1	LOEB & LOEB LLP DAVID GROSSMAN (SBN 211326)	
2	DAVID GROSSMAN (SBN 211326) dgrossman@loeb.com JENNIFER JASON (SBN 274142)	
3	jjason@loeb.com 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 2200	
4	Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: 310.282.2000 Facsimile: 310.282.2200	
5		
6	LOEB & LOEB LLP JONATHAN ZAVIN (admitted <i>pro hac v</i> jzavin@loeb.com	ice)
7	jzavin@loeb.com 345 Park Avenue	
8	New York, NY 10154 Telephone: 212.407.4000 Facsimile: 212.407.4990	
9		
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs PARAMOUNT PICTURES	
11	CORPORATION and CBS STUDIOS INC.	
12		
13		DISTRICT COURT
14	CENTRAL DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA
15		
16	PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION, a Delaware	Case No.: 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E
17	corporation; and CBS STUDIOS INC., a Delaware corporation,	JOINT EXHIBIT LIST
18	Plaintiffs,	
19	V.	
20	AXANAR PRODUCTIONS, INC., a	Discovery Cutoff: November 2, 2016
21	AXANAR PRODUCTIONS, INC., a California corporation; ALEC PETERS, an individual, and DOES 1-20,	Pre-Trial Conference: January 9, 2017 Trial: January 31, 2017
22	Defendants.	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 | 2 | 16 | 3 | Co | 4 | Pe | 5 | fo

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(3)(A)(iii) and Local Rule 16-6.1 of the Central District of California, Plaintiffs Paramount Pictures Corporation and CBS Studios, Inc. (collectively, "Plaintiffs") and Defendants Alec Peters and Axanar Productions, Inc. (collectively, "Defendants"), hereby submit the following list of exhibits that they intend to offer at trial:

6

7	Ex No	-	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
8	3	Depo. Ex. 3 - 6/2/10 Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
		from Alec Peters to Ian	(Relevance). FRE 403		
9		Spelling cc: John Van Citters	(prejudicial). Documents		
10		re StarTrek.com. PL0006459	relating to Peters' work on Star		
10		- PL0006460.	Trek props are not relevant to		
11			this case. Plaintiffs have not		
		D F 4 7/20/10 F 1	filed suit based on such work.		
12	4	Depo. Ex. 4 - 7/28/10 Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
13		from Bill Burke to Kristen	(Relevance). FRE 403		
13		Gerringer re: FW: ST people	(prejudicial). An internal CBS		
14		and contact info. PL0007878 - PL0007880.	email containing a list of individuals who have worked		
		CONFIDENTIAL	on Star Trek and other films in		
15		CONTIDENTIAL	the context of brainstorming		
16			ideas for restarting Startrek.com		
10			as a website is not relevant to		
17			this case.		
10	9	Depo. Ex. 9 - 8/24/15 - Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
18		from John Van Citters to Bill	(Relevance). FRE 403		
19		Burke, Veronica Hart re	(prejudicial). An internal CBS		
		Contributors to unlicensed	email discussing people who		
20		films. PL0006941.	work for Axanar who are also		
		CONFIDENTIAL	contributing to CBS' licensed		
21			works is not relevant to this		
22			case. Plaintiffs did not file suit		
			against these individuals and		
23			they are not witnesses in this		
24	10	Depo. Ex. 10 - 9/4/15 Email	case. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
24	10	from Tobias Richter to John	(Relevance). FRE 403		
25		Van Citters cc: Andreas	(prejudicial). An email between		
		Mergenthaler re German	a CBS employee and a visual		
26		voyager cover. PL0012373 -	effects professional has no		
27		PL0012377.	relevance to this case.		
		CONFIDENTIAL			
28					

1

No. Adm. Adm.	1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
The Certificate of Recordation. PL0000045-76. Depo. Ex. 12 - Copyright registrations: The Man Trap 27/786 (Star Trek Series); Encounter at Farpoint (Star Trek - the Next Generation Series) 1/7/88. The Emissary, Part 1 (Star Trek - Deep space Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL.0000035-44. 11			Description	Objections	Date Id.	
PL000045-76. PL000045-76.	2	11	Depo. Ex. 11 - 9/1/16			
PL000045-76. Depo. Ex. 12 - Copyright registrations: The Man Trap 27/786 (Star Trek Series); Encounter at Farpoint (Star Trek - the Next Generation Series) 11/7/88; The Emissary, Part 1 (Star Trek - Deep space Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 11	3					
registrations: The Man Trap 27/86 (Star Trek Series); Encounter at Farpoint (Star Trek - the Next Generation Series) 17/88; The Emissary, Part 1 (Star Trek - Deep space Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 11 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitr re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 17 CONFIDENTIAL 18 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 10 CONFIDENTIAL 11 CONFIDENTIAL 12 CONFIDENTIAL 13 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 16 CONFIDENTIAL 17 CONFIDENTIAL 18 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 10 Confidents intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	4	10				
27/86 (Star Trek Series); Encounter at Farpoint (Star Trek - Next Generation Series) 1/7/88; The Emissary, Part 1 (Star Trek - Deep space Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL.0000035-44. 11 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke co: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 17 CONFIDENTIAL 18 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 10 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill general to the film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	4	12	1			
Encounter at Farpoint (Star Trek - the Next Generation Series) 17/788; The Emissary, Part 1 (Star Trek - Deep space Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 10	5					
Series 17/88; The Emissary, Part 1 (Star Trek - Deep space Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94, PL000035-44. 13 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.						
Part 1 (Star Trek - Deep space Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 13 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 18 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 19 CONFIDENTIAL 10 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 10 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 10 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0012412. 11 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0012412. 12 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0012412. 15 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0012412. 16 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0012412. 17 Depo. Ex. 13 - 5/27/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. Pl0012412. 18 Depo. Ex. 13 - 5/27/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. Pl0012412. 19 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. Pl0012412. 10 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. Pl0012412. 10 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan Bridges. Pl0012412. 10 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan Bridges. Pl0012412. 11 Depo. Ex. 13 - 5/27/15 - Email From John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan Bridges. Pl0012412. 12 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email From John Va	0		Trek - the Next Generation			
Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 13 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	7					
Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL.0000035-44. Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL PLONENTIAL Plffs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.			` .			
TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 13 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	8		•			
Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 13 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 Trek: Voyager (Script) 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 13 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is afan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	9		`			
10 10/17/94. PL0000035-44. 13 Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 18 (Prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	10		,			
Email from Alec Peters to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 18 Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	10					
John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 15 PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 16 PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 17 PL0012412. 18 Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	11	13				
cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL 18 CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	12					
Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	12		The state of the s			
PL0012412. 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL 18 CONFIDENTIAL Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	13		*			
15 14 Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Bill (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	14		1			
Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL (prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	14	14	Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
PL0006993. CONFIDENTIAL emails relating to other films, and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	15			`		
CONFIDENTIAL and particularly the guidelines set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	16			1 1		
set by other film studios, has no relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	10					
relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	17		CONTIDENTIAL			
Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	18					
that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	10					
film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	19					
the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	20					
film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.						
that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	21					
that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	22					
impact on the copyright infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.				· ·		
infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	23			1		
Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.	24					
have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as well.				l		
creators is legally irrelevant as well.	25					
well.	26					
	27			well.		

1		Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2		No.	•	ū.		Adm.
		15	Depo. Ex. 15 - 4/8/15 - Email from John Van Citters to Liz			
3			Kalodner cc: Veronica Hart;			
4			Bill Burke re Alec Peters.			
5			PL0012220. CONFIDENTIAL			
	-	16	Depo. Ex. 16 - STAR TREK	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
6			Facebook Fan Page	(Relevance). FRE 403		
7				(prejudicial). The Star Trek fan films guidelines are not		
8				relevant. Defendants intend to		
9				submit this exhibit in order to		
				argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants		
10				label the Axanar Works as a		
11				"fan film," no court has ever		
12				held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate,		
				which in this case it is not) has		
13				any impact on the copyright		
14				infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
15				have sued other "fan film"		
				creators is legally irrelevant as		
16	_	17	Depo. Ex. 17 - Star Trek Fan	well. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
17		1 /	Film Guidelines Announced	(Relevance). FRE 403		
18				(prejudicial). The Star Trek fan		
19				films guidelines are not relevant. Defendants intend to		
				submit this exhibit in order to		
20				argue that the Axanar film is a		
21				fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a		
22				"fan film," no court has ever		
				held that a "fan film" (whether		
23				or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has		
24				any impact on the copyright		
25				infringement analysis.		
26				Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film"		
				creators is legally irrelevant as		
27	L			well.		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
	No.	Description	Objections	Date Iu.	Adm.
2	18	Depo. Ex. 18 - [Dkt 48]			
3		5/23/16 Answer of			
		Defendants Axanar			
4		Productions, Inc., and Alec			
5		Peters to Plaintiffs' First			
3		Amended Complaint;			
6		Counterclaim for Declaratory			
_	24	Relief; Demand for Jury Trial Depo. Ex. 24 - 3/24/65			
7		Binding agreement between			
8		Desilu Productions and			
		Norway Corporation with			
9		services to Gene			
10		Roddenberry. PL0001475-			
10		1486. CONFIDENTIAL			
11	25	Depo. Ex. 25 - 8/24/67 Letter			
		from Sherwin Samuels to			
12		Eugen Frank. PL0012673-			
13		12692. CONFIDENTIAL			
13	26	Depo. Ex. 26 - 5/27/76			
14		Memorandum of Agreement			
1.5		between Paramount Pictures			
15		Corporation ("Paramount"), on one hand and The Norway			
16		Corporation ("Norway") and			
		Lincoln Enterprises, Inc.			
17		("Lincoln") on the other hand.			
18		PL0001420-1451.			
10		CONFIDENTIAL			
19	27	Depo. Ex. 27 - 2/18/97			
20		Certificate of Recordation			
20		from Norway Corporation to			
21		Paramount Pictures			
		Corporation. PL0001041-			
22	20	1050. CONFIDENTIAL			
23	28	Depo. Ex. 28 - 12/17/07 Star Trek Agreement between			
23		Paramount Pictures			
24		Corporation and Norway			
25		Corporation. PL0000941-			
25		992. CONFIDENTIAL			
26					

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
	No.	Description	Objections	Date 1a.	Adm.
2	29	Depo. Ex. 29 - 2/18/97			
3		Certificate or Recordation			
4		from Majel Roddenberry, Eugene Roddenberry, Jr., &			
		Darleen Roddenberry to			
5		Paramount Pictures			
6		Corporation. PL0001052- 1065. CONFIDENTIAL			
7	30	Depo. Ex. 30 - 5/3/90			
		Certificate of Recordation			
8		Assignment to Paramount			
9		Pictures Corporation. PL0001295-1297.			
		CONFIDENTIAL			
10	31	Depo. Ex. 31 - 12/21/05			
11		Assignment & License of			
12		rights to certain properties from Paramount Pictures			
		Corporation to CBS between			
13		Paramount Pictures			
14		Corporation and subsidiaries			
15		and CBS Studios Inc. PL0000998-1033.			
		CONFIDENTIAL			
16	41	Depo. Ex. 41 - 8/26/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17		Robert Meyer Burnett comment re "How \$1.1	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
18		Million 'Star Trek' Fan	probative, waste of time). The		
10		Movie Has Escaped Studio	text is unreadable, and in any		
19		Shutdown (So Far)", The	event, Mr. Burnett's comments		
20		Wrap, www.thewrap.com/how-1-1-	are not probative of any relevant matters.		
		million-star-trek-fan-movie-	recevant matters.		
21		has-escaped-studio-			
22		shutdown-so-far.			
23	42	PL0005997-6007. Depo. Ex. 42 - Prelude to			
		Axanar Booklet Back Page			
24		Front Cover - Booket Inside.			
25		AX003153. CONFIDENTIAL			
26	43	Depo. Ex. 43 - Prelude to			
		Axanar Booklet Back Page,			
27		Front Page, Booklet Inside.			
28		AX003152.			

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.	COMEIDENTELAT			Adm.
	44	CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 44 - 11/3/15 Email			
3	• •	string between Bill Hunt and			
4		Alec Peters. AX030004-30007. CONFIDENTIAL			
5	45	Depo. Ex. 45 - Credit list.	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
6		AX000203-209. CONFIDENTIAL	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
7			probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
8			any authority to support their		
9			position that the quality of the work, or the careers or		
10			experience of the people who work on them, have any impact		
11			on whether a work is infringing		
12			or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137,		
13			Defendants' Motion in Limine ("MIL") No. 9.		
14	46	Depo. Ex. 46 - 3/26/14 Deal Memo. AX003426.	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
15		CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
16			probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
17			any authority to support their position that the quality of the		
18			work, or the careers or experience of the people who		
19			work on them, have any impact		
20			on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright		
21			law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
22	47	Depo. Ex. 47 - 5/30/14 Star			
23		Trek: Prelude to Axanar by Axanar Productions			
24		Kickstarter, Kickstarter, https://www.kickstarter.com/			
25		projects/194429923/star-trek-			
26		prelude-to-axanar (last visited 5/30/14). PL0005894-5916.			
	1	1	ı		

_ I

1		Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2		48	Depo. Ex. 48 - 7/15/15 Star			710111
3			Trek: Axanar, Indiegogo			
4			https://www.indiegogo.com/p rojects/star-trek-axanar#/story			
			(last visited 7/15/15).			
5		40	PL0005854-5888.	D. C. E. I. D. E. I. 401, 402		
6		49	Depo. Ex. 49 - 4/12/15 Draft Marketing Plan. AX003784-	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
7			3790. CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
8				probative, waste of time). Fed. R. Evid. 602 (lacks foundation		
				as the author of the draft		
9				marketing plan, which was		
10				never used, was not deposed); FRE 802 (hearsay). This draft		
11				marketing plan did not relate to		
12				the Axanar Works; it relates to		
14				potential plans unrelated to the Axanar Works, and was		
13				prepared by someone that was		
14				never deposed in this action.		
				See ECF No. 135, Defendants'		
15		50	D F 50 1/11/15 DI	MIL No. 7.		
16		50	Depo. Ex. 50 - 1/11/15 Blog post, Ares Studios Launches!,	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
17			Axanar Productions,	(more prejudicial than		
			http://www.axanarproduction	probative, waste of time). How		
18			s.com/ares-studios-launches. PL0005842-5846.	Defendants spent money received through donations,		
19				with respect to a work that this		
20				lawsuit has halted,including on a studio, with respect to a work		
				that this lawsuit halted, has no		
21				relevance to copyright		
22				infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
23				Plaintiffs are not donors to		
24				Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no		
				standing to object to how		
25				Defendants' allegedly spent the		
26	<u> </u>			money raised. Id.		

