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502, UMG is entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction prohibiting infringement of UMG's copyrights and exclusive rights under copyright.

WHEREFORE, UMG prays for judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For a preliminary and a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, and their respective agents, servants, employees, officers, successors, licensees, and assigns, and all persons acting in concert or participation with each or any of them, from directly or indirectly infringing in any manner any of plaintiff's sound recordings, including but not limited to the recordings listed on Exhibit G.
2. For an accounting, the imposition of a constructive trust, restitution of Defendants' unlawful proceeds, and damages according to proof.
3. For punitive and exemplary damages in an amount as may be awarded at trial.
4. For prejudgment interest according to law.
5. For plaintiff's costs incurred in this action including reasonable attorneys' fees.
6. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Andrew H. Bart

Andrew H. Bart
Gianni P. Servodidio
Joseph J. McFadden
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
919 Third Avenue
37th Floor
New York, NY 10022
tel. (212) 891-1690
fax (212) 891-1699

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: New York, New York
November 18, 2011

A

From: Drew Lipsher [Lipsher@greycroftpartners.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 12:18 AM
To: Sina Simantob
Subject: RE: Long time no talk!!

Thanks Sina. I would not want stealing anyone's Thunder. I am excited to spend time with the whole team and meet Nancy. It is important to see the home turf and kick the tires. I look forward to getting together with in NY at your convenience. Just let me know when.

In the meantime, on a personal level, I understand the ask forgiveness and not permission strategy. It is a hard one to swallow as an investor knowing what I know, but the labels have been so horrible and naïve that I think it is the only thing that makes sense. I also think that when the labels finally settle with Spotify (and I hear they are close), that will make your life better as well.

As for financing, while Greycroft maybe not be a good fit at that time (although you never know), maybe we get something in the end. Worst case is I come and help build the whole thing!

Drew

Andrew B. Lipsher
Partner
Greycroft, LLC
601 Lexington Avenue, 53rd Floor
New York, New York 10022

212-419-2444 (office)
917-455-5261 (mobile)
lipsher@greycroftpartners.com

From: Sina Simantob [mailto:sina@highlandcityclub.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 12:12 AM
To: Drew Lipsher
Subject: RE: Long time no talk!!

I can make it to Gainesville next week but I know that Sam is really excited about having you there all to himself. Then there is Nancy who wants to meet with you and talk shop re Grooveshark, Spyderlynk and more. So if I show up I'll steal his thunder. Sam and Josh have gotten a lot done recently so they want to show off a bit and get your advice and stamp of approval that they are on the right track.

Briefly, we bet the company on the fact that it is easier to ask for forgiveness than it is to ask for permission. When EMI sued, everyone thought it is the end of the company. Once we settled that suit everyone said EMI was weak anyway so the real Goliath to beat is UMG. Well it took the boys a bit before they could re-group but I think these guys have a real chance to settle with UMG within a year and by that time they'll be up to 35m uniques and a force to be dealt with.

Personally I rather hook up with you in NY one-on-one, meanwhile, I really appreciate your taking the time to visit them in their own humble home turf and I know that they will remember all your help after they settle with UMG and go out to get the big C round that I know you are interested in.

8/11/2010

B

.

From: Jia Gottlieb [jia@stillmountain.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2009 5:17 PM
To: Sina Simantob
Subject: Re: Grooveshark in 1 Year

Sina,
Sina,

This is EXCITING. Staying in the saddle as you dodge the bullets and jump the fences will make for a thrilling ride. If possible I'd love to be a fly on the wall at your Dec. 18 meeting.

Jia

On Tue, Dec 1, 2009 at 8:16 PM, Sina Simantob <sina@highlandcityclub.com> wrote:

Josh, you may have missed your call as a writer. This is an excellent review.

The only thing that I want to add is this: we are achieving all this growth without paying a dime to any of the labels.

My favorite story related to our case is the story of a kid who appears in front of the judge for sentencing for the crime of having murdered both his parents, saying "judge, have mercy on me cuz I am an orphan."

In our case, we use the label's songs till we get a 100m uniques, by which time we can tell the labels who is listening to their music where, and then turn around and charge them for the very data we got from them, ensuring that what we pay them in total for streaming is less than what they pay us for data mining.

Let's keep this quite for as long as we can.

Alex, we still need you to do the report outlining all of our recent data like last month's \$135K revenue, deals in progress, the Inverness deal closed, etc. But we no longer need this report for our investors cuz the \$3m Bridge round is done, as much as we need it for the internal team and the December 18 Board meeting in Boulder.

On the Label front, Merlin has their full contract and we are waiting for their final feedback, but I'd say that's 90% done. Sony is coming along well with our next meeting scheduled for Monday. We have got Warner's feedback and it ain't pretty, but neither is their financial condition so this may turn out to be another long-and-hard fight. We have opened a channel to Universal but it is too early to say where they stand.

Great teamwork. Now lets kick some serious ass.

Sina

REDACTED

C

From: Sina Simantob <sina@highlandcityclub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2010 1:05 AM
To: Ring, David <david.ring@umusic.com>
Cc: Sam Tarantino <sam.tarantino@escapemg.com>
Subject: Catching up

Hi David,

Hope this note finds you well.

Late last week Grooveshark received the paperwork re UMG's suit.

I am writing to acknowledge that we are now officially on notice and will respond within 30 days; and to own up to the fact that I promised you a Term Sheet by mid-December and did not deliver, so no hard feelings on the receipt of the legal docs. We acknowledge the fact that Grooveshark owes UMG for the use of its valuable content, and plan to settle this case to everyone's satisfaction hopefully sooner than later so that we can focus on future cooperation.

I also want to let you know that from the start we knew that Universal is in a class of its own, and that we'll never get a second chance to make a first best impression. So, since I was not able to secure a face-to-face meeting with you and your team to explain why we are more than a Freemium service started by a couple of collage kids, I spent a lot of time finding common colleagues who could act as a bridge between us. In retrospect, I realize that this may have been a mistake.

I respect rules and laws, so I'll leave it up to our mutual lawyers to do what they do best to protect us. But since our main objective is to secure the necessary licenses to use UMG's music for our mutual benefit, I want to know if it is possible to expedite and advance our cause on parallel tracks so that while our lawyers talk, we can take the lead and continue to explore a solution that works for UMG and Grooveshark.

As I stated before, Sam and I are more than willing to fly out to LA to meet with you and your team to introduce ourselves, discuss Grooveshark's vision and why VCs like Intel would like to finance us; and hopefully explain why we think Grooveshark has the key to monetize all digital content, including music, to the benefit of users and right's holders, including UMG.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sina Simantob
Executive Chairman
Escape Media Group

D

[job board](#) [advertise](#) [about](#) [conferences](#) [charts](#)

digital music news

[home](#)

search

Login

Username

Password

login

[forgot your password?](#)

Register to access archived stories or to receive the Daily Snapshot email.

Jobs

The latest openings. Complete list [here](#).



Label Relations Manager
eMusic
New York, NY

Interactive Marketing Rep
EMI CMG
Brentwood, TN

Marketing Director
Om Records/Om Entertainment
Group
San Francisco, CA

Strategic Sales Manager
Baeblemusic

Manager, Marketing
EMI CMG
Brentwood, TN

Senior Manager, Music Product
Management
Sonos
Santa Barbara, CA or Cambridge,
MA

Direct Sales Manager
Mexican Summer/Kemado
Records
Brooklyn, NY

VP Business Development
Shindig
NYC

King Crimson Can't Get Their Music Off of Grooveshark. So They cc'd Digital Music News...

Flat

[paul](#)

Thursday, October 13, 2011

The following are excerpts from a lengthy and angry email exchange between King Crimson guitarist Robert Fripp, his team, and Grooveshark. It dates back at least two months, and reveals a fruitless attempt to clear Grooveshark of Fripp's materials. We were cc'd on the thread today.

Date: September 13th, 2011
From: Declan Colgan
To: Grooveshark SVP Paul Geller

This is not simply about takedowns.

Most of the material taken down over the weekend has already re-appeared.

