Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 1 of 72 Page ID #:10459

EXHIBIT "A"

Ca	e 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E D	ocument 158-2 F #:10460	Filed 12/29/16	Page 2 of 72	Page ID
1	LOEB & LOEB LLP				
1	DAVID GROSSMAN (S dgrossman@loeb.com	SBN 211326)			
2	JENNIFER JASON (SBI jjason@loeb.com	N 274142)			
3 4	10100 Santa Monica Blv	d., Suite 2200			
4 5	Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: 310.282.2000 Facsimile: 310.282.2200)			
6	LOEB & LOEB LLP	looitte dama la ser	;)		
7	JONATHAN ZAVIN (ac jzavin@loeb.com	imitted pro hac v	ice)		
8	345 Park Avenue New York, NY 10154				
9	Telephone: 212.407.4000 Facsimile: 212.407.4990)			
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs				
11	PARAMOUNT PICTUR CORPORATION and CH				
12	INC.				
13	UN	NITED STATES	DISTRICT C	OURT	
14	CEN	NTRAL DISTRIC	CT OF CALIF	FORNIA	
15					
16	PARAMOUNT PICTUR		Case No.: 2	2:15-cv-09938-	RGK-E
17	CORPORATION, a Dela corporation; and CBS ST	TUDIOS INC.,	JOINT EX	KHIBIT LIST	
18	a Delaware corporation,				
19	Plaintiffs,				
20			D.		1 0 0016
21	AXANAR PRODUCTIC California corporation; A an individual, and DOES	LEC PETERS,	Pre-Trial C	Cutoff: Noven onference: Jan	aber 2, 2016 uary 9, 2017
22			Irial: Janu	ary 31, 2017	
23	Defendants.				
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
) nership mal	11021643.2 202828-10048			JOI	NT EXHIBIT LIST

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnersh Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 3 of 72 Page ID #:10461

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

28

6

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 4 of 72 Page ID #:10462

1	F	Degerintin	Objections	Detc L1	Data
	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	11	Depo. Ex. 11 - 9/1/16			
3		Certificate of Recordation. PL0000045-76.			
4	12	Depo. Ex. 12 - Copyright			
		registrations: The Man Trap			
5		2/7/86 (Star Trek Series);			
6		Encounter at Farpoint (Star Trek - the Next Generation			
7		Series) 1/7/88; The Emissary,			
		Part 1 (Star Trek - Deep space			
8		Nine Series) 10/10/93; Caretaker (Star Trek Voyager			
9		TV Series) 3/25/96; and Star			
10		Trek: Voyager (Script)			
	12	10/17/94. PL0000035-44.			
11	13	Depo. Ex. 13 - 8/27/15 - Email from Alec Peters to			
12		John Van Citters; Bill Burke			
13		cc: Elizabeth Kalodner;			
		Mallory Levitt re Axanar. PL0012412.			
14	14	Depo. Ex. 14 - 5/6/15 - Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
15		from John Van Citters to Bill	(Relevance). FRE 403		
16		Burke re fan bridges. PL0006993.	(prejudicial). Internal CBS emails relating to other films,		
		CONFIDENTIAL	and particularly the guidelines		
17			set by other film studios, has no		
18			relevance to this case. Defendants intend to submit		
19			this exhibit in order to argue		
			that the Axanar film is a fan		
20			film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a "fan		
21			film," no court has ever held		
22			that a "fan film" (whether or not		
23			that label is accurate, which in this case it is not) has any		
			impact on the copyright		
24			infringement analysis.		
25			Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film"		
26			creators is legally irrelevant as		
			well.		
27					
28					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 5 of 72 Page ID #:10463

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	15	Depo. Ex. 15 - 4/8/15 - Email			Aum.
3		from John Van Citters to Liz			
		Kalodner cc: Veronica Hart;			
4		Bill Burke re Alec Peters.			
5		PL0012220. CONFIDENTIAL			
	16	Depo. Ex. 16 - STAR TREK	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
6	10	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		
			held that a "fan film" (whether		
12			or not that label is accurate,		
13			which in this case it is not) has		
			any impact on the copyright infringement analysis.		
14			Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
15			have sued other "fan film"		
			creators is legally irrelevant as		
16	17		well.		
17	17	Depo. Ex. 17 - Star Trek Fan Film Guidelines Announced	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
10		Thin Ouldennes Announced	(prejudicial). The Star Trek fan		
18			films guidelines are not		
19			relevant. Defendants intend to		
20			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,		
24			which in this case it is not) has		
~+			any impact on the copyright infringement analysis.		
25			Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
26			have sued other "fan film"		
			creators is legally irrelevant as		
27			well.		
28					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 6 of 72 Page ID #:10464

