

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

KESEY, LLC, an Oregon Limited Liability)
Company,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

MICHELE FRANCIS, aka MISHELLE)
McMINDES, an individual; MIKE HAGEN,)
an individual; KATHERINE WILSON, an)
individual; SUNDOWN & FLETCHER,)
INC., an Oregon corporation;)
ASSOCIATES FILM PRODUCERS)
SERVICES, an Oregon partnership or)
other business entity; and DOES 1 through)
100, inclusive,)

Defendants.)

Civil Case No. 06-540-AC

ORDER

_____)

David Aronoff
Lathrop & Gage LLP
1888 Century Park East, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, California 90067

E.J. Simmons
621 SW Morrison, Suite 1300
Portland, Oregon 97205

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Steven H. Corey
Corey, Byler, Rew, Lorenzen & Hojem
222 S. E. Dorian Drive
Pendleton, Oregon 97801-0218

Michael B. Kratville
11920 Burt Street, Suite 145
Omaha, NE 68154

Todd Frazier
Raynor, Rensch & Pfeiffer
10110 Nicholas Street, Suite 102
Omaha, NE 68114

Judson M. Carusone
Bromley Newton LLP
627 Country Club Road, Suite 200
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Attorneys for Defendants

KING, Judge:

The Honorable John V. Acosta, United States Magistrate Judge, filed Findings and Recommendation on August 17, 2009. Defendants Michele Francis, Mike Hagen, and Sundown & Fletcher, Inc. (collectively "S&F defendants") filed timely objections to the Findings and Recommendation.


When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate's Findings and Recommendation concerning a dispositive motion or prisoner petition, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the magistrate's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ.

P. 72(b); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). This court has, therefore, given de novo review of the rulings of Magistrate Judge Acosta.

This court ADOPTS the Findings and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Acosta (#101) dated August 17, 2009 in its entirety.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (#66) is GRANTED. Plaintiff is declared the sole owner of all rights in and to the Screenplay and any derivative works based on the Screenplay. The S&F Defendants' Counterclaims are dismissed. The S&F defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#62) is GRANTED as to Count III of the Complaint and to the extent it limits Count II of the Complaint to conduct occurring two years before the Complaint was filed, and DENIED in all other respects. Does 1-100 are dismissed as defendants. Plaintiff is directed to submit a proposed form of judgment after conferring with defendants..

DATED this 2nd day of November, 2009.



GARR M. KING
United States District Judge