This is about that fact that Grooveshark has, repeatedly, allowed this material to be made available illegally, despite numerous notices that this represents an infringement of the copyrights involved: from Grayzone (one behalf of the copyright owner), from myself (as the licensee of the material) & communications that have been personally addressed directly to the company by the copyright holder Robert Fripp.

Irrespective of whether or not a third party label did warrant to Grooveshark that they had such rights (& Virgin/EMI - mentioned by Mr. Ford in writing to a fan who asked the question recently as having granted such licenses to Grooveshark assure us that they did not grant such rights), they are not the copyright owners & would have had no rights to do so.

I can ask Mark Furman, a senior lawyer at the company & copied on this note to confirm this yet again if it will help?

You ask for time & patience from us on the basis that "takedowns have been honored", yet your site continues to offer King Crimson music illegally to the public.

That deserves public comment.

If you were taking our position "seriously", you would disable the facilities to search & upload King Crimson music as you do for other artists.

- Declan

Reply.
From: Geller
To: Colgan, Robert Fripp, David Singleton, Mark Fumer (Virgin Music), et al.

Declan,

I think I've been respectful of your position and I don't object personally to your public commentary. I just said that it doesn't make me take you more seriously, because I already do. I'm trying to find a solution that fits your needs. Thank you for your understanding.

-Paul

Date: September 13th, 2011
From: Robert Fripp
To: Geller

dear mr. geller,

<http://grooveshark.com/#/search/song?q=king+crimson>

my assumption is that you have not yet managed to find a *solution that fits (our) needs*.

sincerely, rf.



Most Read Stories

[30 Years Of Music Industry Change. In 30 Seconds Or Less...](#)

[What an Artist Really Gets Paid. Continued...](#)

[King Crimson Can't Get Their Music Off of Grooveshark. So They cc'd Digital Music News...](#)

[This Morning, Grooveshark Sent Us This Angry Email...](#)

[We Just Tested Spotify+Facebook. And It's Got Serious Issues...](#)

[We Asked Rhapsody What They Pay Artists. And This Is What They Said...](#)

[fast-forward to October 13th...]

From: David Singleton
To: Grooveshark SVP Paul Geller

Dear Paul,

I read your [recent interview in Digital Music News](#) with interest. With regard to artist's rights you clearly stated :

"You have complete control over what you put on Grooveshark and what you don't."

This seems to be at odds with our own experience, where we have NO choice about what we put on Grooveshark. The only choice we are offered is over how much of our time and money we wish to waste in REMOVING items from a service we have never chosen to engage with - a completely different scenario.

You will appreciate that there is huge difference between someone inviting a guest into their home (where they have a choice in advance) and someone moving into your home uninvited and then giving you the chance to evict them. Particularly if that same uninvited guest returns every day until they are evicted again - at your own expense.

Have Grooveshark changed their modus operandi, or is your statement to Digital Music News utterly misleading as it quite clearly implies that artists put their music onto Grooveshark and choose what to present?

Best

David Singleton

Reply.

Hey David,

I am going to leave Paul Resnikoff CCed on this email against my better judgement but I removed Aaron Ford since he no longer works for us. I hope you let Paul know that I don't just respond to emails like this while he is watching but take time with unhappy artists like the one you represent whenever necessary -- suffice to say that your case is the only one I felt it necessary to be involved with. Ever.

Your experience with Grooveshark was unique in that you followed the procedures to a T, we claimed to have removed the links to your content, but as you demonstrated, they remained intact. I have never seen that happen before. After finding that, there was an exhaustive review of what technical procedures could have caused it and we put two additional safety nets in place to help prevent it from happening to you or anyone else again.

I'll spare you the technical details except to say: we found a bug. We didn't see that it had ever effected anyone before. Fixed the bug and now monitor it to make sure it never effects you or anyone else. I thought we resolved that after our last email thread since I had not heard back from you or Declan.

The fact that it ever reached my desk was regrettable in that the conversations escalated through Aaron. There was some idea that your content had been delivered by a label but wasn't completely ingested. (We've had some ingestion problems this year that were producing weird results like that.) I don't know where that mistruth originated but I know what I saw in email threads prior to my involvement. I saw some opportunities to handle your case better.

Long story short: We're sorry. I'm sorry. Aaron is sorry. Not our M.O. but we made changes anyway. Email me if you ever have a problem again.

-Paul

@Paul Resnikoff, I'd appreciate it if you didn't publish my email. I think I've given you enough as of late but if you find it within your realm of journalistic responsibility to do so, I won't hold it against you.

|

118 people like this. Be the first of your friends.

[Leave a Comment](#) • [View Comments Flat](#)

Comment By: megan	Thursday, October 13, 2011
more utter bullshit from grooveshark.	
I have tried repeatedly, yet failed, to have my material removed from the platform. I get no response to anything filed through their DMCA channel and emails (nearly 30 of them) direct to the company go ignored.	

I was never asked if I want my music to be on there (I don't), no effort has ever been made to contact me once it was (I found out by chance), and I can't get it removed.

Grooveshark are worse than any 'pirates' out there. They are a bunch of people in Florida who want to become rich from ripping off artists who have neither the stamina nor powerful enough lawyers to fight them.

People like Grooveshark are the cancer of the music world and should be shut down as soon as possible.

Reply

Comment By: You should read this:

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Comment By: Ben

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Stop sending the DMCA notices to the scammers themselves. They have no respect for artists. Instead, send the notices directly to their hosting provider.

safe harbor = hosting provider

You send a DMCA notice to YouTube directly because they have their own servers (Google empire).

Grooveshark is hosted by Level3 (level3.com). This hosting company's DMCA designated agent information is on this page:

level3.com/en/network-security/designation-of-agent/

Put the pressure on the hosting companies themselves. And if any company lies to you or tries to cover a scammer, go public and ask all the other artists to never do business with the hosting company that had this mafia behavior.

Hurt them where it hurts the most...

<http://www.digitalmusicnews.com/stories/101711grooveshark>

Reply

Comment By: @EricSongza

Thursday, October 13, 2011

Eric Davich
This is amazing.

Reply

Comment By: Joda

Thursday, October 13, 2011

Nice expose Paul! Keep up the good work!

Reply

Comment By: Trumped4399

Thursday, October 13, 2011

I guess you gotta add King Crimson to that list of artists who'd gladly spit in the faces of the bottomfeeders at Grooveshark...

Grooveshark -- how does it feel to be so universally hated by artists?

Reply

Comment By: tony colman

Thursday, October 13, 2011

more utter gash from Grooveshark. They have no respect for creators whatsoever. They do not take down content if you ask them to, and they upload content illegally. They make Pirate Bay look good. At least PB don't pretend to be hollier than thou.

Reply

Comment By: blu mar ten

Thursday, October 13, 2011

+1 on the grooveshark hate from artists.

getting stuff removed from there is next to impossible unless you want to make it a full-time job.

fuck you grooveshark, fuck you

	Reply
<p>Comment By: Food For Thought Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>What Megan reports above is verbatim to what I've heard dozens of times.</p> <p>All indications are that Grooveshark's takedown mechanism is a ruse intended to exhaust and frustrate artists & labels while making their site appear to be DMCA compliant.</p> <p>Don't believe me (or the others posting same here)? Try to get a track you own/control taken down (and if you do get it down watch how quickly it "mysteriously" goes back up).</p>	Reply
<p>Comment By: Mich Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>"Ingestion problems"? I'm having a bit of trouble swallowing that.</p>	Reply
<p>Comment By: Visitor Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>Haha http://grooveshark.com/#/album/In+The+Court+Of+The+Crimson+King/5049111</p>	Reply
<p>Comment By: Visitor Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>Still up: http://grooveshark.com/s/The+Court+Of+The+Crimson+King/3d30tp?src=5</p>	Reply
<p>Comment By: lcart210 Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>Exposing these conversations brings far more pressure to bear than the most exhaustive article. Really appreciate it, Paul. Keep up the great work.</p>	Reply
<p>Comment By: JSS Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>*yawn*</p> <p>How long will people continue to gripe about file sharing and oline streams? Aren't we in year 13 of this same old debate. The landscape has changed. You can't put it back in the box. Bread's also more expensive than it was in 1970. That's how it goes. Evolve or die.</p>	Reply
<p>Comment By: Steve Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>Evolve or die?</p> <p>Simple-minded argument. Historically, as technology has evolved, copyright law has evolved along with it. Not just "died." The rights of artist and songwriters aren't simply thrown out the window.</p> <p>Jeez -- try to at least contribute <i>something</i> of value to the conversation.</p>	Reply
<p>Comment By: Bread IS more expensive Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>And it doesn't become more affordable when the artist gets ripped off.</p> <p>I've heard this lame response more than I care to remember. Would you work for free, or worse yet, have your labor stolen?</p>	Reply
<p>Comment By: tom thumb Friday, October 14, 2011</p> <p>clarify for me - you seem to be saying that if some new technology arrives that allows wannabe tech company millionaires to take what you create without giving you anything in return, you're some sort</p>	

of stick-in-the-mud for not cheering and going along with it?