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	18	Depo. Ex. 18 - [Dkt 48]			
3		5/23/16 Answer of			
4		Defendants Axanar			
4		Productions, Inc., and Alec Peters to Plaintiffs' First			
5		Amended Complaint;			
		Counterclaim for Declaratory			
6		Relief; Demand for Jury Trial			
7	24	Depo. Ex. 24 - 3/24/65			
		Binding agreement between			
8		Desilu Productions and			
9		Norway Corporation with services to Gene			
		Roddenberry. PL0001475-			
10		1486. CONFIDENTIAL			
11	25	Depo. Ex. 25 - 8/24/67 Letter			
		from Sherwin Samuels to			
12		Eugen Frank. PL0012673-			
13	26	12692. CONFIDENTIAL			
	26	Depo. Ex. 26 - 5/27/76 Memorandum of Agreement			
14		between Paramount Pictures			
15		Corporation ("Paramount"),			
		on one hand and The Norway			
16		Corporation ("Norway") and			
17		Lincoln Enterprises, Inc.			
		("Lincoln") on the other hand. PL0001420-1451.			
18		CONFIDENTIAL			
19	27	Depo. Ex. 27 - 2/18/97			
		Certificate of Recordation			
20		from Norway Corporation to			
21		Paramount Pictures			
		Corporation. PL0001041-			
22	28	1050. CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 28 - 12/17/07 Star			
23	20	Trek Agreement between			
		Paramount Pictures			
24		Corporation and Norway			
25		Corporation. PL0000941-			
		992. CONFIDENTIAL			
26					
27					
28					
	11021643.	2	4	JOINT EX	HIBIT LIST
ship	202828-10				

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

202828-10048

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 7 of 72 Page ID #:10465

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
	No.	Description	Objections	Date Iu.	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			
8		Certificate of Recordation Assignment to Paramount			
		Pictures Corporation.			
9		PL0001295-1297.			
10		CONFIDENTIAL			
	31	Depo. Ex. 31 - 12/21/05 Assignment & License of			
11		rights to certain properties			
12		from Paramount Pictures			
13		Corporation to CBS between			
		Paramount Pictures Corporation and subsidiaries			
14		and CBS Studios Inc.			
15		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		
		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.		
21		million-star-trek-fan-movie-			
		has-escaped-studio-			
22		shutdown-so-far. PL0005997-6007.			
23	42	Depo. Ex. 42 - Prelude to			
24		Axanar Booklet Back Page			
		Front Cover - Booket Inside. AX003153.			
25		CONFIDENTIAL			
26	43	Depo. Ex. 43 - Prelude to			
		Axanar Booklet Back Page,			
27		Front Page, Booklet Inside. AX003152.			
28	L	1111003152.			

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 8 of 72 Page ID #:10466

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 9 of 72 Page ID #:10467

Ex No	≜	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
48	Depo. Ex. 48 - 7/15/15 Star			Auni.
	Trek: Axanar, Indiegogo			
	https://www.indiegogo.com/p			
	rojects/star-trek-axanar#/story			
	(last visited 7/15/15).			
	PL0005854-5888.			
49	Depo. Ex. 49 - 4/12/15 Draft	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	Marketing Plan. AX003784-	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	3790. CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
		probative, waste of time). Fed.		
		R. Evid. 602 (lacks foundation		
		as the author of the draft		
		marketing plan, which was never used, was not deposed);		
		FRE 802 (hearsay). This draft		
		marketing plan did not relate to		
		the Axanar Works; it relates to		
		potential plans unrelated to the		
		Axanar Works, and was		
		prepared by someone that was		
		never deposed in this action.		
		See ECF No. 135, Defendants'		
		MIL No. 7.		
50	Depo. Ex. 50 - 1/11/15 Blog	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	post, Ares Studios Launches!,	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Axanar Productions,	(more prejudicial than		
	http://www.axanarproduction s.com/ares-studios-launches.	probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money		
	PL0005842-5846.	received through donations,		
	1 20003012 3010.	with respect to a work that this		
		lawsuit has halted, including on		
		a studio, with respect to a work		
		that this lawsuit halted, 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.		
110216		7	JOINT EX	

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 10 of 72 Page ID #:10468

1					
1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	51	Depo. Ex. 51 - 7/5/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		2 3 0111.
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		
)			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		
13			probative, waste of time). How		
15			Defendants planned to or did		
14			spend money received through		
15			donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See		
15			ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL		
16			No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors		
17			to Defendants' crowdfunding		
17			campaign, and thus have no		
18			standing to object to how		
			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
19	53	Depo. Ex. 53 - 1/6/15 Robert	money raised. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
20	55	Meyer Burnett posts photo to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Facebook	(more prejudicial than		
21			probative, waste of time).		
22			Personal social media post,		
			through which Mr. Burnett		
23			reposted a photo someone else		
24			originally posted regarding J.J. Abrams treatment of R2-D2 in		
			the Star Wars movie, is not		
25			relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright		
26			claims in this lawsuit.		
	54	Depo. Ex. 54 - 10/18/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
27		Robert Meyer Burnett	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
28		Facebook posts	(more prejudicial than		
20					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 11 of 72 Page ID #:10469

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		probative, waste of time).		Adm.
3			Personal social media post		
3			concerning Mr. Burnett's		
4			excitement about Star Wars',		
5			The Force Awakens, and		
5			comments on J. J. Abrams role		
6			in prior Star Trek movies, is not relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright		
7			claims.		
8	55	Depo. Ex. 55 - 6/2/14 Robert	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
9		Meyer Burnett Tweet	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
			probative, waste of time).		
10			Personal social media post		
11			concerning is not relevant to		
11			Plaintiffs' copyright claims.		
12	56	Depo. Ex. 56 - 11/28/13	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
13		Robert Meyer Burnett Tweet	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
			(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
14			Personal social media post		
15			concerning is not relevant to		
15			Plaintiffs' copyright claims.		
16	57	Depo. Ex. 57 - 2/6/13 Robert	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17		Meyer Burnett Tweets	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
			(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
18			Personal social media post		
19			concerning J.J. Abrams is not		
			relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright		
20			claims.		
21	59	Depo. Ex. 59 - 3/5/15 Studio	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevence) Fed. P. Evid. 403		
		Floor Going in!, Axanar Productions	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
22		http://www.axanarproduction	probative, waste of time). How		
23		s.com/studio-floor-going-in.	Defendants spent money		
24		PL0005847-5853.	received through donations,		
24			including with repsect to the studio rented to create the film,		
25			has no relevance to copyright		
26			infringement. See ECF No.		
20			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
27			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
28			Defendants' crowdfunding		
20					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 12 of 72 Page ID #:10470