28

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	51	Depo. Ex. 51 - 7/5/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
3		Squadron Strike: Axanar In	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Development, Ad Astra	(more prejudicial than		
4		Games,	probative, waste of time). How		
5		www.adastragames.com. PL0006013-6023.	Defendants spent money received through donations has		
		FL0000013-0023.	no relevance to copyright		
6			infringement. See ECF No.		
7			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
8			Defendants' crowdfunding		
9			campaign, and thus have no		
9			standing to object to how		
10			Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id.		
11	52	Depo. Ex. 52 - 6/30/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
11		Axanar Budget. PL0006010-	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
12		6012.	(more prejudicial than		
			probative, waste of time). How		
13			Defendants planned to or did		
14			spend money received through		
			donations has no relevance to		
15			copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL		
16			No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors		
			to Defendants' crowdfunding		
17			campaign, and thus have no		
18			standing to object to how		
10			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
19			money raised. Id.		
20	53	Depo. Ex. 53 - 1/6/15 Robert	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
20		Meyer Burnett posts photo to Facebook	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
21		racebook	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
22			Personal social media post,		
22			through which Mr. Burnett		
23			reposted a photo someone else		
24			originally posted regarding J.J.		
24			Abrams treatment of R2-D2 in		
25			the Star Wars movie, is not		
			relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims in this lawsuit.		
26	54	Depo. Ex. 54 - 10/18/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
27		Robert Meyer Burnett	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Facebook posts	(more prejudicial than		
28					

No. Probative, waste of time), Personal social media post concerning Mr. Burnett's excitement about Star Wars', The Force Awakens, and comments on J. J. Abrams role in prior Star Trek movies, is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, wa	1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
Personal social media post concerning Mr. Burnett's excitement about Star Wars', The Force Awakens, and comments on J. J. Abrams role in prior Star Trek movies, is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet	2	No.		much stime mosts of time		Adm.
concerning Mr. Burnett's excitement about Star Wars', The Force Awakens, and comments on J. J. Abrams role in prior Star Trek movies, is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet				•		
cxcitement about Star Wars', The Force Awakens, and comments on J. J. Abrams role in prior Star Trek movies, is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet	3			1		
comments on J. J. Abrams role in prior Star Trek movies, is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. 55 Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet 10 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. 12 Depo. Ex. 56 - 11/28/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet 13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet 14 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. 16 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets 17 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets 18 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions Intp://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. 29 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Production s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. 20 Defendants' repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' repowdfundine	4			_		
in prior Star Trek movies, is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. 55 Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet Meyer Burnett Tweet S6 Depo. Ex. 56 - 11/28/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet S7 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet S8 Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. S7 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet S7 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets S8 Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. D6: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. D6: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. D6: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. D6: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. D6: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. D6: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. D6: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. D6: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed.	ا ہے			*		
relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Depo. Ex. 56 - 11/28/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiff	5					
Section Sect	6			<u> </u>		
Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims.				1.0		
Meyer Burnett Tweet Meyer Burnett Tweets Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial tha	/			Clamis.		
(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. 56 Depo. Ex. 56 - 11/28/13 Pobert Meyer Burnett Tweet 57 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets 58 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets 59 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. 59 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. 50 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. 50 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853.	8	55	Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. 56 Depo. Ex. 56 - 11/28/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet 57 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets 58 Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets 59 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. 50 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. 50 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Production s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853.			Meyer Burnett Tweet			
Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims.	9					
11 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 16 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	10			-		
Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims.				=		
Depo. Ex. 56 - 11/28/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims.	11					
Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Robert Meyer Burnet Tweets Robert Meyer Burnett Meyer A. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (releva	12	56	Depo. Ex. 56 - 11/28/13			
probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding			Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	13					
Personal social media post concerning is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Meyer Burnett Tweets Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	14			•		
Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding				-		
Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims.	15			_		
Meyer Burnett Tweets (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	16	57	Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert	1,7 0		
(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding				· ·		
Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	17					
Personal social media post concerning J.J. Abrams is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. 59 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. 24 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	18					
relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright claims. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding				=		
21 59 Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	19			_		
Defo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	20			1,00		
Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding		59	Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio			
Productions http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	21		1 *			
http://www.axanarproduction s.com/studio-floor-going-in. PL0005847-5853. probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	22		Productions	` 1 3		
PL0005847-5853. received through donations, including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding						
including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	23			<u> </u>		
studio rented to create the film, has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	24		PL0005847-5853.	=		
has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding						
infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	25			The state of the s		
27 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding	26					
Defendants' crowdfunding				135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
28 Detendants' crowdfunding	27					
	28			Defendants' crowdfunding		

1		Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2		No.		campaign, and thus have no		Adm.
3				standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the		
4				money raised. Id. Allowing Plaintiffs to continue to		
5				scrutinize the expenditures for a work that their lawsuit halted,		
7				and the financials of renting a studio, would provide no		
8	_	50	Depo. Ex. 60- 11/3/15 Email	probative value. Id.		
		30	string between Robert Meyer			
9			Burnett and Alec Peters. AX030011-30012.			
10			CONFIDENTIAL			
11	6	51	Depo. Ex. 61 - 5/9/16 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12			from Alec Peters to Diana Kingsbury, et al. AX030316-	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
13			30317. CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). This		
				internal email regarding a staff meeting has no bearing on any		
14				issue in this action		
15	6	52	Depo. Ex. 62 - 7/26/14 Prelude to Axanar First			
16			Invitational Screening Comic-			
17			Con International San Diego. AX005089-5104.			
18			CONFIDENTIAL			
	6	53	Depo. Ex. 63 - 3/3/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
19			Entertainment Partners Production Setup Order.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
20			AX000396-402. HIGHLY	probative, waste of time). How		
21			CONFIDENTIAL	Defendants spent money received through donations has		
22				no relevance to copyright		
23				infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
24				Plaintiffs are not donors to		
				Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no		
25				standing to object to how		
26				Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id.		
27	╽┕			- 7		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
	64	Depo. Ex. 64 - 12/11/14 Email string between Ken	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
3		<pre><ken@burbankprint.com></ken@burbankprint.com></pre>	(more prejudicial than		
4		and Diana Kingsbury.	probative, waste of time). How		
		AX030336-30337.	Defendants spent money		
5		CONFIDENTIAL	received through donations has		
6			no relevance to copyright		
			infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
7			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
8			Defendants' crowdfunding		
			campaign, and thus have no		
9			standing to object to how		
10			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
	65	Depo. Ex. 65 - 6/3/15 Axanar	money raised. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
11	03	Productions organizational	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
12		chart. AX000200.	(more prejudicial than		
12			probative, waste of time).		
13			Plaintiffs have not presented		
14			any authority to support their		
15			position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience		
15			of the people who work on		
16			them, or the colloquial use of		
17			the word "professional," have		
1/			any impact on whether a work		
18			is infringing or improper under		
19			copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
19	66	Depo. Ex. 66 - 8/31/15 Photo	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
20		of Alec Peters. PL0000859.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
21			(more prejudicial than		
			probative, waste of time).		
22			Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their		
23			position that the quality of the		
			work, the careers or experience		
24			of the people who work on		
25			them, or the colloquial use of		
			the word "professional," have		
26			any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under		
27			copyright law. See ECF No.		
			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
28					

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	67	Depo. Ex. 67 - 7/6/14 Photo	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		Aum.
3		of Diana Kingsbury and Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
4		Peters. AX005088. CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
		CONFIDENTIAL	Defendant Peters' personal		
5			relationship with Diana		
6			Kingsbury has no relevance to		
			Plaintiffs' copyright claims. See ECF No. 133, Defendants'		
7			MIL No. 5.		
8	68	Depo. Ex. 68 - 7/13/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
9		Itinerary for Alec Peters Los Angeles, CA / Calgary,	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
10		Canada trip. AX003508-	probative, waste of time). How		
		3509. CONFIDENTIAL	Defendants spent money		
11			received through donations has no relevance to copyright		
12			infringement. See ECF No.		
13			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
			Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding		
14			campaign, and thus have no		
15			standing to object to how		
16			Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id.		
	69	Depo. Ex. 69 - 2/25/15 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17		from Diana Kingsbury to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
18		Alec Peters, et al. AX029176.	(more prejudicial than		
19		CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
			any authority to support their		
20			position that the quality of the		
21			work has any impact on whether a work is infringing or		
22			improper under copyright law.		
			See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
23	71	Depo. Ex. 71 - 5/7/15 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		string between Horace Austin	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		and Diana Kingsbury.	(more prejudicial than		
26		AX029713-29714. CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money		
			received through donations has		
27			no relevance to copyright		
28			infringement. See ECF No.		

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
3			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
			Defendants' crowdfunding		
4			campaign, and thus have no		
5			standing to object to how		
			Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id.		
6	73	Depo. Ex. 73 - 9/7/16 Axanar	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7		balance sheets for years 2014	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
/		to 2016. AX030915-31129.	(more prejudicial than		
8		CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). How		
			Defendants spent money		
9			received through donations has		
10			no relevance to copyright		
			infringement. See ECF No.		
11			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to		
12			Defendants' crowdfunding		
			campaign, and thus have no		
13			standing to object to how		
14			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
14			money raised. Id.		
15	74	Depo. Ex. 74 - 7/15 The	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
16		Axanar Annual Report	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
16		Revised. PL0000825-847.	(more prejudicial than		
17			probative, waste of time). How		
10			Defendants spent money received through donations has		
18			no relevance to copyright		
19			infringement. See ECF No.		
			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
20			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
21			Defendants' crowdfunding		
			campaign, and thus have no		
22			standing to object to how		
23			Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id.		
23	75	Depo. Ex. 75 - 12/22/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		Email string between Diana	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Kingsbury and Matthew	(more prejudicial than		
25		Kalvin. AX030665-30666.	probative, waste of time). How		
26		CONFIDENTIAL	Defendants spent money		
			received through donations has		
27			no relevance to copyright		
28			infringement. See ECF No.		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
$2 \ $	No.		125 Defendants' MIL No. 7		Adm.
			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to		
3			Defendants' crowdfunding		
$4\ $			campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how		
5			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
6			money raised. Id.		
9	76	Depo. Ex. 76 - 12/5/15 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7		string between Kate Bergh,	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
8		Diana Kingsbury et al.	(more prejudicial than		
$\circ \parallel$		AX029766-29767. CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money		
9		CONFIDENTIAL	received through donations has		
10			no relevance to copyright		
10			infringement. See ECF No.		
11			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
12			Defendants' crowdfunding		
13			campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how		
14			Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id.		
15	77	Depo. Ex. 77 - 3/17/16 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
13	' '	string between Diana	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
16		Kingsbury and Alec Peters.	(more prejudicial than		
17		AX030869-30870.	probative, waste of time). How		
1/		CONFIDENTIAL	Defendants spent money		
18			received through donations has		
10			no relevance to copyright		
19			infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
20			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
			Defendants' crowdfunding		
21			campaign, and thus have no		
22			standing to object to how		
			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
23	70	D E 70 5/12/16 E 1	money raised. Id.		
24	78	Depo. Ex. 78 - 5/13/16 Email string between Marc	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Hofstatter and Diana	(more prejudicial than		
25		Kingsbury. AX030292-	probative, waste of time).		
26		30293. CONFIDENTIAL	Defendants' crowdfunding		
			efforts, and any disputes related		
27			to those efforts, are completely		
28			irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claims.		
20					

Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
		See ECF No. 133, Defendants'		
		MIL No. 5.		
80	Depo. Ex. 80 - 4/5/16 Alec	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	Peters Facebook post.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	PL0000899	(more prejudicial than		
		probative, waste of time).		
		Email updating his fans		
		concerning instant lawsuit is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright		
		claims.		
82	Depo. Ex. 82 - 7/14/16 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
02	Startrek.com Printout entitled	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	The Original Series Set Tour	(prejudicial). FRE 602 (Lacks		
	to Open	foundation). FRE 802		
		(Hearsay). An article about a		
		licensed tour of the set of The		
		Original Series (the first Star		
		Trek television series) is not		
		relevant to this case.		
		Defendants' Axanar Works		
		were not licensed, nor do they contend that they were licensed.		
83	Depo. Ex. 83 - 1/23/08 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
65	Email chain from Liz	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	Kalodner to John Van Citters	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
	re Star Trek. PL0006230 -	(Hearsay). An internal CBS		
	PL0006231.	email discussing Mr. Peters'		
		Star Trek prop business has no		
		relevance to this case.		
84	Depo. Ex. 84 - 1/20/10 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	Email string from Elizabeth	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	Kalodner to Craig Freeman re	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
	FW: Star Trek Experience	(Hearsay). An email chain		
	Inventory. PL0007983 -	discussing Star Trek props has		
85	PL007985. Depo. Ex. 85 - 1/14/10 Email	no relevance to this case. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
0.5	string from John Van Citters	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	to Elizabeth Kalodner;	(prejudicial). An internal CBS		
	Veronica Hart re Power	email about another film that		
	Point. PL0000754.	Mr. Peters was involved with,		
	CONFIDENTIAL	which is not at issue in this		
		case, has no relevance to this		
		case.		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No. 86	Depo. Ex. 86 - 8/2/10 Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		Adm.
3		string from Elizabeth	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		Kalodner to John Van Citters	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
4		re Star Trek. PL0007981 - PL0007982.	(Hearsay). An email between Mr. Peters to		
5		1 20007702.	CBS and subsequent internal		
6			CBS emails regarding an		
			individual who created another film that is not at issue in this		
7			case has no relevance to this		
8	07	D E 07 0/00/14 E 1	case.		
9	87	Depo. Ex. 87 - 8/22/14 Email string from John Van Citters	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
10		to Elizabeth Kalodner re	(prejudicial). An internal CBS		
		Staffing - 2015. PL0000765. CONFIDENTIAL.	email discussing staffing and how the "antics" of Mr. Peters		
11		CONFIDENTIAL.	and other individuals continues		
12			to have a CBS employee		
13			concerned has no relevance to this case.		
14	88	Depo. Ex. 88 - 4/24/15 Email	tills case.		
		from John Van Citters to			
15		Elizabeth Kalodner re One more thing. PL0008852.			
16		CONFIDENTIAL			
17	89	Depo. Ex. 89 - 7/6/15 Email			
		from Bill Burke to Veronica Hart cc: John Van Citters;			
18		Marian Cordry re Axanar.			
19		PL0006978. CONFIDENTIAL			
20	90	Depo. Ex. 90 - 5/31/16	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
21		Defendant Alec Peters'	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Responses to Plaintiff Paramount Pictures	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
22		Corporation and CBS Studios	Plaintiffs continue in their		
23		Inc.'s First Set of Request for	attempts to offer testimony and		
24		Production of Documents	evidence regarding alleged discovery violations, though no		
25			discovery violations have been		
			found against Defendants. See		
26			ECF No. 126, Defendants' MIL No. 1.		
27		_1			