"there is huge difference between someone inviting a guest into their home (where they have a choice in advance) and someone moving into your home uninvited and then giving you the chance to evict them. Particularly if that same uninvited guest returns every day until they are evicted again - at your own expense."

Reply

Comment By: What?

Saturday, October 22, 2011

There's a huge difference here. This isn't simple filesharing. This is a bunch of punks making MILLIONS of dollars on the backs of these artists. These artists are getting ZERO compensation.

I e-mail you a track, fine. You really should technically have bought it, but who cares? I've shared albums with friends, send them copies. It's all good. Even torrenting is cool. Why? Because for the most part, people aren't directly profiting off of this. Beyond that, tracking down exactly what you're looking for and then building your collection of improperly tagged tracks is a pain in the ass. It's much easier to just go to grooveshark. For the less than tech-savvy it's the bomb! A single website with serach-click-play functionality, all built into a legit/legal looking operation. That way, even those who have probably never used P2P in their lives and those who might think they're not doing anything scummy jump on board and and enjoy the freebies.

People then sit there and think, "Man. Pandora is crap. I can't listen to whatever I want, I have to sit through those lame-ass audio ads, and I can only skip forward a limited number of times. I'm going to grooveshark. They run ads too. So the artists must be getting a piece there too." Most of the uninformed masses fail to realize that Pandora has licensing agreements in place and is playing by the books. That's how they're (barely) able to offer a free service. Meanwhile, these chumps at Grooveshark are pocketing virtually ALL of the ad revenue they bring in. I'm not a musician and am in no way involved in the music industry. But I know wrong when I see it. And Grooveshark is just plain wrong.

Reply

Comment By: contentprovidernot

Monday, October 24, 2011

You don't understand the problem.

Reply

Comment By: What's a "mistruth"?

Friday, October 14, 2011

That has to be one of the funniest things I've read lately.

My kids tell me mistruths all the time, apparently. But I can send them to their room. Can't do that here, unfortunately.

Excellent post.

Reply

Comment By: Steve

Friday, October 14, 2011

I feel all the hate towards Grooveshark is justified. Yes, things are moving towards that direction, and I fully support it, as a musician and a music fan. The cat's out of the bag, so to speak, and as much as my life would potentially be easier if it was 1993, I haven't played an actual CD in years. Haven't had to.

The only thing that bugs me about this is while Grooveshark is trying to circumvent the issues that other sites are having, you can't find Crimson music on any 'legit' streaming site either. As a King Crimson fan, I think much of that music is timeless and should be available to be discovered by younger musicians, and it frustrates me that Fripp is so determined to keep his music away from them. At least I was able to upload my Crimson (and Beatles. And Zep. And AC/DC) collection to Google Music.

Reply

Comment By: Oh, honestly.

Friday, October 14, 2011

RF's music is readily available. He just insists that it's come by honestly. There is absolutely no truth in the implication that he is trying to keep his music away from people.

Reply

Comment By: Kev

Friday, October 14, 2011

Here's the net take away from this story -- and from similar stories that will inevitably come out in the future.

Grooveshark loses.

Regardless of how well arguments are made, pro or con, in this silly comments section -- Grooveshark loses. The headline says it all -- and that is the take-away in the minds of the collective public. That GS is part of the problem, and not artist advocates.

GS wants so badly to be in the same conversation as MOG, Rdio, Spotify and the other more legitimate streaming sites. But they're most often not. Articles like these -- with damning headlines, no less -- are each a nail in their eventual coffin. Their investors (Michael Buckley @ Intel Capital), their brand sponsors, their advertisers -- even the artists they choose to promote -- they'll eventually fall by the wayside. The reason being: the cons of the association with Grooveshark exceed the pros. Essentially, there's too much residual stink associated with GS.

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Friday, October 14, 2011

When told for the umpteenth time by Declan Colgan and Robert Fripp to remove unauthorised King Crimson and related material (for which all recording copyrights are owned outright by Fripp) from their site, Groove\$hark's "VP of Legal Affairs" responded:

Mr. Panegyric and Mr. Fripp:

I am surprised by your complete lack of professionalism and diligence...

I think this tells you what kind of outfit they are - they're completely in the wrong and know it, but rather than apologise, make amends and clean up their act, they prefer to sling mud.

Parasites, pure and simple.

Reply

Comment By: HA

Friday, October 14, 2011

I love that people think anyone at Grooveshark actually makes money.

Reply

Comment By: lol

Friday, October 14, 2011

" Comment By: HA

I love that people think anyone at Grooveshark actually makes money. "

no one thinks that they make money. we know this because they don't pay any of us.

what we object to is them trying to build a business without paying for any of the construction materials.

as someone said above - parasites

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Friday, October 14, 2011

\$2million a month and 'profitable' by their own reckoning

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Friday, October 14, 2011

Here are profiles of the gentleman who accused Robert Fripp and his licensee of a "complete lack of professionalism" when they asked Groove\$hark to stop illegally streaming their copyright recordings.

His name is Marshall Custer and he plays the drums.

www.linkedin.com/pub/marshall-custer/4/153/409

www.colorado.edu/law/careers/profiles/custer.htm

Reply

Comment By: @amaccardo

Friday, October 14, 2011

Anthony Accardo

Absolutely outrageous

	Reply
<hr/>	
Comment By: @LondonElek	Friday, October 14, 2011
London Elektriccity good to see Grooveshark maintaing their rep for illegally uploading music.	
	Reply
<hr/>	
Comment By: WILL	Friday, October 14, 2011
Paul, you're gonna be taking Hypbot's ad revenue real soon! It's kicking off on here!	
	Reply
<hr/>	
Comment By: LOL	Friday, October 14, 2011
at this comment	
	Reply
<hr/>	
Comment By: @Alternate1985	Friday, October 14, 2011
Nick Mango It's 12:57pm est, and I can still listen to King Crimson on Grooveshark.	
	Reply
<hr/>	
Comment By: Theo Aronson	Friday, October 14, 2011
kudos to both Pauls for how they handled themselves	
	Reply
<hr/>	
Comment By: justin1992	Friday, October 14, 2011
Uh – sounds like a mangement shuffle is long over-due at good 'ol Grooveshark... What a bunch of hacks. Occupy Grooveshark!! Hahahaha...	
	Reply
<hr/>	
Comment By: Indie Label	Friday, October 14, 2011
We had this exact same experience with an extremely similar email exchange. Totally and blatently illegal and they don't care. They're hoping to sell to someone before anyone calls them on it and walk away with cash.	
	Reply
<hr/>	
Comment By: Darren	Friday, October 14, 2011
I know this is the kind of sensational bull that Paul R thrives on, but for some reason or another, I expected more out of the digitalmusicnews community. This is what I hear ad nauseum from the majority of content holders and industry authorities (work at majors, indies, management, artists, etc.) -since Napster, the industry is evolving to some kind of cloud-based access model (remains to be seen exactly what this will look like in ~5 years) -teens (the next generation of music buyers) almost never pay to listen to music because they don't feel they have to. Again, Napster reeducated the consumer side of the industry into this mindset and that's never changing. This being the next generation of music consumers, this leads to hopes of bundling and subscription revenues which leads to.. -they really hope subscription model works, but VERY few people are hopeful considering there would need to be ONE winner to meet the kind of numbers that would pay out everyone who owns a piece of the content. I say 'very' few because anyone who looks at the numbers knows that Spotify has to reach a RIDICULOUS number of subscribers before they can become profitable and start paying actual revenues	

rather than the money Sean Parker and the rest of their VCs gave them to start

-Grooveshark is a 'disrupter' (more on this to follow)

-No one, and I mean, NO ONE is happy about per-stream pay outs. If you're an artist or a manager and you're banking on per-stream payouts being your major revenue generator for the future, you need to start looking into the alternative revenue streams that are going to fund the careers of the musicians with slightly more business-savvy.