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	110.		campaign, and thus have no		Aum.
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,		
6			and the financials of renting a		
7			studio, would provide no probative value. Id.		
3	60	Depo. Ex. 60- 11/3/15 Email string between Robert Meyer			
9		Burnett and Alec Peters.			
		AX030011-30012. CONFIDENTIAL			
	61	Depo. Ex. 61 - 5/9/16 Email from Alec Peters to Diana	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Kingsbury, et al. AX030316- 30317. CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
		JUSIT. CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). This internal email regarding a staff		
			meeting has no bearing on any issue in this action		
	62	Depo. Ex. 62 - 7/26/14 Prelude to Axanar First			
		Invitational Screening Comic-			
		Con International San Diego. AX005089-5104.			
$\ $	63	CONFIDENTIAL Depo. Ex. 63 - 3/3/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Entertainment Partners	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Production Setup Order. AX000396-402. HIGHLY	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How		
		CONFIDENTIAL	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		
ll [money raised. Id.		
, 1 ,	11021643.2	2	10	JOINT EX	Н

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 13 of 72 Page ID #:10471

1					
1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No. 64	Depo. Ex. 64 - 12/11/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		Adm.
3		Email string between Ken	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
3		<ken@burbankprint.com></ken@burbankprint.com>	(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.		
7			135, Defendants' MIL No. 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		
10			money raised. Id.		
11	65	Depo. Ex. 65 - 6/3/15 Axanar	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
10		Productions organizational	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
12		chart. AX000200.	(more prejudicial than		
13			probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
1 4			any authority to support their		
14			position that the quality of the		
15			work, the careers or experience		
			of the people who work on		
16			them, or the colloquial use of		
17			the word "professional," have		
			any impact on whether a work		
18			is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No.		
19			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
	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		
21			probative, waste of time).		
22			Plaintiffs have not presented		
23			any authority to support their position that the quality of the		
23			work, the careers or experience		
24			of the people who work on		
25			them, or the colloquial use of		
23			the word "professional," have		
26			any impact on whether a work		
27			is infringing or improper under		
27			copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
28	L	<u> </u>	157, Derendants WILL NO. 9.		

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

11021643.2 202828-10048 JOINT EXHIBIT LIST

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 14 of 72 Page ID #:10472

1	_				_
1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	67	Depo. Ex. 67 - 7/6/14 Photo	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		1 Xu 111.
3		of Diana Kingsbury and Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Peters. AX005088.	(more prejudicial than		
4		CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). Defendant Peters' personal		
5			relationship with Diana		
			Kingsbury has no relevance to		
6			Plaintiffs' copyright claims.		
7			See ECF No. 133, Defendants'		
8	68	Depo. Ex. 68 - 7/13/15	MIL No. 5. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
0	08	Itinerary for Alec Peters Los	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
9		Angeles, CA / Calgary,	(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.		
			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
13			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
14			Defendants' crowdfunding		
15			campaign, and thus have no standing to object to how		
15			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
16			money raised. Id.		
17	69	Depo. Ex. 69 - 2/25/15 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
1/		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 improper under copyright law.		
22			See ECF No. 137, Defendants'		
23			MIL No. 9.		
	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. AX029713-29714.	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How		
26		CONFIDENTIAL	Defendants spent money		
			received through donations has		
27			no relevance to copyright		
28			infringement. See ECF No.		

12

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 15 of 72 Page ID #:10473

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				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	70		money raised. Id.		
	73	Depo. Ex. 73 - 9/7/16 Axanar	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7		balance sheets for years 2014 to 2016. AX030915-31129.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (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		
12			campaign, and thus have no		
13			standing to object to how		
14			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
			money raised. Id.		
15	74	Depo. Ex. 74 - 7/15 The	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
16		Axanar Annual Report Revised. PL0000825-847.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
		Revised. FL0000823-847.	probative, waste of time). How		
17			Defendants spent money		
18			received through donations has		
			no relevance to copyright		
19			infringement. See ECF No.		
20			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
			Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding		
21			campaign, and thus have no		
22			standing to object to how		
			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
23			money raised. Id.		
24	75	Depo. Ex. 75 - 12/22/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Email string between Diana	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Kingsbury and Matthew Kalvin. AX030665-30666.	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How		
26		CONFIDENTIAL	Defendants spent money		
20			received through donations has		
27			no relevance to copyright		
28			infringement. See ECF No.		
20					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 16 of 72 Page ID #:10474