1	Ex		Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
$2 \parallel$	91	0.	Depo. Ex. 91 - 1/1/86 The	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		Adm.
3			Four Year War	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
3				(more prejudicial than		
4				probative, waste of time).		
5				Plaintiffs should be precluded		
3				from relying on evidence		
6				relating to allegedly infringed works they failed to claim in		
$_{7}\Vert$				their First Amended Complaint.		
				See ECF No. 130, Defendants'		
8				MIL No. 3.		
9	92		Depo. Ex. 92 - 11/26/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
9			Axanar Script, Revision: 7.7.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
10			AX006494-6606. HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
11			CONTIDENTIAL	Preliminary works such as draft		
				screenplays are too unreliable in		
12				determining substantial		
13				similarity as to the final work.		
				ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of		
14				the jury's and the Court's time		
15				to review draft scripts when		
				there is no risk such scripts will		
16				be used. Id.		
17	93		Depo. Ex. 93 - Article titled	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
			"Behind the scenes filming "Star Trek: Axanar."	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
18			PL0005893.	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
19			1 20003073.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
				any authority to support their		
20				position that the quality of the		
21				work, the careers or experience		
				of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of		
22				the word "professional," have		
23				any impact on whether a work		
				is infringing or improper under		
24				copyright law. See ECF No.		
25	0.4		D E 04 0/10/15	137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
	94		Depo. Ex. 94 - 8/18/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
26			Axanar's Indiegogo fundraising page, Indiegogo,	(more prejudicial than		
27			www.indiegogo.com/projects/	probative, waste of time).		
			axanar#/story. PL0011826.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
28						

1		Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	ľ	1100		any authority to support their		110111
3				position that the quality of the		
				work, the careers or experience		
4				of the people who work on		
5				them, or the colloquial use of		
				the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work		
6				is infringing or improper under		
7				copyright law. See ECF No.		
				137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
8		95	Depo. Ex. 95 - 9/3/15 Star	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
9			Trek Axanar feature film on	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
9			track to start filming October	(more prejudicial than		
10			2015 and for release in the first half of 16, Next Big	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
11			Future,	any authority to support their		
11			http://www.nextbigfuture.co	position that the quality of the		
12			m/15/09/star-trek-axanar-	work, the careers or experience		
12			feature-film-on-track.html.	of the people who work on		
13			PL0006064.	them, or the colloquial use of		
14				the word "professional," have		
1.5				any impact on whether a work		
15				is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No.		
16				137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
		96	Depo. Ex. 96 - How Axanar	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17			Began. AX000193-195.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
18			CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
				probative, waste of time). How		
19				Defendants spent money received through donations has		
20				no relevance to copyright		
				infringement. See ECF No.		
21				135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
22				Plaintiffs are not donors to		
22				Defendants' crowdfunding		
23				campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how		
24				Defendants' allegedly spent the		
				money raised. Id.		
25		97	Depo. Ex. 97 - 5/30/14 Star	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
26			Trek: Prelude to Axanar by	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
			Axanar Productions -	(more prejudicial than		
27			Kickstarter, Kickstarter,	probative, waste of time).		
28			https://www.kickstarter.com/	Plaintiffs have not presented		

$_{1}\ $	10	Daniel Color	01 '- 4'	D. 4. II	D. 4
	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2		projects/194429923/star-trek-	any authority to support their		
3		prelude-to-axanar.	position that the quality of the		
4		PL0005896-5900.	work, or the careers or experience of the people who		
$4\ $			work on them, have any impact		
5			on whether a work is infringing		
6			or improper under copyright		
0			law. See ECF No. 137,		
7	00	D E 00 7/15/15	Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
8	98	Depo. Ex. 98 - 7/15/15 Axanar's Indiegogo	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
8		fundraising page,	(more prejudicial than		
9		www.indiegogo.com/projects/	probative, waste of time).		
10		axanar#/story. PL0005857-	Plaintiffs have not presented		
		5858.	any authority to support their		
11			position that the quality of the work, or the careers or		
12			experience of the people who		
			work on them, have any impact		
13			on whether a work is infringing		
14			or improper under copyright		
			law. See ECF No. 137,		
15	99	Depo. Ex. 99 - 8/26/15	Defendants' MIL No. 9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
16		Robert Meyer Burnett	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		comment re "How \$1.1	(more prejudicial than		
17		Million 'Star Trek' Fan	probative, waste of time). The		
18		Movie Has Escaped Studio	text is unreadable.		
10		Shutdown (So Far)", The			
19		Wrap, www.thewrap.com/how-1-1-			
20		million-star-trek-fan-movie-			
21		has-escaped-studio-			
21		shutdown-so-far.			
22	100	PL0005997-5998.	Defer Fed D Frid 401 402		
23	100	Depo. Ex. 100 - 11/15/14 Tweet from Axanar to	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		@AwesomEmergency	(more prejudicial than		
24			probative, waste of time).		
25			Plaintiffs have not presented		
			any authority to support their		
26			position that the quality of the work, or the careers or		
27			experience of the people who		
			work on them, have any impact		
28					

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
$2 \parallel$	No.		on whether a work is infringing		Adm.
			or improper under copyright		
3			law. See ECF No. 137,		
4			Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
	101	Depo. Ex. 101 - 10/11/13	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
5		Alec Peters Facebook post.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
6		PL0012224.	(more prejudicial than		
			probative, waste of time).		
7			Plaintiffs have not presented		
			any authority to support their		
8			position that the quality of the		
9			work, the careers or experience of the people who work on		
			them, or the colloquial use of		
10			the word "professional," have		
11			any impact on whether a work		
			is infringing or improper under		
12			copyright law. See ECF No.		
13			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
13	102	Depo. Ex. 102 - 7/10/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
14		Dennis Koch Facebook post. PL0011818.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
15		FL0011818.	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time); Fed.		
13			R. Evid. 802 (hearsay).		
16			Plaintiffs have not presented		
17			any authority to support their		
17			position that the quality of the		
18			work, the careers or experience		
10			of the people who work on		
19			them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have		
20			any impact on whether a work		
			is infringing or improper under		
21			copyright law. See ECF No.		
22			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
			Also the author, Dennis Koch,		
23			was not deposed and so this		
24	102	Dana Ev. 102 0/24/15	lacks foundation and is hearsay.		
	103	Depo. Ex. 103 - 9/24/15 Taking Matters Into His Own	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Hands, Rich Schepis, The	(more prejudicial than		
26		Bronze Review,	probative, waste of time); Fed.		
20		www.thebronzereview.com	R. Evid. 802 (hearsay).		
27		(last visited 12/10/15).	Defendants' crowdfunding		
20		PL0005743-5745.	efforts are completely irrelevant		
28					

1		Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2		110.		to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF		ruiii.
3				No. 133, Defendants' MIL No.		
4				5. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their		
				position that the quality of the		
5				work, the careers or experience of the people who work on		
6				them, or the colloquial use of		
7				the word "professional," have		
8				any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under		
				copyright law. See ECF No.		
9				137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Also the author of this article		
10				was not deposed and has not		
11				submitted any declaration in		
12				this matter, so this exhibit is hearsay.		
13		104	Depo. Ex. 104 - 1/1/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
			Certificate of Authorship. AX000355-357. HIGHLY	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
14			CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). How		
15				Defendants spent money		
16				received through donations has no relevance to copyright		
17				infringement. See ECF No.		
				135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to		
18				Defendants' crowdfunding		
19				campaign, and thus have no		
20				standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the		
21		107	D F 105 5/15 A	money raised. Id.		
22		105	Depo. Ex. 105 - 7/15 Axanar Electronic Press Kit.			
			PL0011781-11794.			
23	-	106	CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 106 - Excerpts of	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		100	podcasts that Alec Peters	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25			participated in	(more prejudicial than		
26				probative, waste of time). Defendants' crowdfunding		
				efforts are completely irrelevant		
27				to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF No. 133, Defendants' MIL No.		
28	L			110. 155, Determants with 10.		

1		Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2		No.		5 Disintiffs have not presented		Adm.
				5. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their		
3				position that the quality of the		
4				work, the careers or experience		
				of the people who work on		
5				them, or the colloquial use of		
6				the word "professional," have		
				any impact on whether a work		
7				is infringing or improper under		
8				copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
8		107	Depo. Ex. 107 - 11/11/67	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
9			blueprint of the Star Trek	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
10			sound stage at Paramount	(more prejudicial than		
10			Studios. AX028725.	probative, waste of time).		
11			CONFIDENTIAL	Concept drawings for a		
12				potential stage have no		
12				relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
13				Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining		
				substantial similarity as to the		
14				final work. See ECF No. 134,		
15				Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
	1	108	Depo. Ex. 108 - 8/8/96	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
16			blueprint of Star Trek Deep	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
17			Space Nine sound stage.	(more prejudicial than		
			AX028719. CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time).		
18			CONFIDENTIAL	Concept drawings for a potential stage have no		
19				relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
				Preliminary works are too		
20				unreliable in determining		
21				substantial similarity as to the		
21				final work. See ECF No. 134,		
22		100	Dana Ev. 100 1/1/76	Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
23		109	Depo. Ex. 109 - 1/1/76 Blueprints. AX028563-	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
23			28571. CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
24				probative, waste of time).		
25				Concept drawings have no		
25				relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
26				Preliminary works are too		
27				unreliable in determining		
27				substantial similarity as to the		
28	L			final work. See ECF No. 134,		

Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential spaceship have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defendants' MIL No. 6.	Adm.
3 110 Depo. Ex. 110 - Diagram of the Enterprise. AX028634. CONFIDENTIAL Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential spaceship have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 112 Depo. Ex. 112 - 8/27/15	
the Enterprise. AX028634. CONFIDENTIAL (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential spaceship have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.	
probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential spaceship have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.	
Concept drawings for a potential spaceship have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.	
potential spaceship have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.	
relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.	
Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.	
unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.	
9 final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.	
9 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 112 Depo. Ex. 112 - 8/27/15	
10 Depo. Ex. 112 - 8/27/15	ļ
Email from	
11 Alec@Axanarproductions.co	
m to John Van Citters; Bill Burke cc: Elizabeth	
Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re	
13 Axanar. PL0000761.	
14 Depo. Ex. 113 - 8/25/15 How Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402	
\$1.1 Million 'Star Trek' Fan (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403	
Movie Has Escaped Studio (more prejudicial than	
Shutdown (So Far), by probative, waste of time). Beatrice Verhoeven, The Defendants' crowdfunding	
Wran efforts are completely irrelevant	
http://www.thewrap.com/how to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF	
18 -1-1-million-star-trek-fan- No. 133, Defendants' MIL No.	
movie-has-escaped-studio- shutdown-so-far. 5. How Defendants spent money received through	
PL0005727-5730. Inoney received through donations has no relevance to	
20 copyright infringement. See	
ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL	
No. 7. Planuits nave not	
presented any authority to support their position that the	
quality of the work, the careers	
or experience of the people who	
work on them, or the colloquial	
use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a	
work is infringing or improper	
under copyright law. See ECF	
No. 137, Defendants' MIL No.	
28	Į l

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
$2 \parallel$	No. 114	Depo. Ex. 114 - 8/30/15			Adm.
3	114	Axanar and CBS, Axanar			
4		Productions, http://www.axanarproduction			
		s.com/axanar-and-cbs.			
5		PL0005973-5974.			
6	115	Depo. Ex. 115 - Axanar's Indiegogo fundraising page,			
7		Indiegogo,			
8		www.indiegogo.com/projects/axanar#/story. PL0011827.			
9	116	Depo. Ex. 116 - 11/16/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Axanar Productions Estimated New Media	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
10		Budget. AX000075-87.	probative, waste of time).		
11		HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL	Defendants' crowdfunding		
12			efforts are completely irrelevant		
12			to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF No. 133, Defendants' MIL No.		
13			5. How Defendants spent		
14			money received through		
			donations has no relevance to		
15			copyright infringement. See		
16			ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs have not		
			presented any authority to		
17			support their position that the		
18			quality of the work, the careers		
10			or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial		
19			use of the word "professional,"		
20			have any impact on whether a		
21			work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF		
22			No. 137, Defendants' MIL No.		
23	117	Depo. Ex. 117 - 12/15/14	9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	117	Lease Agreement by and	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
24		between Industry Drive LLC	(more prejudicial than		
25		and Axanar Productions.	probative, waste of time). How		
		AX000001-30. HIGHLY	Defendants spent money		
26		CONFIDENTIAL	received through donations, including through a studio		
27			lease, has no relevance to		
			copyright infringement. See		
28					

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2			ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL		
3			No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors		
			to Defendants' crowdfunding		
4			campaign, and thus have no		
5			standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the		
			money raised. Id.		
6	118	Depo. Ex. 118 - 4/15/16	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7		Valkyrie Studios.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		AX030320.	(more prejudicial than		
8			probative, waste of time). How		
9			Defendants spent money		
			received through donations, including through a studio		
10			lease, has no relevance to		
11			copyright infringement. See		
			ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL		
12			No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors		
13			to Defendants' crowdfunding		
			campaign, and thus have no		
14			standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the		
15			money raised. Id.		
	120	Depo. Ex. 120 - 3/8/16	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
16		Twitter post from	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
17		@StarTrekAxanar	(more prejudicial than		
			probative, waste of time). Fed.		
18			R. Evid. 602 (lacks foundation). Social media post concerning		
19			Defendants' speculation about		
			Plaintiffs' motivation for instant		
20			lawsuit is irrelevant to		
21			Plaintiff's copyright claims.		
			Defendant Peters has no personal knowledge of		
22			Plaintiffs' motivation for instant		
23			lawsuit.		
	121	Depo. Ex. 121 - 5/11/2007	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Peters and Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
		GOSSETT-EMAILS 009121-9122.	probative, waste of time). Concept drawings have no		
26		00/121-/122.	relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
27			Preliminary works are too		
			unreliable in determining		
28					