I don't agree with everything Grooveshark's done in the past. For the majority of their time around, they've been a young company that's made some pretty immature decisions. What I do believe is that Grooveshark's model of free-to-play, unlimited access to music is what's going to prevail, if not in 5, certainly in the next 10 years.

Technology takes consumers ahead,

copyright laws fight to keep up,

a newly realized industry is born via new revenue streams.

As a content rights holder, I'm doing my best to learn the lesson from 10 years ago the industry failed at when they flipped the finger to both consumers and 'Napster', the disrupter that absolutely changed this industry for the better. Now 'that's an outrageous statement' is what you're saying because we still haven't figured out how to become a \$40 billion/year industry yet, but we'll get there. This industry is better than ever because...

-more music is being created than ever before

-more people are listening than ever before

Reply

Comment By: Andrea

Friday, October 14, 2011

Snooze...

And Grooveshark as *disrupter*? Please, you insult truly disruptive technologies by this statement. No one is trying to stop new technology -- in fact, we clearly welcome it. But models that rip off artists won't last. The tide will turn.

What to do with the monies *not* being paid out for artist royalties? Grooveshark should a great crisis PR firm and try dearly to find a positive spin out of all this...

(Kudos to Digital Music News...)

Reply

Comment By: Darren

Friday, October 14, 2011

Clearly. This industry is well known for embracing the technology leaps.

/unnesecary sarcasm

But in all seriousness and so I understand where you're coming from, is your point that per stream royalties are going to be the major revenue generators for artists in our 'new industry'?

Reply

Comment By: pissed off artist

Friday, October 14, 2011

all utterly irrelevant.

what grooveshark are doing by allowing unmoderated upload of artist material then refusing to take it down is basically saying that you have no option but to be raw material in their build-a-business-model experiment.

If artists don't want to be a part of it why are they being forced into it?!?!?

Whether the artists are short-sighted or not is neither here nor there. Their *right* to be short-sighted is being removed from them in order to build someone else's business that they will never see any benefit from, and that is simply **wrong**.

Reply

Comment By: Andrea

Friday, October 14, 2011

Amen, PissedOffArtist.

Groovesharks arrogance amazes me.

Reply

Comment By: Darren	Friday, October 14, 2011
I agree with you on that. Grooveshark needs to figure out their ingestion problems.	
Reply	

Comment By: Indie Label	Friday, October 14, 2011
Darren,	
What you're saying is that since someone figured out away to give artists stuff away for free, artists are dumb for not letting them? You're saying that artists and labels are not "business savvy" because they want to be paid for their work? That's literally the opposite of "business savvy."	
What you're seeing is one group of folks who play by the rules (laws) and another group who, since they're not collectible monetarily, don't really have any motivation to follow those rules. This is how YouTube built a business on Viacom properties and sold to Google for a bagillion dollars; then google was immediately sued by Viacom.	
The OTHER option, the one that makes sense, the one that's "savvy," is that artists and labels stop laying down and accepting this "people think music is free" (which, by the way, isn't true... iTunes sells a metric assload of music every day). If everyone who makes music decides to stick up for themselves and demand to be paid what they deserve... then it's no longer the "reality."	
Oh, well, people are stealing all our shit... we'd be dumb not to let them.	
Bull.	
Reply	

Comment By: Indie Label	Friday, October 14, 2011
Also, Darren...	
Your statement, which is echoed by many, that teens don't buy music is compeltely not true. Do you have any idea where you first heard that statement? Probably from someone else who heard it from someone who heard it from the guy who totally made it up because it sounded right.	
It's False.	
You want proof? Justin Bieber has \$100 Million + in iTunes sales of proof.	
Apparently you think that's 65-year-old coal miners downloading Biebes.	
If people stopped ASSUMING these things as given; and scams like Grooveshark would stop taking it upon themselves to "liberate" other people's content... that would allow the industry to create a solution that works for everyone.	
Until then, look at an actual number/statistic now and then.	
Reply	

Comment By: Anon Coward	Friday, October 14, 2011
http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=king+crimson	
7,380 Results and Counting	
Reply	

Comment By: Visitor	Friday, October 14, 2011
what's your point? youtube have a proper payment structure in place and are paying out no problem - i make a lot of money from youtube plays.	
They also have a dmca process that works and take stuff down within 24 hours or less.	
no problem with youtube at all. loads of problems with grooveshark though.	
Reply	

Comment By: The Laughing Man	Friday, October 14, 2011
You get paid for views of content uploaded by users other than yourself? Man, my understanding of how youtube advertising works is way off.	
I must assume then that isn't the case and you do periodic searches of youtube's content yourself and submit takedown requests. AFAIK, isn't that exactly how you'd deal with Grooveshark or any other company that has to abide by the DMCA?	

I'm not a lawyer, but I don't know of any minimum/maximum time someone has to complete the DMCA process. I'd think anything within a few days would be acceptable.

~

The original point of posting that search URL is because others have been posting Grooveshark search URL's in a similar format. If the shit pot is going to be stirred I'm one to ensure that *all* the shit gets stirred.

If the copyright holder of King Crimson want's to exercrise their owner rights I'd hope that they'd do so to all DMCA compliant sites.

Reply

Comment By: Visitor Friday, October 14, 2011

You get paid for views of content uploaded by users other than yourself? Man, my understanding of how youtube advertising works is way off.

Yes, exactly so. You get on youtube's content program and you get paid for plays regardless of who uploaded it. In fact the more people that upload your stuff the better it is for you. We make good quality videos for our tracks and give them out free to our fans to stick on their channels specifically for this reason. It helps them by giving them decent quality content for their channels and saves them the hassle of have to create videos, and it helps us because we get paid for the plays and get to control the quality of the content.

I must assume then that isn't the case and you do periodic searches of youtube's content yourself and submit takedown requests. AFAIK, isn't that exactly how you'd deal with Grooveshark or any other company that has to abide by the DMCA?

No, see above. The difference is youtube honours takedown requests and deals with them immediately whereas Grooveshark just ignores them.

Reply

Comment By: Allan Saturday, October 15, 2011

Hello Visitor, thanks for your comment.

>We make good quality videos for our tracks and give them out free to our fans to stick on their channels specifically for this reason.

Great - but other musicians prefer not to give away their recordings free, which is really what this row with GrooveShark is about.

Reply

Comment By: Jon b. Friday, October 14, 2011

For what it is worth, Mr. Geller responded almost immediately to an email from us and promised to act quickly on our take-down request.

Jon b.
Valley Entertainment

Reply

Comment By: Haha Friday, October 14, 2011

Of course he's going to act quickly, now that he has completely humiliated himself, and his company!

Geller isn't going to amount to much in this business the way he conducts himself...

Reply

Comment By: Allan Saturday, October 15, 2011

For what it is worth, Mr. Geller responded almost immediately to an email from us and promised to act quickly on our take-down request.

Jon b. (Valley Entertainment)

Thanks Jon. Unfortunately it probably isn't worth much; GrooveShark have repeatedly promised Declan Cogan and Robert Fripp they will take down illegal materila, but it always reappears.

This suggests they don't really want to sort out the problem.

Reply

Comment By: GR8FL Saturday, October 15, 2011

Just wondering how Robert Fripp, King Crimson, Porcupine Tree, et al thinks they are going to expose their music; attract new fans and keep their current ones with their seeming investment in the archaic business model in this digital age that we currently are in? I truly believe that musicians should be fairly compensated for their work and nobody should be ripping anyone off, but there has to be some realism inserted into this thread.

I am just a regular person who happens to like a lot of music. Personally, I have invested thousands and thousands of \$\$ over the years. But I am not going to buy anything that I have never heard of. Because of the Internet and sites such as GS (which I don't like much for other reasons), I have been exposed to more new music than through any combined medium which includes XM/Sirius (also on the decline). Once upon a time I used to go to record stores and sample vinyl records. I would walk in having no intention to buy anything, only to walk out an hour later having purchased 20 albums, all because I sampled a few tracks. The same held true when I purchased CDs. But the demise of local music retailers has curtailed this experience.