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 17 of 72 Page ID #:10475

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		See ECENe 122 Defendente?		Adm.
			See ECF No. 133, Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
3	80	Depo. Ex. 80 - 4/5/16 Alec	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
4		Peters Facebook post.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
5		PL0000899	(more prejudicial than		
5			probative, waste of time).		
6			Email updating his fans concerning instant lawsuit is not		
7			relevant to Plaintiffs' copyright		
			claims.		
8	82	Depo. Ex. 82 - 7/14/16 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
9		Startrek.com Printout entitled	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		The Original Series Set Tour	(prejudicial). FRE 602 (Lacks foundation). FRE 802		
10		to Open	(Hearsay). An article about a		
11			licensed tour of the set of The		
			Original Series (the first Star		
12			Trek television series) is not		
13			relevant to this case.		
			Defendants' Axanar Works were not licensed, nor do they		
14			contend that they were licensed.		
15	83	Depo. Ex. 83 - 1/23/08 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
10		Email chain from Liz	(Relevance). FRE 403		
16		Kalodner to John Van Citters	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
17		re Star Trek. PL0006230 - PL0006231.	(Hearsay). An internal CBS email discussing Mr. Peters'		
10		1 20000231.	Star Trek prop business has no		
18			relevance to this case.		
19	84	Depo. Ex. 84 - 1/20/10 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
20		Email string from Elizabeth	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		Kalodner to Craig Freeman re FW: Star Trek Experience	(prejudicial). FRE 802 (Hearsay). An email chain		
21		Inventory. PL0007983 -	discussing Star Trek props has		
22		PL007985.	no relevance to this case.		
	85	Depo. Ex. 85 - 1/14/10 Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
23		string from John Van Citters	(Relevance). FRE 403		
24		to Elizabeth Kalodner; Veronica Hart re Power	(prejudicial). An internal CBS email about another film that		
		Point. PL0000754.	Mr. Peters was involved with,		
25		CONFIDENTIAL	which is not at issue in this		
26			case, has no relevance to this		
			case.		
27					
28					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 18 of 72 Page ID #:10476

No. 86				Adm.
	Depo. Ex. 86 - 8/2/10 Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		2 Xu III.
	string from Elizabeth	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	Kalodner to John Van Citters re Star Trek. PL0007981 -	(prejudicial). FRE 802 (Hearsay).		
	PL0007982.	An email between Mr. Peters to		
		CBS and subsequent internal		
		CBS emails regarding an		
		individual who created another film that is not at issue in this		
		case has no relevance to this		
		case.		
87	Depo. Ex. 87 - 8/22/14 Email string from John Van Citters	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
	to Elizabeth Kalodner re	(prejudicial). An internal CBS		
	Staffing - 2015. PL0000765.	email discussing staffing and		
	CONFIDENTIAL.	how the "antics" of Mr. Peters		
		and other individuals continues to have a CBS employee		
		concerned has no relevance to		
		this case.		
88	Depo. Ex. 88 - 4/24/15 Email from John Van Citters to			
	Elizabeth Kalodner re One			
	more thing. PL0008852.			
	CONFIDENTIAL			
89	Depo. Ex. 89 - 7/6/15 Email from Bill Burke to Veronica			
	Hart cc: John Van Citters;			
	Marian Cordry re Axanar.			
	PL0006978. CONFIDENTIAL			
90	Depo. Ex. 90 - 5/31/16	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	Defendant Alec Peters'	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Responses to Plaintiff Paramount Pictures	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
	Corporation and CBS Studios	Plaintiffs continue in their		
	Inc.'s First Set of Request for	attempts to offer testimony and		
	Production of Documents	evidence regarding alleged		
		discovery violations, though no discovery violations have been		
		found against Defendants. See		
		ECF No. 126, Defendants' MIL		
		No. 1.		
11021643. 202828-10		16	JOINT EX	HIBIT LI

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 19 of 72 Page ID #:10477

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 20 of 72 Page ID #:10478

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		any authority to support their		Adm.
3			position that the quality of the		
3			work, the careers or experience		
4			of the people who work on		
_			them, or the colloquial use of		
5			the word "professional," have		
6			any impact on whether a work		
			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		
	-	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	probative, waste of time).		
		first half of 16, Next Big	Plaintiffs have not presented		
11		Future,	any authority to support their		
12		http://www.nextbigfuture.co m/15/09/star-trek-axanar-	position that the quality of the 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		
14			any impact on whether a work		
15			is infringing or improper under		
16			copyright law. See ECF No.		
16	06	Dana En Of How Avanan	137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
17	96	Depo. Ex. 96 - How Axanar Began. AX000193-195.	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
10		CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
18			probative, waste of time). How		
19			Defendants spent money		
			received through donations has		
20			no relevance to copyright		
21			infringement. See ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
22			Defendants' crowdfunding		
23			campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how		
24			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
25	05		money raised. Id.		
	97	Depo. Ex. 97 - 5/30/14 Star	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
26		Trek: Prelude to Axanar by Axanar Productions -	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
27		Kickstarter, Kickstarter,	probative, waste of time).		
		https://www.kickstarter.com/	Plaintiffs have not presented		
28	L	, .	1 1	I	