1		Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	Ī			substantial similarity as to the		
3				final work. ECF No. 134,		
_ ,				Defendants' MIL No. 6. It		
4				would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review		
5				drawings related to draft scripts		
				when there is no risk such		
6				scripts will be used. Id.		
7	-	122	Depo. Ex. 122 - Drawings of	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
			Phasers. AX003045-3048.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
8			CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
9				probative, waste of time).		
				Concept drawings have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
10				Preliminary works are too		
11				unreliable in determining		
11				substantial similarity as to the		
12				final work. ECF No. 134,		
				Defendants' MIL No. 6. It		
13				would be a waste of the jury's		
14				and the Court's time to review		
				drawings related to draft scripts		
15				when there is no risk such		
16	_	123	Depo. Ex. 123 - Rough	scripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		123	drawings of Phasers.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
17			AX003032-3044.	(more prejudicial than		
18			CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time).		
10				Concept drawings have no		
19				relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
20				Preliminary works are too		
20				unreliable in determining		
21				substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134,		
22				Defendants' MIL No. 6. It		
22				would be a waste of the jury's		
23				and the Court's time to review		
				drawings related to draft scripts		
24				when there is no risk such		
25				scripts will be used. Id.		
		124	Depo. Ex. 124 - 1/4/2011	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
26			Email from Alec Peters to Christian Gossett.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
27			GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time). The		
			009564.	fact that Defendants have seen		
28	L					

Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
		Star Trek works is not disputed,		
		and the fact that they through to		
		re-watch certain works does not shed light on which, if any, of		
		those works were substantially		
		similar to the Axanar works,		
		and whether the Axanar works		
		are in any event, protected by		
107	D	fair use.		
125	Depo. Ex. 125 - 11/25/12	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	Email string between Christian Gossett and Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
	Peters. AX0029228-29233.	probative, waste of time).		
	CONFIDENTIAL	Concept drawings have no		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
		Preliminary works are too		
		unreliable in determining		
		substantial similarity as to the		
		final work. ECF No. 134,		
		Defendants' MIL No. 6. It		
		would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review		
		drawings related to draft scripts		
		when there is no risk such		
		scripts will be used. Id.		
126	Depo. Ex. 126 - 11/13/13	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	Email from Alec Peters to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
	GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
	007167.	Nondescript email with links is irrelevant.		
127	Depo. Ex. 127 - 3/24/13	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
- - '	Email from Sean Tourangeau	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	to Christian Gossett, et al.	(more prejudicial than		
	GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
	009291-9292.	Concept drawings for a		
		potential costume have no		
		relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
		Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining		
		substantial similarity as to the		
		final work. ECF No. 134,		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.	D E 100 7/00/10	D.C. E.I.D.E.I. 401, 402		Adm.
	128	Depo. Ex. 128 - 7/28/13 Email string between Alec	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
3		Peters and Brenda Hinesley.	(more prejudicial than		
4		AX029187-29190.	probative, waste of time).		
_		CONFIDENTIAL	Concept drawings for a		
5			potential costume have no		
6			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
7			Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining		
7			substantial similarity as to the		
8			final work. ECF No. 134,		
9			Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
9	129	Depo. Ex. 129 - 8/14/13	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
10		Email from Facebook notification to Christian	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
11		Gossett. GOSSETT-	probative, waste of time).		
11		EMAILS007324.	Defendant Peters' movie		
12			critique has no relevance to		
13			Plaintiffs' claims.		
13	130	Depo. Ex. 130 - 12/18/13	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
14		Email from Alec Peters to Christian Gossett, et al.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
15		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
		007156-7157.	Defendants' potential and future		
16			plans for a studio has no		
17			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
			See ECF No. 135, Defendants'		
18			MIL No. 7. Allowing Plaintiffs to continue to scrutinize the		
19			expenditures for a work that		
			their lawsuit halted, and the		
20			financials of renting a studio,		
21			would provide no probative		
	131	Depo. Ex. 131 - 1/6/14 Email	value. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
22	131	from Alec Peters to Christian	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
23		Gossett. GOSSETT-	(more prejudicial than		
		EMAILS007123-7124.	probative, waste of time).		
24			Concept drawings for a		
25			potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
26			Preliminary works such as draft		
26			screenplays are too unreliable in		
27			determining substantial		
20			similarity as to the final work.		
28					

ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review drawings related to draft scripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining unterpretation of the probative of time). Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantal similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining on the prevention o	1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review drawings related to draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 132 Depo. Ex. 132 - 4/26/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters, et al. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. 133 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gosett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. 144 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007631-7634. 155 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters and Christian Gossett to Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. Good and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiff's claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	2	140.		ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		Aum.
the jury's and the Court's time to review drawings related to draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Depo. Ex. 132 - 4/26/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters, et al. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553.	3					
draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Depo. Ex. 132 - 4/26/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters, et al. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. Defo. Ex. 132 - 4/26/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. Gossett to Gossett to Alec Peters. Gossett to Alec Peters. Gossett to Alec Peters. Gossett to Alec Peters. Gossett to Gossett to Gossett to Gossett to Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. G				the jury's and the Court's time		
risk such scripts will be used. Id. Depo. Ex. 132 - 4/26/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters, et al. GOSSETT-EMAIL.S- 006024. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL. No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work in the quality of the work any impact on whether a work in the quality of the work any impact on whether a work in the quality of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have	4			_		
132 Depo. Ex. 132 - 4/26/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters, et al. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. Grelvance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 133	ا ج			<u> </u>		
132 Depo. Ex. 132 - 4/26/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters, et al. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk used seripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	3			<u> </u>		
Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters, et al. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Defo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Email from Christian Gossett to determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	6	122	Dana En 122 4/26/14			
to Alec Peters, et al. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL. No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of time). Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word 'professional,' have any impact on whether a work	اار	132		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. GOSSETT-EMAILS 006024. probative, waste of time). Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the work 'professional,' have any impact on whether a work	1/					
9 006024. Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 133 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS-007631-7634. Defendants' MIL No. 6. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS-007552-7553. Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS-007552-7553. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	8					
screenplays are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 133 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. 14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 15 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 16 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 17 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETS-EMAILS 007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETS-EMAILS 007552-7553. 19 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETS-EMAILS 007552-7553. 10 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email the probability of the Work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the work or professional, "have any impact on whether a work by the any impact on				-		
similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 133 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. 18 19 20 21 21 22 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 21 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 21 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 21 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28	9			_		
similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 133 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alee Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	10			determining substantial		
No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 133 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. 14 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. 15 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. Gossett to Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. 15 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 16 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 17 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 19 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 20 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 21 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 22 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 23 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 24 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 25 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 26 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 27 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 28 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 29 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 20 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 20 Unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 27 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 28 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. 29 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 10 Once prejudicial than probative, waste of time). 20 Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work				1		
the jury's and the Court's time to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 133 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. 14 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 15 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 16 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 17 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 19 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 20 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	11			*		
to review notes regarding draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. 133 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. 14 Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. 15 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 16 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 17 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. 18 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 19 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 10 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 11 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 11 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 12 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 13 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 14 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 15 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 16 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 17 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 18 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 19 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 10 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 10 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 11 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 11 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 12 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 13 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 14 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 15 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 16 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 17 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 18 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 19 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 10 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 10 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 11 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 12 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 13 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 14 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 15 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 16 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 17 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 18 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 19 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 10 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 11 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 11 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 12 Defendan	12					
scripts when there is no risk such scripts will be used. Id. Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depos. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depos. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depos. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depos. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depos. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depos. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depos. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553.	12					
such scripts will be used. Id. Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-Emails. GOSSETT-Emails tring between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS007552-7553. Defo. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudical than probative, waste of time). Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudical than probative, waste of time). Pelaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	13					
Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS007631-7634. Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Defo. Ex. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work				_		
from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. from Christian Gossett. (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	14	133	Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email			
Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS007631-7634. (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	15					
Concept drawings for a potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 24 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 25 Defendants' MIL No. 6. 26 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work			Alec Peters. GOSSETT-	(more prejudicial than		
potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 24 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	16		EMAILS007631-7634.	-		
potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 24 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. 25 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	$ _{17} $			1 2		
Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work				-		
unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	18					
substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	10			<u> </u>		
final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. 134 Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	19			_		
Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	20			I		
Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Dels: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	$ \mathbf{a}_1 $			·		
Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Peters and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	$ Z_1 $	134	Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
GOSSETT-EMAILS 007552-7553. probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	22		<u> </u>			
24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	22					
24 25 26 26 27 28 29 20 20 21 22 23 24 25 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 25 26 27 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 25 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28	23					
position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	24		007552-7555.			
work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work						
of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	25			1 -		
them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	26					
any impact on whether a work				them, or the colloquial use of		
any impact on whether a work	27			_		
	28			any impact on whether a work		

is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MII. No. 9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' MII. No. 9. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' Crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL	1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
Copyright law. See ECF No. 137. Defendants' MIL No. 9.	2	110.		is infringing or improper under		Aum.
135 Depo, Ex. 135 - 5/13/14 Email string between Christian Gossett and Karl Kelly. GOSSETT-EMAILS- 008703-8705. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringengenie. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS09367-9368. Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS009367-9368. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance) from their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work in the position that the quality of the work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work in the position that the quality of the work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work in the position that the quality of the work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work in the position that the quality of the work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work in the position that the quality of the work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work in the position that the quality of the work is infringence.	3					
Email string between Christian Gossett and Karl Kelly. GOSSETT-EMAILS- 008703-8705. Email string between Christian Gossett and Karl Kelly. GOSSETT-EMAILS- 008703-8705. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Defe. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368. Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368. Defendants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them or the colloquial use of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them, or the colloquial use of the work work on them or the work work on them or the work work on them or the colloquial use of the work work on theme and the professional."						
Christian Gossett and Karl Kelly. GOSSETT-EMAILS-008703-8705. Christian Gossett and Karl Kelly. GOSSETT-Email String between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS-009367-9368. Christian Gossett and Karl Kelly. Gossional, "have any impact on that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright aw. See ECF No. 137, Defendants MIL No. 9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. (CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any timpact on whether a work is infringented. The position work is infringented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any timpact on whether a work is infringented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work upon the people whom work on them.	4	135	-	,		
Kelly. GOSSETT-EMAILS- 008703-8705. Kelly. GOSSETT-EMAILS- 008703-8705. Kelly. GOSSETT-EMAILS- 008703-8705. Frobative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137. Defendants' MIL No. 9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135. Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the work on professional, have any impact on whether a work in the paintiffs have not presented any impact on whether a work in them, or the colloquial use of the work on whether a work in them, or the colloquial use of the work on whether a work in the position whether a work in them, or the colloquial use of the work on whether a work in the position whether a work in them.	5		<u> </u>	,		
Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word 'professional,' have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS009367-9368. Pefer Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 call Sheet. Ax005147.						
position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. 136 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368. 16 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 17 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 18 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 18 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 18 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. Ax005147. 19 Defendants' acmpaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 19 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is the work in them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is the work in the quality of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright information in the quality of the work in the quality of the work in the quality of the work in the quality of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright in	6			1 = '		
work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. 136	7					
of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. 136 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS-009367-9368. 16 Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS-009367-9368. 17 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 18 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 18 CONFIDENTIAL 19 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 10 Defendants yes to time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL						
them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. 136 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS009367-9368. 14 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS009367-9368. 15 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 18 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 19 CONFIDENTIAL 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 138 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 139 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 130 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 131 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 132 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 138 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 139 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 130 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 131 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 132 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 138 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 139 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 130 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 130 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 131 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 132 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 139 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 130 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 130 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 131 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 132 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 139 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 130 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 130 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 131 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 132 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 133 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 140 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 150 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 150 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/	0			_		
the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. 136 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS009367-9368. 16 DEMAILS009367-9368. 17 DEMAILS009367-9368. 18 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL 18 Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL 19 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL 20 Deferior prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word, impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright is infringenent. See ECF No. 137, Defendants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 20 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional." have any impact on whether a work	9					
any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. 136 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT-EMAILS009367-9368. 16 EMAILS009367-9368. 17 EMAILS009367-9368. 18 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. 18 CONFIDENTIAL 19 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL 138 Converse of time of the work waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	10			the word "professional," have		
copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Confident and probative, waste of time) Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work						
137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. 136 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	11					
136 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368. 15 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368. 16 Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14 Email string between Alec Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368. 16 Defondants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL 138 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL 139 Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	12					
Peters and Jhennifer Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368. 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 Email sheld evert Arc (incevarice). Tell R. Evit. R. E	12	136	Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368. Probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	13		_			
EMAILS-009367-9368. Defendants spent money received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	14					
received through donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	15		•	1 = '		
infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work						
135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL 23 CONFIDENTIAL 24 Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	16			100		
Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	$17\ $					
Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work						
campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 Sheet. AX005147. (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	18					
Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	19					
money raised. Id. 137 Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL 23 probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	20					
Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work						
Sheet. AX005147. CONFIDENTIAL (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	21	137	Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call	•		
CONFIDENTIAL (more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	22		Sheet. AX005147.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work			CONFIDENTIAL	, I 3		
24 25 26 26 27 28 29 20 20 21 22 22 23 24 25 25 26 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 25 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 25 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 20 20 21 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	23					
position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	24			_		
work, the careers or experience of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	25					
them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	z					
the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work	26					
any impact on whether a work	27					
	28			any impact on whether a work		

1	E N		Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2		0.		is infringing or improper under		110111
3				copyright law. See ECF No.		
	10	0	D = 120 D 1 1	137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
4	13	8	Depo. Ex. 138 - Prelude to	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
5			Axanar Script. AX011521- 11541. HIGHLY	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
			CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time).		
6				Preliminary works such as draft		
7				screenplays are too unreliable in		
				determining substantial		
8				similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
9				No. 6. It would be a waste of		
10				the jury's and the Court's time		
10				to review notes regarding draft		
11				scripts when there is no risk		
12	139	0	Dana Ev. 120 7/0/14 Email	such scripts will be used. Id.		
12	13	9	Depo. Ex. 139 - 7/9/14 Email from Alec Peters to Christian	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
13			Gossett. GOSSETT-	(more prejudicial than		
14			EMAILS003483.	probative, waste of time).		
				Plaintiffs have not presented		
15				any authority to support their		
16				position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience		
				of the people who work on		
17				them, or the colloquial use of		
18				the word "professional," have		
10				any impact on whether a work		
19				is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No.		
20				137, Defendants' MIL No. 9		
21	140	0	Depo. Ex. 140 - 7/12/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
21			Email from Christian Gossett	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
22			to Terry McIntosh. GOSSETT-EMAILS	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
23			003490.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
			003.130.	any authority to support their		
24				position that the quality of the		
25				work, the careers or experience		
				of the people who work on		
26				them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have		
27				any impact on whether a work		
28				is infringing or improper under		