It's only been through the Internet and sites that allow music to be streamed that has served to 'market' music for free for the recording industry. Because of the Internet, I have discovered plenty of music which has resulted in spending large amounts of money on CDs, digital downloads, upgraded audio software/hardware, shows, merchandise, etc. I know 1000s of people that have done the same. I just don't get how the recording industry refuses to see how this all benefits them. But instead of being grateful, they bury their head in the sand and refuse to understand how their artists are promoted at no cost to them at all.

And yes, GS was wrong to not have honored the takedown request when first asked. I will also respect the wishes of Robert Fripp and never listen online again to anything to do with his music.

Reply

Comment By: Visitor Saturday, October 15, 2011

Comment By: GR8FL

Just wondering how Robert Fripp, King Crimson, Porcupine Tree, et al thinks they are going to expose their music; attract new fans and keep their current ones with their seeming investment in the archaic business model in this digital age that we currently are in? I truly believe that musicians should be fairly compensated for their work and nobody should be ripping anyone off, but there has to be some realism inserted into this thread.

Realistically, those particular artists are doing fine and are good examples of the new business model: they own their own recordings, advertise their music on their own sites and don't have to resort to Spotify et al (at the rate of \$0.000001 per play or whatever it is) to attract listeners.

Of course it's not so easy for new bands, but one way forward would be for artists to set up their own online shops and form alliances with similar-minded acts and labels to form commercial mini-networks. Musicians are a co-operative breed and will happily link to each others' sites if they like the music.

Good point about the demise of record shops; but really, it's not hard to find new music on the internet via legitimate, artist-approved sites and their audio clips.

Because of the Internet, I have discovered plenty of music which has resulted in spending large amounts of money on CDs, digital downloads, upgraded audio software/hardware, shows, merchandise, etc.

Cool - nothing wrong with the Internet, the beef here is about the unethical behaviour of some companies who trade on it.

Reply

Comment By: GR8FL Saturday, October 15, 2011

Visitor: You stated "*Realistically, those particular artists are doing fine and are good examples of the new business model: they own their own recordings, advertise their music on their own sites and don't have to resort to Spotify et al (at the rate of \$0.000001 per play or whatever it is) to attract listeners.*"

This would be true if people actually heard of King Crimson and purposely went to their site to find the music. But I can guarantee you that for every person that has heard of this band, that there are dozens that never have.

The music sites that I have frequented, where I have joyously streamed a new track that I legally purchased, then digitized and uploaded, has in many cases exposed thousands to a particular artist for the first time. Some would argue that I am breaking the law by uploading and making it available. I argue in return that I have benefitted the artist because now they have 10 or 100 or 1000 new fans who are in turn telling their community about it, which in turn creates even more interest exponentially. Bottom line is more revenue to the artist through CD sales, ticket sales, merchandise sales, etc.

Maybe this isn't the right thread to be discussing this and I am not defending Grooveshark at all; they were slapped with a DMCA Takedown and have ignored it. They should comply.

But I want to make very clear that music lovers such as myself, who have no profit making motive, only the desire to listen and share with others on a global level, are not being exposed to bands such as King Crimson if this is the business model they are sticking with.

Reply

Comment By: Visitor Monday, October 17, 2011

"Realistically, those particular artists are doing fine and are good examples of the new business model: they own their own recordings, advertise their music on their own sites and don't have to resort to Spotify et al (at the rate of \$0.000001 per play or whatever it is) to attract listeners."

Actually it was me (Allan) who said this - something went awry with the 'reply' procedure :)

I think it's worth briefly discussing the exposure angle since it's frequently cited as a justification for illicit music usage.

... I have benefitted the artist because now they have 10 or 100 or 1000 new fans who are in turn telling their community about it, which in turn creates even more interest exponentially.

That's an argument one hears a lot. Where I would disagree is that you don't "create fans" by adding a group's name and tracks to a list of 5,000 others on some streaming site. It's too indiscriminate. The internet is supposed to be a tool for intelligent, target-based marketing: a good example of that is Burning Shed in the UK, who intelligently group together acts who might appeal to the same listeners.

I can guarantee you that for every person that has heard of this band, that there are dozens that never have.

That's OK. It's sensible not to try to market to everybody. Most music doesn't have mass appeal, and there would be no point in marketing a special-interest band like King Crimson to the world at large. IMHO what the music scene needs now is intelligent, consensual focus, not the scattergun, globalized approach of the old record companies..

I understand you're not defending Grooveshark et al, thanks for making that clear!

Reply

Comment By: T Monday, October 17, 2011

How Mr Fripp & others like him expose their music is by utilising the internet to market it & they should then be entitled to expect due reward for their efforts. On dgmlive.com I watched the video of Scarcity of Miracles, & bought the cd, went to a performance by Travis & Fripp advertised there, bought the cd of "Thread" & a couple of weeks later downloaded the same performance. Perhaps I am out of date as well, but the expectation that music of quality will continue to be made by those like Fripp if they can't scrape some sort of living from it. I wonder how many there are like [Martin Orford](#) who have quietly given up as piracy has taken their livelihood away. Buy his cd (or legitimate download) "The Old Road"

Reply

Comment By: party people! Friday, October 14, 2011

calling all artists, songwriters and copyright creators:

there's too much hatin', and not enuf lovin'!

come show some real love to those fluffy, wacky groovesharkers!

they're throwing a party next thursday night, october 20th, from 9 until midnight, at the LES Thompson Hotel. this isn't a cmj event, so all you have to do is rsvp to cmj@soundctrl.com

paul, jack, sam and the rest of the grooveshark crew can't wait to meet you!

:)

Reply

Comment By: Mathew Saturday, October 15, 2011

You think you can insult a musician and then expect the rest to act as if it never happened?

The only way I am licensing my label's catalog (+450 titles) for Grooveshark is if Robert Fripp does the same.

Want to bet how many other label managers and artists think like this?

Reply

Reply

Comment By: mellowlandings Saturday, October 15, 2011

Comment By: party people!
calling all artists, songwriters and copyright creators:
there's too much hatin', and not enuf lovin'!
come show some real love to those stuffy, wacky groovesharkers!
...more like "too much stealin', not enough hidin'!"
After Grooveshark's blatant disrespect and disregard for the artists' right to compensation, you seriously expect them to just turn the other way and run to this so-called 'party' with opejn arms?
Pray tell me, 'party person'...are you nuts?

Reply

Comment By: I had enough of this Saturday, October 15, 2011

My \$0.10 piece of public advice to Robert Fripp and any one else hurt by the piracy websites like Grooveshark:
If Grooveshark is not responding to *multiple* DMCA notices, it is time to start sending them to their **hosting company and domain registrar** (yes, they are service providers as well, yes I have done this successfully in the past).
Also, BMI, ASCAP, SECAC, MCPS e.t.c. have to step up and protect their members. Enough is enough. Let's see if a hosting company wants to ignore a notice from a PRO.

Reply

Comment By: Jazz Musician Saturday, October 15, 2011

Sad times !
Is greed the new religion ?

Reply

Comment By: Ty Sunday, October 16, 2011

Grooveshark is not only built on the backs of artists and writers, but also on the backs of intern labor.

Reply

Comment By: @LondonElek Monday, October 17, 2011

London Elektricity
good to see Grooveshark maintainga their rep for illegally uploading music.

Reply

Comment By: @MusicTechPolicy Monday, October 17, 2011

Editor Baker
Grooveshark wants "time & patience" because "takedowns have been honored", yet you sell King Crimson music illegally

Reply

Comment By: DMCA much? Monday, October 17, 2011

Enough with the Grooveshark hate. They are entitled to the DMCA for user-generated content just like everyone else. The only way to get undistributed/orphan content into a subscription service is to incorporate a user-upload function. The more millions of tracks, the more people will subscribe. These sites are the future of the music industry, but must be scaled out to provide the residual annuity that will eventually replace record sales. Stop living in the past people.