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 21 of 72 Page ID #:10479

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

19

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 22 of 72 Page ID #:10480

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 23 of 72 Page ID #:10481

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		to Disingiffed alainer Car ECE		Adm.
			to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF No. 133, Defendants' MIL No.		
3			5. Plaintiffs have not presented		
4			any authority to support their		
5			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		
-			any impact on whether a work		
8			is infringing or improper under		
9			copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
10			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.		
	104	Depo. Ex. 104 - 1/1/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
13		Certificate of Authorship.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
14		AX000355-357. HIGHLY	(more prejudicial than		
15		CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money		
15			received through donations has		
16			no relevance to copyright		
17			infringement. See ECF No.		
			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
18			Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding		
19			campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how		
20			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
21	105	Depo. Ex. 105 - 7/15 Axanar	money raised. Id.		
22	100	Electronic Press Kit.			
		PL0011781-11794.			
23	100	CONFIDENTIAL			
24	106	Depo. Ex. 106 - Excerpts of podcasts that Alec Peters	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		participated in	(more prejudicial than		
25			probative, waste of time).		
26			Defendants' crowdfunding		
27			efforts are completely irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF		
			No. 133, Defendants' MIL No.		
28	L	1		ıI	

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 24 of 72 Page ID #:10482

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
	No.			Dutt Iui	Adm.
2			5. Plaintiffs have not presented		
3			any authority to support their		
			position that the quality of the		
4			work, the careers or experience		
5			of the people who work on them, on the colloquial use of		
5			them, or the colloquial use of the word "professional," have		
6			any impact on whether a work		
7			is infringing or improper under		
			copyright law. See ECF No.		
8			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
0	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		
		Studios. AX028725. CONFIDENTIAL	probative, waste of time).		
11		CONFIDENTIAL	Concept drawings for a potential stage have no		
12			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
			Preliminary works are too		
13			unreliable in determining		
14			substantial similarity as to the		
			final work. See ECF No. 134,		
15	100	D D 100 0/0/0 f	Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
16	108	Depo. Ex. 108 - 8/8/96	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
10		blueprint of Star Trek Deep Space Nine sound stage.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
17		AX028719.	probative, waste of time).		
18		CONFIDENTIAL	Concept drawings for a		
10			potential stage have no		
19			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
20			Preliminary works are too		
20			unreliable in determining		
21			substantial similarity as to the final work. See ECF No. 134,		
\mathbf{a}			Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
22	109	Depo. Ex. 109 - 1/1/76	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
23		Blueprints. AX028563-	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		28571. CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
24			probative, waste of time).		
25			Concept drawings have no		
			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
26			Preliminary works are too unreliable in determining		
27			substantial similarity as to the		
			final work. See ECF No. 134,		
28	·				

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 25 of 72 Page ID #:10483

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.			2 2	Adm.
	110	Depo. Ex. 110 - Diagram of	Defendants' MIL No. 6. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
3	110	the Enterprise. AX028634.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
4		CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
5			probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a		
6			potential spaceship have no		
			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims. Preliminary works are too		
7			unreliable in determining		
8			substantial similarity as to the		
9			final work. See ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
10	112	Depo. Ex. 112 - 8/27/15			
11		Email from Alec@Axanarproductions.co			
		m to John Van Citters; Bill			
12		Burke cc: Elizabeth Kalodner; Mallory Levitt re			
13		Axanar. PL0000761.			
14	113	Depo. Ex. 113 - 8/25/15 How \$1.1 Million 'Star Trek' Fan	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
15		Movie Has Escaped Studio	(more prejudicial than		
16		Shutdown (So Far), by	probative, waste of time).		
		Beatrice Verhoeven, The Wrap,	Defendants' crowdfunding efforts are completely irrelevant		
17		http://www.thewrap.com/how	to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF		
18		-1-1-million-star-trek-fan- movie-has-escaped-studio-	No. 133, Defendants' MIL No.5. How Defendants spent		
19		shutdown-so-far.	money received through		
20		PL0005727-5730.	donations has no relevance to copyright infringement. See		
21			ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL		
22			No. 7. Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to		
			support their position that the		
23			quality of the work, the careers or experience of the people who		
24			work on them, or the colloquial		
25			use of the word "professional," have any impact on whether a		
26			work is infringing or improper		
			under copyright law. See ECF		
27			No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
28	L				

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 26 of 72 Page ID #:10484

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 27 of 72 Page ID #:10485

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
			ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors		
3			to Defendants' crowdfunding		
4			campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how		
5			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
6			money raised. Id.		
	118	Depo. Ex. 118 - 4/15/16	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7		Valkyrie Studios. AX030320.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
8		AA050520.	probative, waste of time). How		
			Defendants spent money		
9			received through donations,		
10			including through a studio		
			lease, has no relevance to		
11			copyright infringement. See		
12			ECF No. 135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors		
12			to Defendants' crowdfunding		
13			campaign, and thus have no		
14			standing to object to how		
14			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
15			money raised. Id.		
16	120	Depo. Ex. 120 - 3/8/16	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
10		Twitter post from @StarTrekAxanar	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
17			probative, waste of time). Fed.		
18			R. Evid. 602 (lacks foundation).		
10			Social media post concerning		
19			Defendants' speculation about		
20			Plaintiffs' motivation for instant		
20			lawsuit is irrelevant to Plaintiff's copyright claims.		
21			Defendant Peters has no		
22			personal knowledge of		
			Plaintiffs' motivation for instant		
23			lawsuit.		
24	121	Depo. Ex. 121 - 5/11/2007	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Email string between Alec Peters and Christian Gossett.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		GOSSETT-EMAILS	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
26		009121-9122.	Concept drawings have no		
			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
27			Preliminary works are too		
28			unreliable in determining		
20					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 28 of 72 Page ID #:10486

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 29 of 72 Page ID #:10487

Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm
110.		Star Trek works is not disputed,		Auii
		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		
105	Deres Ere 125 11/25/12	fair use.		
125	Depo. Ex. 125 - 11/25/12 Email string between	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Christian Gossett and Alec	(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		
120	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,		
		Defendants' MIL No. 6.		