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	110.		copyright law. See ECF No.		Aum.
3			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
	141	Depo. Ex. 141 - 7/15/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
4		Email string between Christian Gossett and Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
5		Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS-	probative, waste of time).		
		-002422-2423.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
6			any authority to support their		
7			position that the quality of the		
8			work, the careers or experience		
0			of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of		
9			the word "professional," have		
10			any impact on whether a work		
			is infringing or improper under		
11			copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
12	142	Depo. Ex. 142 - 7/14/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Email string between Terry	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
13		McIntosh, Alec Peters, et al.	(more prejudicial than		
14		GOSSETT-EMAILS 009648-9649.	probative, waste of time).		
15		009048-9049.	Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their		
			position that the quality of the		
16			work, the careers or experience		
17			of the people who work on		
			them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have		
18			any impact on whether a work		
19			is infringing or improper under		
			copyright law. See ECF No.		
20	1.40	D E 140 5/14/15	137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
21	143	Depo. Ex. 143 - 7/14/15 Email string between Thor	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
22		Benitez and Christian	(more prejudicial than		
		Gossett. GOSSETT-	probative, waste of time).		
23		EMAILS002545-2547.	Preliminary works such as draft		
24			screenplays are too unreliable in		
			determining substantial similarity as to the final work.		
25			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
26			No. 6. It would be a waste of		
			the jury's and the Court's time		
27			to review notes regarding draft		
28	L		scripts when there is no risk		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		such scripts will be used. Id.		Adm.
3	144	Depo. Ex. 144 - 8/1/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
3		Christian Gossett Facebook	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
4		posts	(more prejudicial than		
اے			probative, waste of time).		
5			Preliminary works such as draft		
6			screenplays are too unreliable in		
			determining substantial		
7			similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
8			No. 6. It would be a waste of		
			the jury's and the Court's time		
9			to review notes regarding draft		
10			scripts when there is no risk		
			such scripts will be used. Id.		
11	145	Depo. Ex. 145 - 4/4/14 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12		string between Christian Gossett and Alec Peters.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
13		006727-6729.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
14			any authority to support their		
17			position that the quality of the		
15			work, the careers or experience		
16			of the people who work on		
10			them, or the colloquial use of		
17			the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work		
10			is infringing or improper under		
18			copyright law. See ECF No.		
19			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
	146	Depo. Ex. 146 - 4/8/14 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
20		from Alec Peters to Christian	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
21		Gossett. GOSSETT-	(more prejudicial than		
		EMAILS006693.	probative, waste of time). Email with a nondescript link is		
22			irrelevant to determining		
23			copyright issues.		
	147	Depo. Ex. 147 - 4/13/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		Email from Tobias Richter to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
26		006464.	Concept drawings or		
27			backgrounds have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
			Preliminary works are too		
28			,		

1		D		D.4. II	D. 4
	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2			unreliable in determining		
3			substantial similarity as to the		
4			final work. ECF No. 134,		
4	148	Depo. Ex. 148 - 3/17/14	Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
5	140	Email from Alec Peters to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Hamilton Cox, et al.	(more prejudicial than		
6		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
7		006964.	Concept drawings for a		
			potential costume have no		
8			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary are too unreliable		
9			in determining substantial		
10			similarity as to the final work.		
10			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
11			No. 6.		
12	149	Depo. Ex. 149 - 3/28/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12		Email string between Christian Gossett, Tobais	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
13		Richer, et al. GOSSETT-	probative, waste of time).		
14		EMAILS006858-6866.	Preliminary works are too		
			unreliable in determining		
15			substantial similarity as to the		
16			final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
	152	Depo. Ex. 152 - 10/16/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17	132	Email string between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
18		Christian Gossett and	(more prejudicial than		
		Michael DeMeritt.	probative, waste of time).		
19		GOSSETT-EMAILS	Plaintiffs are not donors to		
20		001134-1138.	Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how		
21			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
22			money raised. Id.		
22	153	Depo. Ex. 153 - 10/27/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
23		Email string between Alec Peters and Jeff Carlisle.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
24		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
25		001053-1054.	Concept drawings for a		
			potential costume have no		
26			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
27			Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in		
			determining substantial		
28		1	6	<u> </u>	

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2			similarity as to the final work.		
3			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
	151	D 7 151 11/05/11	No. 6.		
4	154	Depo. Ex. 154 - 11/27/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
5		Email string between ARP Design and Christian Gossett.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
6		000854-858.	Preliminary works are too		
7			unreliable in determining		
			substantial similarity as to the		
8			final work. ECF No. 134,		
9			Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of the jury's		
			and the Court's time to review		
10			drawings or scenes related to		
11			draft scripts when there is no		
			risk such scripts or scenes will		
12	155	D D 155 11/04/14	be used. Id.		
13	155	Depo. Ex. 155 - 11/24/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Email string between Emil Petrinic and Christian	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
14		Gossett. GOSSETT-	probative, waste of time).		
15		EMAILS000887-891.	Concept drawings for a		
			potential costume or scene have		
16			no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
17			claims. Preliminary works such		
			as draft screenplays are too unreliable in determining		
18			substantial similarity as to the		
19			final work. ECF No. 134,		
			Defendants' MIL No. 6. It		
20			would be a waste of the jury's		
21			and the Court's time to review		
			drawings related to draft scripts or scenes when there is no risk		
22			such scripts or scenes will be		
23			used. Id.		
	156	Depo. Ex. 156 - 2/23/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Peters and Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
		GOSSETT-EMAILS 000513-514.	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
26		000313-314.	any authority to support their		
27			position that the quality of the		
20			work, the careers or experience		
28					

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2			of the people who work on		
3			them, or the colloquial use of		
			the word "professional," have		
4			any impact on whether a work		
5			is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No.		
			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
6	157	Depo. Ex. 157 - Casting	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7	10,	Announcement. AX003372-	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		3373. CONFIDENTIAL.	(more prejudicial than		
8		Order unsealing 12/9/16 [Dkt	probative, waste of time).		
9		109].	Plaintiffs have not presented		
9			any authority to support their		
10			position that the quality of the		
			work, the careers or experience of the people who work on		
11			them, or the colloquial use of		
12			the word "professional," have		
			any impact on whether a work		
13			is infringing or improper under		
14			copyright law. See ECF No.		
			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
15	158	Depo. Ex. 158 - 2/25/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
16		Email string between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
10		Christian Gossett and Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS-	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
17		-001093-1094.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
10		-001073-1074.	any authority to support their		
18			position that the quality of the		
19			work, the careers or experience		
			of the people who work on		
20			them, or the colloquial use of		
21			the word "professional," have		
			any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under		
22			copyright law. See ECF No.		
23			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
	159	Depo. Ex. 159 - 5/20/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		Email string between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Christian Gossett and Alec	(more prejudicial than		
		Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS-	probative, waste of time). How		
26		-007667.	Defendants spent money		
27			received through donations has		
~ /			no relevance to copyright infringement. See ECF No.		
28			immigenent. Dec Let 110.	<u> </u>	

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
3			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
			Defendants' crowdfunding		
4			campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how		
5			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
			money raised. Id.		
6	160	Depo. Ex. 160 - 4/29/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7		Email from Kevin Haney to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Alec Peters. GOSSETT-	(more prejudicial than		
8		EMAILS000274.	probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money		
9			received through donations has		
10			no relevance to copyright		
10			infringement. See ECF No.		
11			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
12			Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding		
14			campaign, and thus have no		
13			standing to object to how		
14			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
			money raised. Id.		
15	161	Depo. Ex. 161 - 4/21/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
16		Email string between christian@axanarproductions.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
		com and Christian Gossett.	probative, waste of time).		
17		GOSSETT-EMAILS	Evidence of disputes between		
18		000276-278.	Defendant Peters and a		
			disgruntled former colleague		
19			have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF No. 133,		
20			Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
21	162	Depo. Ex. 162 - 4/11/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
21		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
22		Peters and Neal Fisher.	(more prejudicial than		
23		GOSSETT-EMAILS 000322-323.	probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money		
		000322-323.	received through donations has		
24			no relevance to copyright		
25			infringement. See ECF No.		
			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
26			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
27			Defendants' crowdfunding campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how		
28	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		Defendants' allegedly spent the		Adm.
3			money raised. Id.		
	163	Depo. Ex. 163 - 4/21/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
4		Email string between Christian Gossett and Robert	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
5		Burnett. GOSSETT-	probative, waste of time).		
6		EMAILS007501-7502.	Evidence of disputes between Defendant Peters and a		
7			disgruntled former colleague		
8			have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF No. 133,		
			Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
9	164	Depo. Ex. 164 - 5/12/15			
10		Captain's Log - May 12, 16, by Alec Peters, Axanar			
11		Productions,			
12		http://www.axanarproduction s.com/captains-log-may-12-			
13	1.57	2015.	D (F D F 101 102		
	165	Depo. Ex. 165 - 7/28/15 Email from Google+ to	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
14		Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
15		GOSSETT-EMAILS 007551.	probative, waste of time). Evidence of disputes between		
16		007221.	Defendant Peters and a		
17			disgruntled former colleague have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
18			claims. See ECF No. 133,		
19	166	Depo. Ex. 166 - 7/27/15	Defendants' MIL No. 5 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Email string between Jeffrey	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
20		Morris to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-EMAILS	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
21		007516.	Evidence of disputes between		
22			Defendant Peters and a		
23			disgruntled former colleague have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
24			claims. See ECF No. 133, Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
25	169	Depo. Ex. 169 - Photograph.	Defendants WIIL NO. 3.		
		AX003503. CONFIDENTIAL			
26	L	CONTIDENTIAL			

1	Ex	-	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No 170	Depo. Ex. 170 - 6/15/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		Adm.
3	170	Excerpt of Blu-ray News –	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Fabulous Baker Boys, Son of	(more prejudicial than		
4		Kong, Space 1999: S2, Them,	probative, waste of time).		
5		Hammer BDs & Axanar: Day	Plaintiffs have not presented		
3		1!, by Bill Hunt, My 2 Cents,	any authority to support their		
6		The Digital Bits, http://www.thedigitalbits.com	position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience		
ا		/columns/my-two-	of the people who work on		
7		cents/061515_1630	them, or the colloquial use of		
8		_	the word "professional," have		
			any impact on whether a work		
9			is infringing or improper under		
10			copyright law. See ECF No.		
	171	Depo. Ex. 171 - 6/22/15	137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
11	1/1	Excerpt from Captain's Log -	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
12		June 20/21, 2106, Axanar	(more prejudicial than		
		Productions,	probative, waste of time).		
13		http://www.axanarproduction	Preliminary works such as draft		
14		s.com/captains-log-june-	screenplays are too unreliable in		
		2021-2015/	determining substantial		
15			similarity as to the final work.		
16			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of		
			the jury's and the Court's time		
17			to review draft scripts when		
18			there is no risk such scripts will		
			be used. Id. Moreover,		
19			evidence has demonstrated that		
20			the term "locked script" is a		
20			term of art, which does not mean that the script will remain		
21			static through production of the		
22			work. See ECF No. 87-1,		
			Defendants' Response to		
23			Plaintiffs' Statement of		
$ \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{A}} $	150		Undisputed Facts.		
24	172	Depo. Ex. 172 - 8/15/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
25		Axanar Facebook post. PL0000903.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
26		1 20000703.	probative, waste of time).		
26			Preliminary works such as draft		
27			screenplays are too unreliable in		
$ \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{o}} $			determining substantial		
28					

1	l 1	X. Io.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2				similarity as to the final work.		
3				ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
				No. 6. It would be a waste of		
4				the jury's and the Court's time		
5				to review draft scripts when there is no risk such scripts will		
				be used. Id. Moreover,		
6				evidence has demonstrated that		
7				the term "locked script" is a		
'				term of art, which does not		
8				mean that the script will remain		
				static through production of the		
9				work. See ECF No. 87-1,		
10				Defendants' Response to		
				Plaintiffs' Statement of		
11	17	'3	Depo. Ex. 173 - 11/26/15	Undisputed Facts. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12	1 /	5	Axanar Script, Revision 7.7.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
			AX026616-26729. HIGHLY	(more prejudicial than		
13			CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time).		
14				Preliminary works such as draft		
17				screenplays are too unreliable in		
15				determining substantial		
16				similarity as to the final work.		
10				ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of		
17				the jury's and the Court's time		
10				to review draft scripts when		
18				there is no risk such scripts will		
19				be used. Id.		
	17	'4	Depo. Ex. 174 - 8/19/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
20			Kickstarter Updates: The	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
21			Scarecrow Project and Star	(more prejudicial than		
			Trek: Axanar!, My 2 Cents,	probative, waste of time). Fed.		
22			by Bill Hunt, Editor, The Digital Bits,	R. Evid. 602 (lacks foundation). How Defendants spent money		
23			http://thedigitalbits.com/colu	received through donations has		
23			mns/my-two-	no relevance to copyright		
24			cents/081914_1245	infringement. See ECF No.		
25			<u> </u>	135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
25				Plaintiffs are not donors to		
26				Defendants' crowdfunding		
				campaign, and thus have no		
27				standing to object to how		
28				Defendants' allegedly spent the		

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	190.		money raised. Id. Plaintiffs		Aum.
3			have not presented any		
3			authority to support their		
4			position that the quality of the		
ہے			work, the careers or experience		
5			of the people who work on		
6			them, or the colloquial use of		
_			the word "professional," have any impact on whether a work		
7			is infringing or improper under		
8			copyright law. See ECF No.		
			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
9	175	Depo. Ex. 175 - 8/25/14 Star	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
10		Trek: The Compendium	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Review, Plus Star Trek:	(more prejudicial than		
11		Axanar & Lord Richard	probative, waste of time). How		
12		Attenborough RIP, My 2 Cents, by Bill Hunt, Editor,	Defendants spent money received through donations has		
12		The Digital Bits,	no relevance to copyright		
13		http://www.thedigitalbits.com	infringement. See ECF No.		
14		/columns/my-two-	135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
14		cents/082514_0010	Plaintiffs are not donors to		
15			Defendants' crowdfunding		
16			campaign, and thus have no		
16			standing to object to how		
17			Defendants' allegedly spent the money raised. Id. Allowing		
10			Plaintiffs to continue to		
18			scrutinize the expenditures for a		
19			work that their lawsuit halted,		
			and the financials of renting a		
20			studio, would provide no		
21	176	Depo. Ex. 176 - 4/23/15	probative value. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
22	170	Blue-ray News: Prelude to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
22		Axanar, I Love Lucy:	(more prejudicial than		
23		Ultimate S2, People Under	probative, waste of time). Fed.		
		the Stars & More, My 2	R. Evid. 602 (lacks foundation).		
24		Cents, by Bill Hunt, Editor,	Plaintiffs have not presented		
25		The Digital Bits,	any authority to support their		
		http://www.thedigitalbits.com/columns/my-two-cents/	position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience		
26		042315_1230. PL0005810-	of the people who work on		
27		5812.	them, or the colloquial use of		
			the word "professional," have		
28				-	