Reply

Comment By: IGNORANT Monday, October 17, 2011

Protecting artists and songwriters IS the future. And protecting these rights in a way that encourages the development new technologies: that's the very do-able goal.

What Grooveshark does is old school, sleazy, and straight-up highway robbery.

Reply

Comment By: Los Angeles Artist (still comi Monday, October 17, 2011

Essentially what you have here, is a ton of people upset at how things have changed and moved on beyond their means to control them.

What you don't have here, is all the artists who are doing great right now.. because they quite simply don't hang out on these kind of blogs and lament for brighter times that past.

The Internet = Free

No matter which way you dice it,

Sure there are some services that provide easier access to music, and some people who dont mind paying for that, but i genuinely feel King Crimson and any artist on here who is mad at groove shark would be better off getting off the blogs, and into their bedroom and writing a decent enough song that people actually want to SHARE!

Thats not a personal stab at any band but more so a reality check, because last time i looked the only bands making any money right now are:

- Touring Artists - that actually have tons of people who want to see them, because they were SHARED a lot.
- Synced Artists - that write either astounding songs that suit a certain film, or have been so SHARED that their perceived value to a brand is worth enough to shell out good size amounts of money for them.
- Pre Internet era bands - bands that got out to the masses before the internet did, and largely have been able to maintain and hold a following before the myspace ere and beyond, of course the ones that haven't are perhaps the ones right now who are fighting all this 'progress' 'change' etc etc

Doesn't that make SHARING sort of a new currency? because the value off each SHARE.. or LIKE or any of that.. is something not even your major labels can buy. You cant fake excitement for a song, but yet when you are SHARED / LIKED alot then all sorts of things start happening for your career...

Funnily enough, all the new platforms do provide just that currency.. Spotify, Grooveshark etc..

So their 'Grooveshark' model for how they get paid, is not really your problem, your problem is how you get paid.. and you gotta wake up soon and realise, your not gonna be buying a house because a million people streamed your song.. but fuck! a million people streamed your song? That must have been due to a TON of SHARES and LIKES, and that must mean its really good.. so get off your argumentative arse, write a decent enough song, get SHARED, get LIKED then get on tour and go see them.. your also not gonna buy a house because you yanked your music off spotify or fought grooveshark with such bravado ..just so that you could remain in the past?

You will quite simply in my opinion, fall slowly into the 'where are they now' part of most of your fans/supporters minds..

..because they are all on Grooveshark, Spotify, etc etc.. and if they aren't yet they will be within a year or so.

Welcome to the new music industry people, its different, very different.. but people still LIKE and SHARE it just like they did when it was word of mouth in the 50s..

(i wrote this quickly because i have a busy day, but scanned my emails this morning and got frustrated by this stupid pointless debate.. so apologies if my grammar is not decent)

much love and luck to all
x

Reply

Comment By: Allan Monday, October 17, 2011

Hi Los Angeles Artist,

Thanks for your positivity. *I* think essentially what we have here is a lot of people upset at Grooveshark, but I take your general points and appreciate you made them without insulting anyone!

>The Internet = Free

OK, so you're suggesting that artists should SHARE their music, as in give it all away? And if they give it away in sufficient quantities, they will make money by other means, right?

>your problem is how you get paid..

Quite! Can you kindly give me a specific example of a contemporary act this financial strategy (i.e. giving away their recordings) has worked for?

Best wishes, Allan

Reply

Comment By: Los Angeles Artist (still comi Monday, October 17, 2011

Yes Alan.. check out a band called The Weeknd
<http://the-weeknd.com/>

they have been giving their album / music away free on their site since march i believe.. and its so good and getting shared so much that they now are getting booked with very good fees all across this fine country.. upward of 25k per show.. because there is DEMAND for them that came from thousands of SHARES and LIKES.

Many different blogs got behind them because they are GOOD. Also their music is for this time apparently.. That doesnt mean your band or my band is BAD, it just means we either havent had the luck or the right timing collide with all our hard work just yet.. but if our songs are actually good.. then you know what! im sure something positive will happen for each of us.

If not it doesnt matter.. we still made good art that we can be so proud of..

its disheartening to comprehend and hard to realise sometimes that things will NEVER again be how they were.

But sooner or later whether you realise it or not you will either evolve like the artists that aren't fighting this.. or you will simply be left behind bitter and twisted..

again that is not directed at you.. its simply directed at myself, at any artist that is struggling to get their head around this adaptation that is currently taking place.

hope that makes sense?

Reply

Comment By: Visitor Monday, October 17, 2011

none of that is either here or there.
 someone above already discussed this. the conversation is not about whether artists are being shortsighted but whether they have the *right* to be shortsighted or not.

grooveshark is removing artists *right* to be stupid or not and that's simply unacceptable.

Reply

Comment By: Los Angeles Artist (still comi Monday, October 17, 2011

@Visitor

respectfully disagree..

And I also believe that first and foremost reality.. removes the right to be stupid.. the term evolve or die, is very relevent in this discussion.

After reality.. perhps, progress.. the future.. life.. evolution.. all of those removes the artist right to be stupid..

maybe not even removes it.. just artists should not be stupid.

People had to stop selling horse and carts when the car was invented.. whether they wanted to or not.. they didnt have a choice. The Car cannot be blamed for being disrespectful to the horse and cart industry..

either ways, this is the kind of argument or topic that will never resolve.. i just wanted to say something so that other artists reading this who are open minded to the future, and how its all evolving may see another side to this very ill-advised and ignorant debate..

If your mad at the new industry.. leave it, get involved with real estate or something else. Last time i checked you still cant download a house.

I cant imagine it being too helpful to your creativity to remain negative and futile, Perhaps start smiling, and stop fighting for the last few crumbs of sales from the old horse and cart music industry, and keep making your art!!

the future is bright people.. its just very different!

again..

much love

x

Reply

Comment By: Visitor Monday, October 17, 2011

you're just reiterating the same point

"People had to stop selling horse and carts when the car was invented.. whether they wanted to or not.. they didnt have a choice."

that analogy only works if you change it to

"People were forced into selling horse and carts when the car was invented, whether they wanted to or not...with the money for their work going straight to the car company - they didnt have a choice."

Reply

Comment By: Allan

Monday, October 17, 2011

Thanks for that example LAA!

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Monday, October 17, 2011

I work for Grooveshark. Here is some information from the trenches:

We are assigned a predetermined ammount of weekly uploads to the system and get a small extra bonus if we manage to go above that (not easy).The assignments are assumed as direct orders from the top to the bottom, we don't just volunteer to "enhance" the Grooveshark database.

All search results are monitored and when something is tagged as "not available", it get's queued up to our lists for upload. You have to visualize the database in two general sections: "known" stuff and "undiscovered/indie/underground". The "known" stuff is taken care internally by uploads. Only for the "undiscovered" stuff are the users involved as explained in some posts above. Practically speaking, there is not much need for users to upload a major label album since we already take care of this on a daily basis.

Are the above legal, or ethical? Of course not. Don't reply to give me a lecture. I know. But if the labels and their laywers can't figure out how to stop it, then I don't feel bad for having a job. It's tough times.

Why am I disclosing all this? Well, I have been here a while and I don't like the attitude that the administration has aquired against the artists. They are the enemy. They are the threat. The things that are said internally about them would make you very very angry. Interns are promised getting a foot in the music industry, only to hear these people cursing and bad mouthing the whole industry all day long, to the point where you wonder what would happen if Grooveshark get's hacked by Anonymous one day and all the emails leak on some torrent or something.

And, to confirm the fears of the members of King Crimson, there is no way in hell you can get your stuff down. They are already tagged since you sent in your first complaint. The administration knows that you can't afford to sue for infringement.

Reply

Comment By: Visitor

Monday, October 17, 2011

quoted before deletion ^

"

I work for Grooveshark. Here is some information from the trenches:

We are assigned a predetermined ammount of weekly uploads to the system and get a small extra bonus if we manage to go above that (not easy).The assignments are assumed as direct orders from the top to the bottom, we don't just volunteer to "enhance" the Grooveshark database.