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 30 of 72 Page ID #:10488

1					
1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	128	Depo. Ex. 128 - 7/28/13	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
3		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
4		Peters and Brenda Hinesley.	(more prejudicial than		
4		AX029187-29190.	probative, waste of time).		
5		CONFIDENTIAL	Concept drawings for a potential costume have no		
			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
6			Preliminary works are too		
7			unreliable in determining		
			substantial similarity as to the		
8			final work. ECF No. 134,		
9	120	$D_{2} = E_{-} = 120 - 9/14/12$	Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
	129	Depo. Ex. 129 - 8/14/13 Email from Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
10		notification to Christian	(more prejudicial than		
11		Gossett. GOSSETT-	probative, waste of time).		
		EMAILS007324.	Defendant Peters' movie		
12			critique has no relevance to		
13			Plaintiffs' claims.		
15	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).		
15		007156-7157.	Defendants' potential and future		
16			plans for a studio has no		
17			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
1/			See ECF No. 135, Defendants'		
18			MIL No. 7. Allowing Plaintiffs to continue to scrutinize the		
19			expenditures for a work that		
19			their lawsuit halted, and the		
20			financials of renting a studio,		
21			would provide no probative		
	101		value. Id.		
22	131	Depo. Ex. 131 - 1/6/14 Email from Alec Peters to Christian	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance) Fed. P. Evid. 403		
23		Gossett. GOSSETT-	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
		EMAILS007123-7124.	probative, waste of time).		
24			Concept drawings for a		
25			potential costume have no		
23			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
26			Preliminary works such as draft		
27			screenplays are too unreliable in		
<i>∠ 1</i>			determining substantial similarity as to the final work.		
28	L	I	similarly us to the mut work.		

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 31 of 72 Page ID #:10489

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
	No.	Description	Objections	Date Iu.	Adm.
2			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
3			No. 6. It would be a waste of		
			the jury's and the Court's time		
4			to review drawings related to		
5			draft scripts when there is no		
			risk such scripts will be used. Id.		
6	132	Depo. Ex. 132 - 4/26/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7	102	Email from Christian Gossett	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
_		to Alec Peters, et al.	(more prejudicial than		
8		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
9		006024.	Preliminary works such as draft		
9			screenplays are too unreliable in		
10			determining substantial		
11			similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
11			No. 6. It would be a waste of		
12			the jury's and the Court's time		
10			to review notes regarding draft		
13			scripts when there is no risk		
14			such scripts will be used. Id.		
	133	Depo. Ex. 133 - 4/4/14 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
15		from Christian Gossett to Alec Peters. GOSSETT-	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
16		EMAILS007631-7634.	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
		LivirAiLS007051-7054.	Concept drawings for a		
17			potential costume have no		
18			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
			Preliminary works are too		
19			unreliable in determining		
20			substantial similarity as to the		
20			final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
21	134	Depo. Ex. 134 - 5/12/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
22		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Peters and Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
23		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
24		007552-7553.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
24			any authority to support their		
25			position that the quality of the work, the careers or experience		
26			of the people who work on		
26			them, or the colloquial use of		
27			the word "professional," have		
20			any impact on whether a work		
28					

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 32 of 72 Page ID #:10490

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
			is infringing or improper under copyright law. See ECF No.		
3			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
4	135	Depo. Ex. 135 - 5/13/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
_		Email string between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
5		Christian Gossett and Karl	(more prejudicial than		
6		Kelly. GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
_		008703-8705.	Plaintiffs have not presented 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		
9			them, or the colloquial use of		
10			the word "professional," have		
11			any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under		
11			copyright law. See ECF No.		
12			137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
12	136	Depo. Ex. 136 - 6/29/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
13		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
14		Peters and Jhennifer	(more prejudicial than		
15		Webberley. GOSSETT- EMAILS009367-9368.	probative, waste of time). How Defendants spent money		
15		LiviAiLS007507-7508.	received through donations has		
16			no relevance to copyright		
17			infringement. See ECF No.		
1/			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
18			Plaintiffs are not donors to Defendants' crowdfunding		
19			campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how		
20			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
21	107		money raised. Id.		
	137	Depo. Ex. 137 - 5/8/14 Call Sheet. AX005147.	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
22		CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than		
23			probative, waste of time).		
24			Plaintiffs have not presented		
24			any authority to support their		
25			position that the quality of the		
26			work, the careers or experience of the people who work on		
26			them, or the colloquial use of		
27			the word "professional," have		
28			any impact on whether a work		
20					

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 33 of 72 Page ID #:10491

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

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 34 of 72 Page ID #:10492

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

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 35 of 72 Page ID #:10493

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
			such scripts will be used. Id.		
3	144	Depo. Ex. 144 - 8/1/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Christian Gossett Facebook	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
4		posts	(more prejudicial than		
5			probative, waste of time).		
			Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in		
6			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		
	1.4.5		such scripts will be used. Id.		
11	145	Depo. Ex. 145 - 4/4/14 Email string between Christian	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance) Fed. P. Evid. 402		
12		Gossett and Alec Peters.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
14		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
13		006727-6729.	Plaintiffs have not presented		
14			any authority to support their		
14			position that the quality of the		
15			work, the careers or experience		
10			of the people who work on		
16			them, or the colloquial use of		
17			the word "professional," have		
			any impact on whether a work 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		
<i>2</i> 1		EMAILS006693.	probative, waste of time).		
22			Email with a nondescript link is		
23			irrelevant to determining copyright issues.		
23	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		
25		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
26		006464.	Concept drawings or		
			backgrounds have no relevance		
27			to Plaintiffs' claims.		
28			Preliminary works are too		