1	Ex No	-	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	110	•	any impact on whether a work		714111
3			is infringing or improper under		
			copyright law. See ECF No.		
4	177	Depo. Ex. 177 - 7/6/15 Blu-	137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
5		ray News – Terminator	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
6		Genisys, Star Trek: Axanar,	(more prejudicial than		
		Zatoichi, Blacklist: S2 & The	probative, waste of time). Fed.		
7		Bits @ Comic-Con!, My 2	R. Evid. 602 (lacks foundation).		
8		Cents, by Bill Hunt, Editor, The Digital Bits,	Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their		
		http://www.thedigitalbits.com	position that the quality of the		
9		/columns/my-two-	work, the careers or experience		
10		cents/070615_1345	of the people who work on		
11			them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have		
			any impact on whether a work		
12			is infringing or improper under		
13			copyright law. See ECF No.		
			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Moreover, preliminary works		
14			are too unreliable in		
15			determining substantial		
16			similarity as to the final work.		
10			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
17	179	Depo. Ex. 179 - 9/21/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
18		TheDigitalBits.com Facebook	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		post sharing Axanar's photo	(more prejudicial than		
19			probative, waste of time). Preliminary works such as draft		
20			screenplays are too unreliable in		
21			determining substantial		
			similarity as to the final work.		
22			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6. It would be a waste of		
23			the jury's and the Court's time		
			to review draft scripts when		
24			there is no risk such scripts will		
25	180	Depo. Ex. 180 - 4/14/16	be used. Id. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
26		Email to Justin from Martin	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		Kelly re Star Trek Beyond	(prejudicial). A draft press		
27		Fan Event - Press Release,	release about Plaintiffs' newest		
28		draft for approval.	Star Trek motion picture, Star		

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	140.	PL0012693-PL0012734.	Trek Beyond, is not relevant to		Aum.
3		CONFIDENTIAL	this case.		
4					
5	181	Depo. Ex. 181 - Twitter	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
6		Image. AX000056.	(Relevance). FRE 403		
			(prejudicial). A tweet by the		
7			director of Star Trek Beyond, a Star Trek motion picture, is not		
8			relevant to this case. Lin is not a		
9			copyright holder, nor is he an		
			employee of Plaintiffs. At the		
10			time of this statement, Lin had not seen Prelude or the Vulcan		
11			scene.		
12	189	Depo. Ex. 189 - 4/29/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Confidential Non-Disclosure	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
13		Agreement ("Agreement") Between Axanar Production	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
14		and Terry McIntosh	Plaintiffs have not presented		
			any authority to support their		
15			position that the quality of the		
16			work, the careers or experience of the people who work on		
17			them, or the colloquial use of		
			the word "professional," have		
18			any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under		
19			copyright law. See ECF No.		
20			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
20	190	Depo. Ex. 190 - Terry	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
21		McIntosh reply to Misty Mills's post re Ares Digital	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
22		v3.14159	probative, waste of time).		
			Evidence of disputes between		
23			Defendant Peters and a		
24			disgruntled former colleague have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
25			claims. See ECF No. 133,		
			Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
26					

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No. 198	Depo. Ex. 198 - 2/11/13	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		Adm.
3		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Peters and Doug Drexler.	(more prejudicial than		
4		AX035311-35313. CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
5		CONTIDENTIAL	any authority to support their		
6			position that the quality of the		
			work, the careers or experience of the people who work on		
7			them, or the colloquial use of		
8			the word "professional," have		
9			any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under		
			copyright law. See ECF No.		
10			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
11	199	Depo. Ex. 199 - 5/19/14 Email string between Alec	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
12		Peters (cc Lewis, Mark, et	(more prejudicial than		
13		al.). GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
		005193-5194.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
14			any authority to support their position that the quality of the		
15			work, the careers or experience		
16			of the people who work on		
			them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have		
17			any impact on whether a work		
18			is infringing or improper under		
19			copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
	200	Depo. Ex. 200 - 10/26/15 List			
20		of "Star Trek" licensed products that Alec Peters has			
21		purchased. AX035743.			
22	•	CONFIDENTIAL			
23	201	Depo. Ex. 201 – "Axanar" Master 2014-16 Oct.	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
		Revised." AX035571-35737.	(prejudicial). Lacks foundation.		
24		CONFIDENTIAL	FRE 802 (Hearsay). In response		
25			to Plaintiffs' document requests, Defendants produced		
26			a financial statement. Then,		
			after Mr. Peters' first		
27			deposition, he altered the financial statement Peters		
28		1	imanetai statement i etcis		

1		Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	ľ			"reversed" out certain expenses		
3				by attempting to offset them		
				with the lease payments he was		
4				required to make on the studio		
5				he rented. Defendants' post- lawsuit financial transactions		
				relating to Axanar Productions,		
6				including their manipulation of		
7				the financial statement, are		
				irrelevant because they do not		
8				eliminate the fact that prior to		
9				the filing of this lawsuit,		
9				Defendants profited from the		
10				business that they created.		
11				Also, this financial statement was created by Defendants		
11				during this litigation, has no		
12				probative weight and is		
				prejudicial.		
13		202	Depo. Ex. 202 - 7/8/14 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
14			string between Alec Peters	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
			and Rocio Evenett.	(more prejudicial than		
15			GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
16			001767-1771.	Concept drawings for a		
10				potential costume have no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
17				Preliminary works are too		
10				unreliable in determining		
18				substantial similarity as to the		
19				final work. ECF No. 134,		
				Defendants' MIL No. 6. It		
20				would be a waste of the jury's		
21				and the Court's time to review		
				drawings related to draft scripts when there is no risk such		
22				scripts will be used. Id.		
23	╽┟	203	Depo. Ex. 203 - 10/12/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
			Email from Alec Peters to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
24			Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
25			GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
			001225.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
26				any authority to support their		
27				position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience		
				of the people who work on		
28			<u> </u>	FF		

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	1100		them, or the colloquial use of		110111
3			the word "professional," have		
3			any impact on whether a work		
4			is infringing or improper under		
ہے			copyright law. See ECF No.		
5			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
6	204	Depo. Ex. 204 - 10/27/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
7		Peters and Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
8		GOSSETT-EMAILS 001057-1058.	probative, waste of time).		
0		001037-1038.	Concept drawings for a potential costume have no		
9∥			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
10			Preliminary works are too		
10			unreliable in determining		
11			substantial similarity as to the		
11			final work. ECF No. 134,		
12			Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
12	205	Depo. Ex. 205 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
13		Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
14		Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
		McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
15			Defendants' use of the Star		
16			Trek name or trademark is irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claim in		
			this case, as Plaintiffs have not		
17			alleged any counts of trademark		
10			infringement. See ECF No.		
18			136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
19	206	Depo. Ex. 206 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
20		Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
21		McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
			Defendants' use of the Star		
22			Trek name or trademark is		
22			irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claim in		
23			this case, as Plaintiffs have not alleged any counts of trademark		
24			infringement. See ECF No.		
			136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
25	207	Depo. Ex. 207 - 11/23/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
26		Facebook Messenger	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
20		exchange between Alec	(more prejudicial than		
27		Peters and Terry McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
20			Defendants' use of the Star		
28					

1		Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
$2\ $		NO.		Trek name or trademark is		Aum.
3				irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claim in		
$_{4}\ $				this case, as Plaintiffs have not alleged any counts of trademark		
				infringement. See ECF No.		
5		200	D E 200 5/24/14	136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
6		208	Depo. Ex. 208 - 5/26/14 Facebook Messenger	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
7			exchange between Alec	(more prejudicial than		
			Peters and Terry McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
8		209	Depo. Ex. 209 - Facebook Messenger exchange between	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
9			Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
10			McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
11				Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their		
				position that the quality of the		
12				work, or the careers or experience of the people who		
13				work on them, have any impact		
14				on whether a work is infringing		
15				or improper under copyright law. See ECF No. 137,		
				Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
16		210	Depo. Ex. 210 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17			Messenger exchange between Alec Peters and Terry	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
18			McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
19				Defendants' use, or nonuse, of the Star Trek name or		
				trademark is irrelevant to		
20				Plaintiffs' claim in this case, as		
21				Plaintiffs have not alleged any counts of trademark		
22				infringement. See ECF No.		
23		211	D F 011 F 1 1	136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
		211	Depo. Ex. 211 - Facebook Messenger exchange between	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
24			Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
25			McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
26				Defendants' use, or nonuse, of the Star Trek name or		
				trademark is irrelevant to		
27				Plaintiffs' claim in this case, as		
28				Plaintiffs have not alleged any		

1		Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
		No.	2000	3 9001 2022	2000 200	Adm.
2				counts of trademark		
3				infringement. See ECF No.		
4		212	Dana Ev. 212 4/12/15	136, Defendants' MIL No. 8		
4		212	Depo. Ex. 212 - 4/12/15 Facebook Messenger	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
5			exchange between Alec	(more prejudicial than		
			Peters and Terry McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
6			•	Defendants' use of the Star		
7				Trek name or trademark is		
				irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claim in		
8				this case, as Plaintiffs have not		
9				alleged any counts of trademark infringement. See ECF No.		
10				136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
10		213	Depo. Ex. 213 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
11			Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
			Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
12			McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
13				Preliminary works are too		
				unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the		
14				final work. See ECF No. 134,		
15				Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
		214	Depo. Ex. 214 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
16			Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
17			Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
			McIntosh	probative, waste of time). Evidence that Defendant Peters'		
18				career aspirations is not relevant		
19				to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF		
				No. 137, Defendants' MIL No.		
20				9.		
21		215	Depo. Ex. 215 - 3/7/15 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
			from Alec Peters to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
22			christian@axanarproductions. com. GOSSETT-EMAILS	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
23			00422.	Evidence of disputes between		
				Defendant Peters and a		
24				disgruntled former colleague		
25				have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
				claims. See ECF No. 133,		
26	<u> </u>			Defendants' MIL No. 5.		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
$2 \parallel$	No. 220	Dana Ev. 220. August 16	Disfer, EDE 401, 402		Adm.
	220	Depo. Ex. 220 - August 16 Star Trek Fan Film	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
3		Guidelines Focus Group	(prejudicial). FRE 602 (Lacks		
4		Report Prepared for CBS and	foundation). The Star Trek		
ا ج		Paramount Submitted by	guidelines are not relevant to		
5		Organized Fans. PL0013816	this case. Defendants intend to		
6		- PL0013853.	submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a		
$_{7}\ $			fan film. While Defendants		
			label the Axanar Works as a		
8			"fan film," no court has ever		
9			held that a "fan film" (whether		
			or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has		
10			any impact on the copyright		
11			infringement analysis.		
	221	Depo. Ex. 221 - 8/2/14 Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
12		from Risa Kessler to Bill	(Relevance). FRE 403		
13		Burke cc: John Van Citters re	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
		"Fan Film" Concepts. PL0013110 - PL0013111.	(Hearsay). An internal CBS email about other films is not		
14			relevant to this case. While		
15			Defendants label the Axanar		
			Works as a "fan film," no court		
16			has ever held that a "fan film"		
17			(whether or not that label is		
			accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the		
18			copyright infringement analysis.		
19	222	Depo. Ex. 222 - 04/30/13 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
20		Email string from Bill Burke	(Relevance). FRE 403		
20		to David Grant cc Ryan Adams re Star Trek	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
21		Continues with attachment.	(Hearsay). An internal CBS email about another film that is		
22		PL0012993.	not at issue in this case has no		
			relevance to this case.		
23			Defendants intend to submit		
24			this exhibit in order to argue		
			that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants label		
25			the Axanar Works as a "fan		
26			film," no court has ever held		
			that a "fan film" (whether or not		
27			that label is accurate, which in		
28			this case it is not) has any		

1		Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	H	No.		impact on the conveight		Adm.
				impact on the copyright infringement analysis.		
3				Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
4				have sued other "fan film"		
اے				creators is legally irrelevant as		
5		222	D F 222 5/11/10	well.		
6		223	Depo. Ex. 223 - 5/11/10 - Email from John Van Citters	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
7			to Liz Kalodner; Bill Burke;	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
7			Ian Spellin re James Cawley;	(Hearsay). A CBS email about		
8			Fan Films. PL0013083.	another film that is not at issue		
9				in this case has no relevance to		
9				this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to		
10				argue that the Axanar film is a		
11				fan film. While Defendants		
				label the Axanar Works as a		
12				"fan film," no court has ever		
13				held that a "fan film" (whether		
				or not that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has		
14				any impact on the copyright		
15				infringement analysis.		
				Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
16				have sued other "fan film"		
17				creators is legally irrelevant as		
	-	224	Depo. Ex. 224 - 9/20/12	well. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
18		<i>22</i> ¬	Redacted Email from Bill	(Relevance). FRE 403		
19			Burke to Ian Spelling re	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
20			huston huddleston.	(Hearsay). An internal CBS		
20			PL0007895.	email about doing a piece on		
21			CONFIDENTIAL	Alec Peters and discussing how he is a licensee is not relevant to		
22				this case.		
22		225	Depo. Ex. 225 - 2/25/15			
23			Email string from Bill Burke			
24			to John Van Citters re Vul-			
			Con. PL0007016 - PL0007017.			
25			CONFIDENTIAL			
26	^L		· ·	<u> </u>		