All search results are monitored and when something is tagged as "not available", it get's queued up to our lists for upload. You have to visualize the database in two general sections: "known" stuff and "undiscovered/indie/underground". The "known" stuff is taken care internally by uploads. Only for the "undiscovered" stuff are the users involved as explained in some posts above. Practically speaking, there is not much need for users to upload a major label album since we already take care of this on a daily basis.

Are the above legal, or ethical? Of course not. Don't reply to give me a lecture. I know. But if the labels and their laywers can't figure out how to stop it, then I don't feel bad for having a job. It's tough times.

Why am I disclosing all this? Well, I have been here a while and I don't like the attitude that the administration has aquired against the artists. They are the enemy. They are the threat. The things that are said internally about them would make you very very angry. Interns are promised getting a foot in the music industry, only to hear these people cursing and bad mouthing the whole industry all day long, to the point where you wonder what would happen if Grooveshark get's hacked by Anonymous one day and all the emails leak on some torrent or something.

And, to confirm the fears of the members of King Crimson, there is no way in hell you can get your stuff down. They are already tagged since you sent in your first complaint. The administration knows that you can't afford to sue for infringement."

Reply

Comment By: Allan Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Says it all, doesn't it? Now watch Grooveshark deny that this person works for them. If you're not sure who's telling the truth, reflect on the fact that G'shark's boss lied to Robert Fripp when he said he had permission from a "label partner" to upload KC material. (A lie he subsequently publicly retracted.)

Reply

Comment By: Nick Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Actually, it's not that easy. They can't just deny it, because they can't be 100% sure if this person has documents or files at hand. What if they send out a press release to deny it, only to wake up to a data leak the next day?

They will probably try to find out who this person is, by making some kind of unofficial investigation inside the company. That is also very tricky, because what are you going to do, sue him...? That would be like a gang going to the nearest police station and making a complaint about a member for going online and saying that they are scamming people's credit cards.

On the other hand, maybe I give Grooveshark too much credit. Maybe they are stupid enough to go down that road. That would be fun. I can picture the Feds in the field office laughing just by reading these lines... :D

Reply

Comment By: L. Hayes Tuesday, October 18, 2011

This is huge!

Hey @Visitor from Grooveshark, if you're listening you HAVE to email Digital Music News to confirm your identity and they'll protect your confidentiality. This has to get out there.

LH

Reply

Comment By: No, no, no. Tuesday, October 18, 2011

That's a very bad idea - Grooveshark could request that Digital Music News reveal their source in court. Perhaps the whistleblower has his/her reasons not to reveal his identity. We have to respect that.

Another interesting fact is that Grooveshark grabs interns from the University of Florida. I wonder what the university officials think about the whole situation of internship labor in "web 2.0" corporations.

Reply

Comment By: Visitor Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Yeah, sorry but that is not going happen any time soon. I am not stupid. If someone from digitalmusicnews.com thinks I am trolling, they can go ahead and delete my post. All the King Crimson music will eventually be available again, anyway. Song by song, perhaps, so that pissed English old man wont notice too soon. Don't take my word for it, just be a little bit patient, wait and see for yourselves. Do a search after a couple days or whatever. Maybe make a "mistake" and search for "King Crimson" as "song", instead of "artist".

Just because you can't see an album available right now, doesn't mean its not sitting quietly in the background. It is policy to put albums on "backup", when they have to be taken down due to a DMCA notice, to chill things out with the labels and what not. The albums are not deleted, if that's what you guys think.

My impression is that the labels only take action when some artist literally prints a page and holds it in front of their noses. So, if you are an artist, either accept it and move on, maybe find some other business to invest your time and talent, or do what you have to do to defend your current business. Pretending that there is some sort of middle ground won't take you very far.

(You should hear the Big Boss screams today. Ho ho ho. Furious. King Crimson - office chair / Big Boss - Steve Balmer)

Reply

Comment By: tarquin Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Looking at the numerous communications about this topic, it appears that Grooveshark are no better than thieves masquerading as a legitimate business. In King Crimson's case, it is abundantly clear who owns the copyright on the band's product.

The copyright owner has requested (demanded) on numerous occasions to remove King Crimson's music from Grooveshark and make it permanently unavailable. This has not happened.

If I walk into a record store and help myself to a bunch of CDs and walk out without paying, am I guilty of theft? Absolutely. Similarly taking music from the internet without paying for it is also stealing. Providing stolen goods for others to pilfer is also a crime, for which one can be tried in court: it is commonly known as "fencing".

Grooveshark has no case, or justification here. They should lose their business license on account of such (criminal) practice. Did Paul Geller get a degree at the Bernie Madoff School of Business Studies?

Reply

Comment By: the irony

Wednesday, October 19, 2011

Grooveshark admits they have no respect for artists' rights.

Yet "Grooveshark" is trademarked! :D

Reply

Comment By: Adam

Wednesday, October 19, 2011

This is crazy. You can still find King Crimson/Robert Fripp material on Grooveshark.

Fripp should e-mail a DMCA notice to Grooveshark's hosting company. The hosts generally avoid bad PR at all costs.

Reply

Comment By: Jeremy A

Thursday, October 20, 2011

OK, Grooveshark is a mafia company. No one in the music industry denies that.

But have King Crimson ever googled their band name? Right now there are piracy results in the first page on Google Search. If you want to protect yourself, you have to do it all around. Otherwise, scams like Grooveshark may play the "they are targeting us" card for PR purposes.

Reply

Comment By: Lisa Thomas Music Services

Monday, October 24, 2011

Paul Geller is either completely out of touch with his own company, hallucinatory, or just a complete liar.

I am the publishing administrator for the main songwriters of the Eagles and have spent hours upon hours serving DMCA takedown notices on Grooveshark's designated agent demanding the site remove all of the compositions owned and controlled by my clients. I have cited the specific url's of each *infringing* post in the notices. To date, Grooveshark has not removed any of the material. (I have noticed, however, that the url's constantly change, meaning that, while Grooveshark *might* momentarily remove a specific url, another identical replacement is uploaded within 24 hours.)

Grooveshark has not made any effort to serve NOI's with respect to its use of any compositions owned by any of my clients, and is not paying to use the music on its service, unlike Spotify, unlike Rhapsody, unlike the **legitimate** music services.

They do not pay labels; they do not pay artists. However, Mr. Geller and his staff surely do not work for free. Perhaps it's time for the artists who are being ripped off by Grooveshark to begin to contact the advertisers paying Grooveshark for ad space to let them know that association with the "evil" internet companies like Grooveshark will bring them the kind of bad publicity and reputation that's difficult to undo.

Artists have power. Grooveshark should be mindful of that.

Reply

Comment By: @JonMoskow

Tuesday, October 25, 2011

Jon Moskowitz

Music biz monkey business. Would be more compelling if I actually liked KC.

Reply

E

catalog, tens of millions of users flock to the site every month to listen to their favorite artists, discover music, and share tracks on social networks like Twitter and Facebook. Listening to any song instantly, creating playlists to return to later, and quick access to one's favorite music are ever the fundamentals of Grooveshark's offering.

Not only do you have access to the best of Grooveshark from any computer in the world, but you can take it with you anywhere you go with unlimited access to Grooveshark on your smartphone with Grooveshark Anywhere. Grooveshark also includes song downloads from MP3 store affiliates like iTunes and Amazon, and ringtones from Thumbplay, ensuring that users can take their favorite music with them wherever they are, in any format they prefer, while providing additional revenue to rights holders.

We're Social

- Follow us on Twitter
- Fan us on Facebook
- Visit our blog

Let's Talk

To get in touch with someone at Grooveshark regarding a press inquiry, please email press@grooveshark.com.

Logos

- Logotypes

Happiness
Find any song in the world and listen to it instantly.

Discovery
Get introduced to new music and new friends.

Freedom
Add your tunes to Grooveshark and access them from anywhere.

Help Blog Artists Careers Contact Privacy

Copyright © 2007-2011 All Rights Reserved
Powered by Grooveshark

F

About Us

Meet the team

Grooveshark is the world's largest on-demand and music discovery service. With over 15 million songs, Grooveshark is an ecosystem that brings together music fans, bands, music labels, and brands.

By creating new revenue sources for the music industry, innovative marketing opportunities for artists, and strategic data products for music and brand managers, Grooveshark cuts into music piracy by helping everyone—from fan to band—make the most of online music.