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 36 of 72 Page ID #:10494

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		unnelishle in determining		Adm.
			unreliable in determining substantial similarity as to the		
3			final work. ECF No. 134,		
4			Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
-	148	Depo. Ex. 148 - 3/17/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
5	110	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.		
0			Preliminary are too unreliable		
9			in determining substantial		
10			similarity as to the final work.		
			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
11	149	Depo. Ex. 149 - 3/28/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12	149	Email string between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Christian Gossett, Tobais	(more prejudicial than		
13		Richer, et al. GOSSETT-	probative, waste of time).		
14		EMAILS006858-6866.	Preliminary works are too		
14			unreliable in determining		
15			substantial similarity as to the		
1.0			final work. ECF No. 134,		
16			Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
17	152	Depo. Ex. 152 - 10/16/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Email string between Christian Gossett and	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
18		Michael DeMeritt.	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
19		GOSSETT-EMAILS	Plaintiffs are not donors to		
17		001134-1138.	Defendants' crowdfunding		
20			campaign, and thus have no		
21			standing to object to how		
21			Defendants' allegedly spent the		
22			money raised. Id.		
	153	Depo. Ex. 153 - 10/27/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
23		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
24		Peters and Jeff Carlisle.	(more prejudicial than		
		GOSSETT-EMAILS 001053-1054.	probative, waste of time). Concept drawings for a		
25		001033-1034.	potential costume have no		
26			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
20			Preliminary works such as draft		
27			screenplays are too unreliable in		
20			determining substantial		
28					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 37 of 72 Page ID #:10495

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		similarity as to the final work.		Adm.
3			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
4	154	Depo. Ex. 154 - 11/27/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
5		Email string between ARP	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Design and Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
6		000854-858.	Preliminary works are too		
7			unreliable in determining		
8			substantial similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134,		
			Defendants' MIL No. 6. It		
9			would be a waste of the jury's		
10			and the Court's time to review drawings or scenes related to		
11			draft scripts when there is no		
			risk such scripts or scenes will		
12	1.5.5		be used. Id.		
13	155	Depo. Ex. 155 - 11/24/14 Email string between Emil	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
14		Petrinic and Christian	(more prejudicial than		
		Gossett. GOSSETT-	probative, waste of time).		
15		EMAILS000887-891.	Concept drawings for a		
16			potential costume or scene have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
			claims. Preliminary works such		
17			as draft screenplays are too		
18			unreliable in determining 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		
22			or scenes when there is no risk		
			such scripts or scenes will be		
23	156	Depo. Ex. 156 - 2/23/15	used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24	150	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).		
26		000313-314.	Plaintiffs have not presented any authority to support their		
27			position that the quality of the		
28			work, the careers or experience		
20					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 38 of 72 Page ID #:10496

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		of the people who work on		Adm.
3			them, or the colloquial use of		
5			the word "professional," have		
4			any impact on whether a work		
5			is infringing or improper under		
5			copyright law. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
6	157	Depo. Ex. 157 - Casting	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7	107	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		
			any authority to support their position that the quality of the		
10			work, the careers or experience		
11			of the people who work on		
			them, or the colloquial use of		
12			the word "professional," have		
13			any impact on whether a work is infringing or improper under		
1.4			copyright law. See ECF No.		
14			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		
18			any authority to support their		
			position that the quality of the		
19			work, the careers or experience		
20			of the people who work on them, or the colloquial use of		
			the word "professional," have		
21			any impact on whether a work		
22			is infringing or improper under		
			copyright law. See ECF No.		
23	159	Depo. Ex. 159 - 5/20/15	137, Defendants' MIL No. 9. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24	137	Email string between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
25		Christian Gossett and Alec	(more prejudicial than		
23		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	L	1	0	1	

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 39 of 72 Page ID #:10497

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		Adm.
2			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.		
	160	Depo. Ex. 160 - 4/29/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
7		Email from Kevin Haney to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
8		Alec Peters. GOSSETT- EMAILS000274.	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How		
0		EMAILS000274.	Defendants spent money		
9			received through donations has		
10			no relevance to copyright		
10			infringement. See ECF No.		
11			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7.		
10			Plaintiffs are not donors to		
12			Defendants' crowdfunding		
13			campaign, and thus have no		
			standing to object to how Defendants' allegedly spent the		
14			money raised. Id.		
15	161	Depo. Ex. 161 - 4/21/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Email string between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
16		christian@axanarproductions.	(more prejudicial than		
17		com and Christian Gossett.	probative, waste of time).		
		GOSSETT-EMAILS 000276-278.	Evidence of disputes between Defendant Peters and a		
18		000270-278.	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		
		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
22		Peters and Neal Fisher. GOSSETT-EMAILS	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time). How		
23		000322-323.	Defendants spent money		
			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	L	1	standing to object to now		