28

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No. 226	Dana Ev. 226 2/25/15			Adm.
3	220	Depo. Ex. 226 - 2/25/15 Email string from Bill Burke			
3		to			
4		mallory@thelicensingshop.co			
5		m re Vulcan Question. PL0007897 - PL0007899.			
		CONFIDENTIAL			
6	227	Depo. Ex. 227 - 5/20/16	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
7		Email string from John Van	(Relevance). FRE 403		
8		Citters to Liz Kalodner; cc: John Wentworth; Bill Burke;	(prejudicial). An internal CBS email after the lawsuit that		
		Leslie Ryan; Yasmin Elachi	discusses the lawsuit is not		
9		re CBS/Paramount Statement.	relevant to this case.		
10		PL0012807 - PL0012808. CONFIDENTIAL			
11	228	Depo. Ex. 228 - 12/18/13	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
		Redacted Email String from	(Relevance). FRE 403		
12		Bill Burke to	(prejudicial). A CBS email		
13		Ianspellin@aol.com; Yasmin Elachi re Addresses.	discussing CBS not being happy with Peters in 2013, prior		
14		PL0010034.	to the fundraising for the		
		CONFIDENTIAL	Axanar Works, is not relevant		
15	220	D E 200 7/00/15	to this case.		
16	229	Depo. Ex. 229 - 7/29/15 Email string from Bill Burke	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
		to Travis Pierson [Redacted]	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
17		re Nimoy Documentary.	(Hearsay). An email discussing		
18		PL0010249. CONFIDENTIAL	Peters' work on a documentary		
19		CONFIDENTIAL	about Leonard Nimoy is not relevant to this case.		
	230	Depo. Ex. 230 - 7/28/14	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
20		Email string from Bill Burke	(Relevance). FRE 403		
21		to Clayton Stone cc: Erika Winterholler; Yasmin Elachi	(prejudicial). FRE 802 (Hearsay). A CBS email about		
22		re Vulcan Harp app - crowd	other films is not relevant to		
		funding. PL0013041 -	this case. Defendants intend to		
23		PL0013042.	submit this exhibit in order to		
24			argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants		
25			label the Axanar Works as a		
			"fan film," no court has ever		
26			held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate,		
27			which in this case it is not) has		
28			any impact on the copyright		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		infrincement analysis		Adm.
3			infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
3			have sued other "fan film"		
4			creators is legally irrelevant as		
5	221	Davis Es. 221 7/21/14	well.		
	231	Depo. Ex. 231 - 7/31/14 Email string from Bill Burke	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
6		to Leslie Ryan cc: Brian	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
7		Reinert; CBS; Yasmin Elachi;	(Hearsay). A CBS email about		
		Chelsea Dutchik; Kimberly	other films is not relevant to		
8		Burnell re Can you do a quick call tomorrow with me and	this case. Defendants intend to submit this exhibit in order to		
9		John? PL0012988 -	argue that the Axanar film is a		
10		PL00129992.	fan film. While Defendants		
			label the Axanar Works as a		
11			"fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether		
12			or not that label is accurate,		
			which in this case it is not) has		
13			any impact on the copyright		
14			infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
15			have sued other "fan film"		
			creators is legally irrelevant as		
16			well.		
17	300	Depo. Ex. 300 - Justin Lin	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
		Tweet. AX000057.	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). A tweet by the		
18			director of Star Trek Beyond, a		
19			Star Trek motion picture, is not		
20			relevant to this case. Lin is not a		
			copyright holder, nor is he an employee of Plaintiffs. At the		
21			time of this statement, Lin had		
22			not seen Prelude or the Vulcan		
	202	D E 202 4/14/16	scene.		
23	302	Depo. Ex. 302 - 4/14/16 Email string from Justin Lin	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
24		to JJ Abrams cc: Rob Moore;	(prejudicial). A draft press		
25		Lindsey Weber; Martin	release about Plaintiffs' newest		
		Kelley; Katherine Rowe;	Star Trek motion picture, Star		
26		Morgan Dameron; Megan Colligan re Star Trek Beyond	Trek Beyond, is not relevant to this case.		
27		Fan Event - Press Release,	uno cuoc.		
		draft for approval.			
28					

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.	2 0302- P 130-2	3,000 a	2 400 200	Adm.
		PL0012788.			
3	303	Depo. Ex. 303 - Transcript of J.J. Abrams Statement	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
4		J.J. Abrams Statement	(prejudicial). Abrams is not a		
			copyright holder, nor is he an		
5			employee of Plaintiffs. At the		
6			time of this statement, Abrams		
			had only seen a short clip of		
7	304	Depo. Ex. 304 - 5/20/16 -	Prelude. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
8	304	Email from Liz Kalodner to	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		John Wentworth cc: Bill	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
9		Burke; Leslie Ryan; Yasmin	(Hearsay). CBS emails about		
10		Elachi; John Van Citters re	statements made by Justin Lin		
11		CBS/Paramount Statement. PL0012809 - PL0012810.	and J.J. Abrams are not relevant. Neither of them are		
11		CONFIDENTIAL	the copyright holders, nor are		
12			they employees of Plaintiffs.		
	305	Depo. Ex. 305 - Social	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
13		Media Posts	(Relevance). FRE 403		
14			(prejudicial). Tweets by Axanar		
15			Productions made after this lawsuit about Plaintiffs' newest		
13			motion picture, Star Trek		
16			Beyond, are not relevant to this		
17			case.		
1 /	306	Depo. Ex. 306 - 6/27/16 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
18		Email from Rob Moore to	(Relevance). FRE 403		
19		Megan Colligan re Update. PL0012799.	(prejudicial). FRE 802 (Hearsay). Paramount emails		
		1 200121773.	about other films are not		
20			relevant to this case. Defendants		
21			intend to submit this exhibit in		
			order to argue that the Axanar		
22			film is a fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar		
23			Works as a "fan film," no court		
			has ever held that a "fan film"		
24			(whether or not that label is		
25			accurate, which in this case it is		
			not) has any impact on the copyright infringement analysis.		
26			copyright infinigement analysis.		

	Adm.
1	

1					
1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No. 501	[Dkt 72-15] Exhibit M to			Adm.
		11/16/16 Grossman			
3		Declaration - Prelude to			
4		Axanar The Illustrated Script			
		of the Short Film			
5	502	[Dkt 72-50] Exhibit UU to			
6		11/16/16 Grossman			
		Declaration - 12/16/1986			
7		Copyright registrations for			
8		the Original Series (1966- 1969), Star Trek: The Next			
8		Generation (1987-1994), Star			
9		Trek: Deep Space Nine			
10		(1993-1999), Star Trek:			
10		Voyager (1995-2001), and			
11		Star Trek: Enterprise (2001-			
		2005). Collectively, the "Star			
12	702	Trek Television Series."			
13	503	[Dkt 72-54] Exhibit VV to 11/16/16 Grossman			
		Declaration - 12/12/1979			
14		Copyright registrations for			
15		Star Trek – The Motion			
		Picture (1979), Star Trek II –			
16		The Wrath of Khan (1982),			
17		Star Trek III The Search for			
1/		Spock (1984), Star Trek IV:			
18		The Voyage Home (1986), Star Trek V: The Final			
19		Frontier (1989), Star Trek VI			
19		- The Undiscovered Country			
20		(1991), Star Trek Generations			
21		(1994), Star Trek: First			
21		Contact (1996), Star Trek:			
22		Insurrection (1998), Star Trek			
		Nemesis (2002), Star Trek			
23		(2009), Star Trek Into			
24		Darkness (2013), Star Trek Beyond (16). Collectively,			
		the "Star Trek Motion			
25		Pictures."			
26				<u>I</u>	

27

28

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.	-	, and the second		Adm.
	504	[Dkt 72-55] Exhibit WW to			
3		11/16/16 Grossman Declaration - 4/18/03			
4		Copyright registration for			
		Garth of Izar			
5	505	[Dkt 72-56] Exhibit XX to			
6		11/16/16 Grossman Declaration - 8/26/06			
7		Copyright registration for			
/		Strangers from the Sky			
8	506	[Dkt 72-57] Exhibit YY to			
9		11/16/16 Grossman			
		Declaration -8/19/08 Copyright registration for			
10		Infinity's Prism. PL0000768-			
11		769.			
	507	[Dkt 72-62] Exhibit BBB to	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12		11/16/16 Van Citters	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
13		Declaration -10/27/16 Copyright registration to The	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
14		Four Years War	Plaintiffs should be precluded		
14			from relying on evidence		
15			relating to allegedly infringed		
16			works they failed to claim in their First Amended Complaint.		
			See ECF No. 130, Defendants'		
17			MIL No. 3. Plaintiffs attempt		
18			to rely on evidence improperly		
10			withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs failed to timely		
19			produce this evidence during		
20			the discovery period. See ECF		
21			No. 128, Defendants' MIL No.		
	700		2.		
22	508	[Dkt 86-2] Unredacted	Pltfs: FRE 403 (prejudicial).		
23		Version of Exhibit 3 to 11/16/16 Oki Declaration -	FRE 802 (Hearsay). FRE 702 (Lacks basis for expert		
		Expert Report of Christian	opinion). Lacks foundation. Mr.		
24		Tregillis, CPA, ABV, CFF,	Tregillis lacks competence or		
25		CLP	expertise to opine on the topics		
			covered in his report.		
26					

21

28

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No. 509	[Dkt 75-6] Exhibit 4 to	Pltfs: FRE 403 (prejudicial).		Adm.
3		11/16/16 Oki Declaration -	FRE 802 (Hearsay). FRE 702		
		Report of Henry Jenkins	(Lacks basis for expert		
4			opinion). Lacks foundation.		
5			Mr. Jenkins lacks competence or expertise to opine on what		
			aids or competes with motion		
6			pictures and television		
7			programming, and he does not		
8			use any data to support his opinions. Further, he purports		
			to claim that Prelude to Axanar		
9			is transformative with no		
10			expertise in the area, and he		
			admits although he is Defendants' expert, he hasn't		
11			even read the Axanar Script at		
12			issue in this case. His report is		
13			not signed under oath.		
	510	[Dkt 86-7] Unredacted version of Exhibit 3 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
14		11/16/16 Peters Declaration -	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
15		Script: "The Undying One"	(Hearsay). FRE 403		
		(aka "AXANAR") Part 1.	(prejudicial). This script, which		
16		AX031943 - AX031989.	was created after this litigation was filed, bears no relevance to		
17			Plaintiffs' claims for		
18			infringement because Plaintiffs		
			have not filed suit based on this		
19			script. Also, this script was created by Defendants during		
20			this litigation, has no probative		
21			weight and is prejudicial.		
	511	[Dkt 86-8] Unredacted	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
22		version of Exhibit 3 to 11/16/16 Peters Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
23		Script: "The Undying One"	(Hearsay). FRE 403		
		(aka "AXANAR") Part 2.	(prejudicial). This script, which		
24		AX031990 - AX032066.	was created after this litigation		
25			was filed, bears no relevance to Plaintiffs' claims for		
26			infringement because Plaintiffs		
			have not filed suit based on this		
27			script. Also, this script was		
28			created by Defendants during		

this litigation, has no probative weight and is prejudicial. 512 [Dkt 75-23] Exhibit 4 to 11/16/16 Peters Declaration - 7/21 Star Trek Beyond (Prejudicial). A tweet by Mr. Peters made after this lawsuit telling people to see Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 513 [Dkt 75-24] Exhibit 5 to 11/16/16 Peters Declaration - Axanar Tweet 12 13 14 15 16 175-26] Exhibit 1 to 11/16/16 Lane Declaration - January 16 Executive Summary a History of STAR TRE 403 (Prejudicial). FRE 802	Adm.
Size Trek Beyond Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). A tweet by Mr. Peters made after this lawsuit telling people to see Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). A tweet by Mr. Peters made after this lawsuit and the state of the s	
S12	
7/21 Star Trek Beyond (prejudicial). A tweet by Mr. Peters made after this lawsuit telling people to see Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 10	
Peters made after this lawsuit telling people to see Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). A tweet by Mr. Peters made after this lawsuit about Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. Star Trek Beyond, Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802	
telling people to see Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 19 10 10 10 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 11 15 16 16 17 18 18 18 19 19 10 10 10 11 10 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	
Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 513 [Dkt 75-24] Exhibit 5 to 11/16/16 Peters Declaration - Axanar Tweet (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). A tweet by Mr. Peters made after this lawsuit about Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 514 [Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to 11/16/16 Lane Declaration - January 16 Executive (Pltfs: FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802	
motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 513 [Dkt 75-24] Exhibit 5 to 11/16/16 Peters Declaration - Axanar Tweet 12 13 14 15 16 17/16/16 Lane Declaration - January 16 Executive motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). A tweet by Mr. Peters made after this lawsuit about Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 514 [Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to 11/16/16 Lane Declaration - January 16 Executive (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802	
relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 513	
never produced by Defendants in this case. 513	
in this case. 513	
513 [Dkt 75-24] Exhibit 5 to 11/16/16 Peters Declaration - Axanar Tweet 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 11 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 11 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 11 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 11 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	
11	
Axanar Tweet (prejudicial). A tweet by Mr. Peters made after this lawsuit about Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 514 [Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to 11/16/16 Lane Declaration - January 16 Executive (prejudicial). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802	
Peters made after this lawsuit about Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 514	
about Star Trek Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 514 [Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to 11/16/16 Lane Declaration - January 16 Executive (prejudicial). FRE 802	
Plaintiffs' most recent motion picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 514 [Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to 11/16/16 Lane Declaration - (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802	1
case. Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants in this case. 514	
was never produced by Defendants in this case. 514 [Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 January 16 Executive (prejudicial). FRE 802	
Defendants in this case. 514 [Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to 11/16/16 Lane Declaration - (Relevance). FRE 403 January 16 Executive (prejudicial). FRE 802	
514 [Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802	
16 11/16/16 Lane Declaration - (Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802	
January 16 Executive (prejudicial). FRE 802	
1/ Summary a History of STAR (Hearsay) FRF 602 (Lacks	
TREK fan films Part 1. foundation). FRE 701-703	
AX000213 - AX000304. (Purported "expert" opinion by	
a witness not qualified as an expert). This summary of other	
20 films has no relevance to this	
case Defendants intend to	
21 submit this exhibit in order to	
argue that the Axanar film is a	
fan film. While Defendants	
label the Axanar Works as a	
24 "fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether	
on not that label is accounts	
which in this case it is not) has	
any impact on the copyright	1
infringement analysis.	
Moreover, whether Plaintiffs	
28 have sued other "fan film"	

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		creators is legally irrelevant as		Adm.
3			well.		
3	515	[Dkt 75-27] Exhibit 1 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
4		11/16/16 Lane Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403		
5		January 16 Executive	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
		Summary a History of STAR TREK fan films Part 2.	(Hearsay). FRE 602 (Lacks foundation). FRE 701-703		
6		AX000305 - AX000340.	(Purported "expert" opinion by		
7		711000303 7111000310.	a witness not qualified as an		
			expert). This summary of other		
8			films has no relevance to this		
9			case. Defendants intend to		
			submit this exhibit in order to		
10			argue that the Axanar film is a fan film. While Defendants		
11			label the Axanar Works as a		
			"fan film," no court has ever		
12			held that a "fan film" (whether		
13			or not that label is accurate,		
13			which in this case it is not) has		
14			any impact on the copyright infringement analysis.		
15			Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
13			have sued other "fan film"		
16			creators is legally irrelevant as		
17			well.		
	516	[Dkt 75-29] Exhibit 1 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
18		11/16/16 Watkins Declaration - Screen Shot Axanar Fan	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
19		Group Page	(Hearsay). FRE 602 (Lacks		
		Group ruge	foundation). These post-		
20			litigation posts on the Axanar		
21			Fan Group page have no		
			relevance to this case.		
22			Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants		
23			in this case.		
	517	[Dkt 90-9] Exhibit H to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
24		11/28/16 Ranahan	(Relevance). FRE 403		
25		Declaration - Wikipedia	(prejudicial). FRE 602 (Lacks		
		Definition of Mockumentary	foundation). FRE 802		
26			(Hearsay). This Wikipedia page states that a "mockumentary" is		
27			sometimes defined as a parody.		
			Mr. Peters however, testified		
28					