Grooveshark serves as an access point for fans, marketing hub for content producers, and an operations center for labels, agencies and brand managers. Grooveshark increases music revenues using one of the most innovative ad platforms in the world, attacks piracy in underperforming markets and reduces the cost of signing and breaking new acts, everyday.



Sam Tarantino
Founder + CEO

Sam is a musician, an entrepreneur, and a visionary. His intent is to fix the world's problems, but for now is settling on fixing the music industry.

[Twitter](#)



Josh Greenberg
Co-Founder + CTO

Josh polishes ideas and turns them into a reality. Josh enjoys contemplating, strategizing, observing, learning, leading, and getting things done.

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)



Vishal Agarwala
Director, Sponsorship & Events

Vishal sometimes can't decide if (he likes coding > designing) or designing more than coding. He also hates Internet Explorer 6 with a passion. But he loves you.

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)



Nikola Arabadjiev
Quality Assurance

Hailing from Bulgaria, Nikola enjoys being on the cutting edge of technology. He tests the latest and greatest at Grooveshark and has an immense passion for electronic music.

[About Us](#)

[Contact Us](#)

[Advertising](#)

[Grooveshark API](#)



I can honestly say it's even better than Pandora. The service is called Grooveshark, and from what I experienced they have as much music on their library as the others.





John Ashenden
 Director + VP of Product
 Happiness
 Create
 Find any song in the world and listen to it instantly.

Discovery
 Get introduced to new music and new friends.

Freedom
 Add your tunes to Grooveshark and access them from anywhere.

John with an H) is both an experienced graphic designer and web developer. John enjoys making things appear shinier than they should be.

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)

[Help](#)

[Blog](#)



James Barnes
 Graphic Designer + Illustrator

"If it weren't for physics and law enforcement, I would be unstoppable." — Bukowski



Chris Blackburn
 Director of Brand Partnerships

Chris enjoys the exploration and implementation stages involved in bringing talented artists to the mainstream. He also enjoys having a few packets of SweetN'Low close by at all times.



Jason Blate
 Internal Operations Director

Organizing the chaos is Jason's specialty. From in-office operations to heading the Street Team, his goal each day is to maintain and promote operational efficiency. Also, he is a ChiaPet connoisseur, which sometimes leads people to believe he may be stuck in the early 90's (not that there's anything wrong with that).



Josh Bonnain
 EVP of Business Development

Josh knows relationships drive healthy, efficient business. He leverages these to help expand Grooveshark into new and exciting territory.

[Twitter](#)



Dale Campbell
 Software Engineer

If voting could change the system, it would be illegal. If NOT voting could change the system, it would be illegal.

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)

[Blog](#)



Mark Caudill
Software Engineer

Mark works on backend code that runs Grooveshark. This code goes on to make music to your ears.

Copyright
© **Escape
Media
Group** 2007
-2011. All
Rights
Reserved.



Beth Condra
Director of Advertising

Beth graduated with her BA in Theatre from Florida State University in 2005. She enjoys listening to Beck, Devendra Banhart, The Smiths, and Patsy Cline. She once went as Gwen Stefani for Halloween and signed autographs.



Michael Cugini
Software Engineer

"The trouble with programmers is that you can never tell what a programmer is doing until it's too late." -- Seymour Cray

[Twitter](#)



Paulo Dasilva
Senior Software Engineer

Like a true Brazilian Paulo loves soccer, and he applies his soccer skills to programming where he passes bytes, dribbles bottlenecks, slide tackles bugs, and kicks packets into the net, so he can meet the team's Goooooals!

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)



Blaise DeAngelo
Director of Artist Relations

"Give me six hours to chop down a tree, and I will spend the first four sharpening the axe." — Abraham Lincoln

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)



Jack DeYoung
EVP of Music Strategy

Jack is the frontman of famed pop collective Vishal and The Agarwalas. Wolverines!!!

[Blog](#)



Kieran Diaz
Grooveshark Dude

I fight for the users!



Alex Estrada
Art Director

Alex is from Miami but her appetite is more diverse than you would assume knowing that. Not only does she like "Miami Steak" and "Miami Fried Corn Product" she also likes such things as "Bean" and "Starburst Candy". Sometime she has "Sweet Banana". Alex complains that the clubs in Gainesville aren't open late enough and that they aren't "killer" enough for her "Shoes, Tall". There is no "Sweet Coffee" for her all night "raging". Alex would like for someone to teach her "words, American" and "credit card shopping."

[Twitter](#)



Mike Feinberg
Sr. Vice President of Artist Development / A&R

Mikes twenty plus year career has focused on inventing and invigorating through collaborations with the most innovative and determined artists, musicians, entrepreneurs, and fans. Whether it is curating new experiences, harnessing scenes, cultivating the cultural landscape or creating conduits between what's now and what's next, the common denominator throughout is Feinberg's unique ability to bring together world class people, and ideas. Feinberg's passion is the relentless pursuit of creating and harnessing the energy, excitement, and emotion of the human experience. His participation in Grooveshark, is another chapter in his relentless quest to share the best and brightest of these moments with the world.



Andrew Frauen
Community Developer

I dig music, movies, coffee, and sharing candy bars. I have aspirations to one day be a doctor lawyer computer programmer supermodel astronaut.



Edwin Fuquen
Software Engineer

Edwin enjoys designing efficient, scalable, and overall kick-ass server code. He also enjoys database design and monitoring your groovy music library, as well as long walks on the beach.

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)



Mike Garrett

Ad Operations / Non-Profit Development

Many people have tried to write a cohesive biography of Mike Garrett; While none have succeeded, all have gone on to win Nobel Prizes for 'Best Use Of Anyone's Time, Ever.'



Paul Geller

SVP, Business Development & Government Affairs

publix > hogan's > jimmy john's > firehouse > larry's giant subs > quisnos > blimpys > subway > sad sack sub sandwich shanty



Nathan Geouge

Senior Systems Engineer

Nate is a server ninja. He rocks the shuriken, balls the wakazashi, drops the bass. He's probably hiding in your bushes right now.

[Twitter](#)



Gene Goldmintz

Usability Analyst

Gene loves videogames and is always up for any talk on the industry. His guilty pleasure is Salt & Vinegar chips + Coke Icee, mmmm.

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)



Kristin Harris

Media Coordinator

Kristin recently graduated from the University of Central Florida with a B.A. in Advertising and Public Relations. A self-proclaimed social media guru, at any given moment you can find Kristin either tweeting or uploading pictures to Facebook. She has a serious case of wanderlust, and a knack for baking cake pops and mini pies.

[Twitter](#)



James Hartig

Software Engineer

I make Grooveshark a friendlier site. Oh, and I maintain the API moat.

[Twitter](#)



Jared Heiman

VP of Sales

Jared graduated from the University of Maryland and heads up Ad Sales for Grooveshark. His music interests include all types ranging from U2 to Phish to Movie Score Soundtracks. His main focus is to make Grooveshark the premiere destination for advertisers to connect with the music community.



Lisa Herman

Executive Assistant

Lisa, formally known as the Alpha Ginger, loves traveling, playing music, and dancing. Lisa graduated from UCF with a BS in Psychology and a Minor in Music Performance. She is always ready to help, make you smile, or get coffee. Lisa's favorite animals are whale sharks and her leopard Tsunami.



Colin Hostert

CIO + CISO

An entrepreneur and systems engineer at heart, Colin joined Escape Media Group to help build the robust and scalable architecture that powers Grooveshark.

[Twitter](#)



Ruoxing Hu

QA Engineer

I'm a QA Developer in Grooveshark doing test automation to ensure that every corner of the site works smoothly. I like video games, basketball, ping-pong, Go, and of course, MUSIC -- using aria to destroy everyone's window!

[Twitter](#)



Jennifer Hutton

Account Coordinator

Jenny received her B.A. in Theatre from the University of Florida and is currently doing absolutely nothing with her degree. She enjoys being helpful, which is a perfect fit at Grooveshark, where everyone needs help. Her favorite pastimes include eating, reading, playing Xbox, watching TV, and hearing people use the Forrest Gump voice when they talk to her.



Jessica Kaplan

Community Developer

I do it for the Luiz.

[Blog](#) [Twitter](#)