NYSCEF DOC. NO. 121

Exhibit A

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. NΥ



Exhibit E

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

1 2 3 4 5	THE LE
6	
7	
8	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - 3 1998
10	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 12	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13	BARBARA ALLEUT BROWN, et al.,) CASE NO. CV 98-5381 DT (RZx)
14) ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' Plaintiffs,) MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS') FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
15	VS.)
16	POLYGRAM RECORDS, et al.,)
17) Defendants.)
19	
20	
21,	I. Background
22 :	A. Factual Summary
23	This case involves claims brought by Plaintiffs Barbara
24	Allbut Brown ("Brown"), Peggy Santiglia Davison ("Davison"), and
25	Phyllis Allbut Sirico, ("Sirico") (collectively "Plaintiffs")
25	against Polygram Records ("Polygram"), Mercury Records, Inc.
27	("Mercury") and FGG Productions, Inc. ("FGG") (collectively
28	"Defendants") for damages and injunctive and declaratory relief

; -

ź

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. 1 in connection with the use of the name "The Angels," which is the 2 professional name under which the Plaintiffs performed as a 3 singing group. The causes of action contained in Plaintiffs' 4 First Amended Complaint are as follows:

(1) The first cause of action is by Davison and Sirico for
6 infringement of a registered trademark against all Defendants;

7 (2) The second cause of action is by all Plaintiffs for
8 false designations and descriptions against all Defendants;

9 (3) The third cause of action is by all Plaintiffs for10 unfair competition against all Defendants;

(4) The fourth cause of action is by Brown and Sirico forbreach of contract against FGG;

(5) The fifth cause of action is by Brown and Sirico forrescission against FGG;

(6) The sixth cause of action is by all Plaintiffs forconstructive trust against FGG;

17 (7) The seventh cause of action is by all Plaintiffs for18 accounting against all Defendants;

(8) The eighth cause of action is by all Plaintiffs for20 fraud against FGG;

(9) The ninth cause of action is by Davison for conversionagainst all Defendants;

(10) The tenth cause of action is by Davison for trespassto chattel against all Defendants; and

(11) The eleventh cause of action is by all Plaintiffs fordeclaratory relief against all Defendants.

27

28

DOCKE.

RM

2

Plaintiffs allege that on or about March 25, 1963, 1 2 Brown and Sirico entered into a contract with Sabina Records ("Sabina Contract") under which all musical records and tapes 3 recorded by Brown and Sirico would become the property of Sabina 4 Records. In return, Sabina Records would pay Brown and Sirico 5 specified royalties of all records sold by Sabina records or any б affiliate or licensee. Amended Complaint at ¶ 15. The Sabina 7 Contract also provided that it was to be interpreted under the 8 laws of the State of New York. Id. at \P 14. On or about March 9 25, 1963, after execution of the Sabina Contract, Sabina Records 10 assigned its rights in the Sabina Contract to FGG. Id. at ¶ 18. 11

Plaintiffs state that Davison was never a party to the Sabina Contract, but sometime in 1963, Davison joined the group "The Angels" and took part in recording songs, including "My Boyfriend's Back." Id. at ¶ 19. "My Boyfriend's Back" became Mercury's largest album hit. Plaintiffs' Opposition at 1.

Plaintiffs allege that on or about June 13, 1963, Brown and Sirico signed a contract with FGG ("FGG Contract") under which FGG would pay Brown and Sirico specified royalties based on sales of Brown and Sirico's recordings.¹ Id. at ¶ 20. The FGG

DOCKE

RM

21

3

Plaintiffs did not attach the Sabina Contract or the FGG Contract to their First Amended Complaint. However, Defendants submitted a copy of the Sabina Contract with their motion to dismiss. They represent that they requested a copy of the Sabina Contract from Plaintiffs and that Plaintiffs gave them a copy of the Sabina Contract but that page 10 is missing and Plaintiffs have been unable to locate page 10. Defendants also represent that neither party has been able to locate a copy of the FGG Contract.

²⁸

DOCKET A L A R M



Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.