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
			that Prelude to Axanar was not a parody.		
3	518	[Dkt 94-5] Unredacted	Pltfs: With respect to bates		
4		Exhibit 1 to 11/28/16 Peters	range, AX035571 - AX035737:		
5		Declaration Financial	FRE 401, 402 (Relevance).		
3		Summary. AX035571 - AX035737.	FRE 403 (prejudicial). Lacks		
6		AX033/3/.	foundation. FRE 802 (Hearsay). In response to Plaintiffs'		
7			document requests, Defendants		
			produced a financial statement.		
8			Then, after Mr. Peters' first		
9			deposition, he altered the financial statement Peters		
			"reversed" out certain expenses		
10			by attempting to offset them		
11			with the lease payments he was		
12			required to make on the studio		
			he rented. Defendants' post- lawsuit financial transactions		
13			relating to Axanar Productions,		
14			including their manipulation of		
			the financial statement, are		
15			irrelevant because they do not eliminate the fact that prior to		
16			the filing of this lawsuit,		
17			Defendants profited from the		
1/			business that they created. Also,		
18			this financial statement was created by Defendants during		
19			this litigation, has no probative		
			weight and is prejudicial. To		
20			the extent that Defendants		
21			intend to introduce PL0013763- PL0013785 (which is Exhibit 1		
22			to Peters' declaration),		
22			Plaintiffs do not object.		
23	519	[Dkt 90-13] Exhibit 3 to			
24		11/28/16 Peters Declaration - 7/6/15 Email string from Liz			
		Kalodner to			
25		alec@axanarproductions.com			
26		cc: John Van Citters;			
		Mallory Levitt; Bill Burke re			
27		Axanar. PL0013787 - PL0013788.			
28					

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No. 520	[Dl+ 00 14] Evbibit 4 to			Adm.
	320	[Dkt 90-14] Exhibit 4 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration -			
3		Facebook posts. PL0013517.			
4	521	[Dkt 90-15] Exhibit 5 to			
5		11/28/16 Peters Declaration -			
		Email re Fan Films Facebook Posts. PL0013502 -			
6		PL0013503.			
7	522	[Dkt 90-16] Exhibit 6 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
8		11/28/16 Peters Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403		
0		Press Release - Unique Trek Project Marks the Return of	(prejudicial). FRE 802 (Hearsay). FRE 1002 (Best		
9		Garth of Izar	evidence). A purported Axanar		
10			Productions Press Release		
			stating that "[t]wo major		
11			players in the universe of Star Trek fan films" planned to		
12			collaborate is irrelevant. While		
13			Defendants label the Axanar		
			Works as a "fan film," no court		
14			has ever held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is		
15			accurate, which in this case it is		
			not) has any impact on the		
16			copyright infringement analysis.		
17			Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants		
18			in this case.		
	523	[Dkt 90-17] Exhibit 7 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
19		11/28/16 Peters Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403		
20		Facebook Response. PL0011822.	(prejudicial). FRE 802 (Hearsay). FRE 1002 (Best		
21		120011022.	evidence). A Facebook post by		
			Axanar claiming that CBS has		
22			laid out unofficial rules for Star Trek fan films is irrelevant.		
23			While Defendants label the		
			Axanar Works as a "fan film,"		
24			no court has ever held that a		
25			"fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate, which in this		
26			case it is not) has any impact on		
			the copyright infringement		
27			analysis.		

11021643.2

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	524	[Dkt 94-6] Unredacted			714111.
3		Exhibit 8 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration - Facebook Post			
4		by Axanar. PL0008222.			
5	525	[Dkt 90-20] Exhibit 10 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration -			
6		Blog Post. PL0005973 -			
	706	PL0005989.			
7	526	[Dkt 90-21] Exhibit 11 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration -			
8		Comic Con Document re			
9		Axanar. PL0000106 - PL0000134.			
10	527	[Dkt 90-23] Exhibit 13 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
11		Peters Declaration in Support of Opposition to Plaintiffs'	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
12		Motion for Partial Summary	(Hearsay). A twitter post from		
		Judgment - Axanar Facebook Post	Defendant Axanar Productions, Inc. after this lawsuit other		
13			films is not relevant to this case.		
14			Moreover, this document was never produced by Defendants		
15			in this case.		
16	528	[Dkt 90-24] Exhibit 14 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
17		Twitter Post	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
			(Hearsay). A twitter post from		
18			Defendant Axanar Productions, Inc. after this lawsuit stating		
19			that "CBS shut down another fan film" is not relevant to this		
20			case. Moreover, this document		
21			was never produced by Defendants in this case.		
22	529	[Dkt 94-8] Unredacted	Detendants in this case.		
23		Exhibit 15 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration - 8/20/16 Email			
24		string from Bill Burke to John			
25		Van Citters re The Wrap is inquiring about the			
		Kickstarter Star Trek fan			
26		film. PL0012814 - PL0012816.			
27		1			

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No. 530	[Dkt 94-9] Exhibit 16 to			Adm.
3		11/28/16 Peters Declaration - 8/8/15 Email string from			
4		Marian Cordry to Holly			
5		Amos, John Citters re SIGH. PL0008689.			
6	531	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63] DVDs of Star Trek Television	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
7		Series titled The Original Series (1966-1969)	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
8		Series (1700-1707)	Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
9			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
10			failed to timely produce this		
11			evidence during the discovery period. See ECF No. 128,		
12	532	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants' MIL No. 2. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
13		DVDs of Star Trek Television	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Series titled Star Trek: The Next Generation (1987-1994)	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
14		Next Generation (1987-1994)	Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
15			evidence improperly withheld		
16			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs failed to timely produce this		
17			evidence during the discovery		
			period. See ECF No. 128, Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
18	533	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
19		DVDs of Star Trek Television	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
20		Series titled Star Trek: Deep Space Nine (1993-1999)	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
21			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
22			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
23			failed to timely produce this evidence during the discovery		
24			period. See ECF No. 128,		
	534	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants' MIL No. 2. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
25		DVDs of Star Trek Television	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
26		Series titled Star Trek:	(more prejudicial than		
27		Voyager (1995-2001)	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
28			evidence improperly withheld		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		Adm.
			failed to timely produce this		
3			evidence during the discovery		
4			period. See ECF No. 128,		
			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
5	535	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
6		DVDs of Star Trek Television	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Series titled Star Trek:	(more prejudicial than		
7		Enterprise (2001-2005)	probative, waste of time).		
8			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on evidence improperly withheld		
			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
9			failed to timely produce this		
10			evidence during the discovery		
10			period. See ECF No. 128,		
11			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
12	536	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
14		DVD of Star Trek Motion Picture titled Star Trek – The	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
13		Motion Picture (1979)	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
1.4		Wotton Ficture (1979)	Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
14			evidence improperly withheld		
15			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
1.			failed to timely produce this		
16			evidence during the discovery		
17			period. See ECF No. 128,		
	537	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants' MIL No. 2 Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
18		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
19		Picture titled Star Trek II –	(more prejudicial than		
		The Wrath of Khan (1982)	probative, waste of time).		
20			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
21			evidence improperly withheld		
			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
22			failed to timely produce this evidence during the discovery		
23			period. See ECF No. 128,		
			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
24	538	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
25		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Picture titled Star Trek III	(more prejudicial than		
26		The Search for Spock (1984)	probative, waste of time).		
27			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
41			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
28			from Detendants, as I familitis		

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	1100		failed to timely produce this		110111
3			evidence during the discovery		
			period. See ECF No. 128,		
4			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
5	539	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
3		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
6		Picture titled Star Trek IV:	(more prejudicial than		
٦		The Voyage Home (1986)	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
7			evidence improperly withheld		
8			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
			failed to timely produce this		
9			evidence during the discovery		
10			period. See ECF No. 128,		
	7.40	DI 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
11	540	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63] DVD of Star Trek Motion	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12		Picture titled Star Trek V:	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
		The Final Frontier (1989)	probative, waste of time).		
13			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
14			evidence improperly withheld		
17			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
15			failed to timely produce this		
16			evidence during the discovery		
10			period. See ECF No. 128,		
17	541	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants' MIL No. 2. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
10	341	DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
18		Picture titled Star Trek VI –	(more prejudicial than		
19		The Undiscovered Country	probative, waste of time).		
		(1991)	Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
20			evidence improperly withheld		
21			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
			failed to timely produce this evidence during the discovery		
22			period. See ECF No. 128,		
23			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
	542	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Picture titled Star Trek	(more prejudicial than		
		Generations (1994)	probative, waste of time).		
26			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
27			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
			failed to timely produce this		
28		1	, F	1	

2	No.		Objections	Date Id.	Date
			evidence during the discovery		Adm.
			period. See ECF No. 128,		
3			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
$4\ $	543	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
5		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
3		Picture titled Star Trek: First	(more prejudicial than		
6		Contact (1996)	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
7			evidence improperly withheld		
			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
8			failed to timely produce this		
9			evidence during the discovery		
			period. See ECF No. 128, Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
10	544	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
11		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
10		Picture titled Star Trek:	(more prejudicial than		
12		Insurrection (1998)	probative, waste of time).		
13			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on evidence improperly withheld		
14			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
14			failed to timely produce this		
15			evidence during the discovery		
16			period. See ECF No. 128, Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
	545	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17	3 13	DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
18		Picture titled Star Trek	(more prejudicial than		
		Nemesis (2002)	probative, waste of time).		
19			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on evidence improperly withheld		
20			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
21			failed to timely produce this		
21			evidence during the discovery		
22			period. See ECF No. 128,		
23	546	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants' MIL No. 2. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	340	DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
24		Picture titled Star Trek (2009)	(more prejudicial than		
25			probative, waste of time).		
			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
26			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
27			failed to timely produce this		
28			evidence during the discovery		

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
$2 \parallel$	No.		period. See ECF No. 128,		Adm.
			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
3	547	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
4		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
5		Picture titled Star Trek Into	(more prejudicial than		
3		Darkness (2013)	probative, waste of time).		
6			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on evidence improperly withheld		
7			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
			failed to timely produce this		
8			evidence during the discovery		
9			period. See ECF No. 128, Defendants' MIL No. 2		
	548	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
10		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
11		Picture titled Star Trek	(more prejudicial than		
12		Beyond (2016)	probative, waste of time).		
12			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on evidence improperly withheld		
13			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
14			failed to timely produce this		
			evidence during the discovery		
15			period. See ECF No. 128, Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
16	549	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants WIIL NO. 2.		
17		DVD of Prelude to Axanar			
17		(8/15/14)			
18	550	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63] DVD of Vulcan Scene			
19		(4/28/16)			
	551	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
20		Book titled Garth of Izar	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
21		(2003)	(more prejudicial than		
			probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
22			evidence improperly withheld		
23			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
24			failed to timely produce this		
			evidence during the discovery period. See ECF No. 128,		
25			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
26	552	Physical Exhibit: Trailer for			
		Axanar feature available at			
27		https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=Np_PVbW6y64			
28		CII: V—INP_I V U VV U Y U Y			

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	553	Physical Exhibit: Trailer for			
3		Axanar feature available at			
4		https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=T_4W5ywBTpE			
5	554	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 75-20]			
		DVD of Prelude to Axanar.			
6		AX031132.			
7	555	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 75-21] DVD of Vulcan Scene.			
8		AX031131.			
9	556	Physical Exhibit: Source	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
		Video. AX035895.	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
10			(Hearsay). This video was		
11			produced on November 3, after		
12			the close of discovery and after		
12			the second court-ordered deposition of Mr. Peters, which		
13			was ordered by the Court		
14			because of his failure to		
			produce documents in		
15			discovery. This video, which		
16			contains clips from some television shows and films, has		
17			no relevance to this case. It		
1/			appears to have been prepared		
18	557	Dhysical Eyhibit, Ayanan	for this litigation. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
19		Physical Exhibit: Axanar Motion Picture Directors WIP	(Relevance). FRE 403		
20		Reel. AX035807.	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
			(Hearsay). This video is a "work in progress" of Axanar.		
21			This video was produced on		
22			November 3, after the close of		
			discovery and after the second		
23			court-ordered deposition of Mr.		
24			Peters, which was ordered by the Court because of his failure		
			to produce documents in		
25			discovery.		
26					<u></u>

20

28

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
$2 \parallel$	558		Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		Aum.
	336		(Relevance). FRE 403		
3			(prejudicial). FRE 802		
4			(Hearsay). A video showing		
			Justin Lin and J.J. Abrams after		
5			this lawsuit is not relevant.		
6			Neither of them are the		
			copyright holders, nor are they		
7			employees of Plaintiffs. At the		
8			time of this statement, Abrams had only seen a short clip of		
8			Prelude. At the time of this		
9			statement, Lin had not seen		
10			Prelude or the Vulcan scene.		
10	559	Physical Exhibit: Parody	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
11		Video. AX035744.	(Relevance). FRE 403		
			(prejudicial). Lacks foundation.		
12			FRE 802 (Hearsay). This		
13			cartoon video, which		
			Defendants refer to as a "parody video" and appears to be a		
14			parody of Prelude to Axanar,		
15			has no relevance to this case.		
13	560	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'	The field will be the customer to the customer		
16		Demonstrative			
17	561	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'			
1/		Demonstrative			
18	562	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'			
10		Demonstrative			
19	563	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'			
20		Demonstrative			
	564	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'			
21		Demonstrative			
22					
	Dotad	December 19, 2016	IOER & IOER IIP		

Dated: December 19, 2016

LOEB & LOEB LLP JONATHAN ZAVIN **DAVID GROSSMAN** JENNIFER JASON

By:/s/ David Grossman

69

David Grossman Attorneys for Plaintiffs PARAMOUNT PICTURES **CORPORATION and CBS STUDIOS** INC.

23 24

25 26 27

28

Dated: December 19, 2016 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP ERIN R. RANAHAN DIANA HUGHES LEIDEN KELLY N. OKI By: /s/ Erin R. Ranahan Erin R. Ranahan Attorneys for Defendants AXANAR PRODUCTIONS, INC. and **ALEC PETERS**