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 40 of 72 Page ID #:10498

Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
		Defendants' allegedly spent the		
		money raised. Id.		
163	Depo. Ex. 163 - 4/21/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	Email string between Christian Gossett and Robert	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Burnett. GOSSETT-	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
	EMAILS007501-7502.	Evidence of disputes between		
		Defendant Peters and a		
		disgruntled former colleague		
		have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
		claims. See ECF No. 133,		
1.64		Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
164	Depo. Ex. 164 - 5/12/15			
	Captain's Log - May 12, 16, by Alec Peters, Axanar			
	Productions,			
	http://www.axanarproduction			
	s.com/captains-log-may-12-			
	2015.			
165	Depo. Ex. 165 - 7/28/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	Email from Google+ to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Christian Gossett. GOSSETT-EMAILS	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
	007551.	Evidence of disputes between		
	007551	Defendant Peters and a		
		disgruntled former colleague		
		have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
		claims. See ECF No. 133,		
1.00		Defendants' MIL No. 5		
166	Depo. Ex. 166 - 7/27/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Email string between Jeffrey Morris to Alec Peters.	(more prejudicial than		
	GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
	007516.	Evidence of disputes between		
		Defendant Peters and a		
		disgruntled former colleague		
		have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
		claims. See ECF No. 133, Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
169	Depo. Ex. 169 - Photograph.	Detendants Will IVO. J.		
107	AX003503.			
	CONFIDENTIAL			

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 41 of 72 Page ID #:10499

1					
1	Ex.	Description	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		
3		Fabulous Baker Boys, Son of	(more prejudicial than		
4		Kong, Space 1999: S2, Them,	probative, waste of time).		
~		Hammer BDs & Axanar: Day	Plaintiffs have not presented		
5		1!, by Bill Hunt, My 2 Cents,	any authority to support their		
6		The Digital Bits,	position that the quality of the		
		http://www.thedigitalbits.com /columns/my-two-	work, the careers or experience of the people who work on		
7		cents/061515_1630	them, or the colloquial use of		
8		cents/001515_1050	the word "professional," have		
			any impact on whether a work		
9			is infringing or improper under		
10			copyright law. See ECF No.		
	1 = 1		137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
11	171	Depo. Ex. 171 - 6/22/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12		Excerpt from Captain's Log - June 20/21, 2106, Axanar	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
12		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		
14		2021-2015/	determining substantial		
15			similarity as to the final work.		
10			ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
16			No. 6. It would be a waste of		
17			the jury's and the Court's time to review draft scripts when		
10			there is no risk such scripts will		
18			be used. Id. Moreover,		
19			evidence has demonstrated that		
			the term "locked script" is a		
20			term of art, which does not		
21			mean that the script will remain		
			static through production of the work. See ECF No. 87-1,		
22			Defendants' Response to		
23			Plaintiffs' Statement of		
			Undisputed Facts.		
24	172	Depo. Ex. 172 - 8/15/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
25		Axanar Facebook post.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		PL0000903.	(more prejudicial than		
26			probative, waste of time).		
27			Preliminary works such as draft screenplays are too unreliable in		
<i>∠</i> /			determining substantial		
28		1			

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 42 of 72 Page ID #:10500

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
			similarity as to the final work. ECF No. 134, Defendants' MIL		
3			No. 6. It would be a waste of		
4			the jury's and the Court's time		
~			to review draft scripts when		
5			there is no risk such scripts will		
6			be used. Id. Moreover, evidence has demonstrated that		
7			the term "locked script" is a		
/			term of art, which does not		
8			mean that the script will remain		
9			static through production of the		
2			work. See ECF No. 87-1, Defendants' Response to		
10			Plaintiffs' Statement of		
11			Undisputed Facts.		
	173	Depo. Ex. 173 - 11/26/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
12		Axanar Script, Revision 7.7.	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
13		AX026616-26729. HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
		CONTIDENTIAL	Preliminary works such as draft		
14			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		
18			to review draft scripts when		
			there is no risk such scripts will		
19	174	Depo. Ex. 174 - 8/19/14	be used. Id. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
20	1/4	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		
		mns/my-two-	no relevance to copyright		
24		cents/081914_1245	infringement. See ECF No.		
25			135, Defendants' MIL No. 7. Plaintiffs are not donors to		
26			Defendants' crowdfunding		
			campaign, and thus have no		
27			standing to object to how		
28			Defendants' allegedly spent the		

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 43 of 72 Page ID #:10501

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 44 of 72 Page ID #:10502

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 45 of 72 Page ID #:10503

Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
110.	PL0012693-PL0012734.	Trek Beyond, is not relevant to		- ium.
	CONFIDENTIAL	this case.		
181	Depo. Ex. 181 - Twitter	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	Image. AX000056.	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		(prejudicial). A tweet by the		
		director of Star Trek Beyond, a		
		Star Trek motion picture, is not relevant to this case. Lin is not a		
		copyright holder, nor is he an		
		employee of Plaintiffs. At the		
		time of this statement, Lin had		
		not seen Prelude or the Vulcan		
100	Dama Em 100 4/00/17	scene.		
189	Depo. Ex. 189 - 4/29/15 Confidential Non-Disclosure	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Agreement ("Agreement")	(more prejudicial than		
	Between Axanar Production	probative, waste of time).		
	and Terry McIntosh	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.		
100	Dana Er 100 Tarra	137, Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
190	Depo. Ex. 190 - Terry McIntosh reply to Misty	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Mills's post re Ares Digital	(more prejudicial than		
	v3.14159	probative, waste of time).		
		Evidence of disputes between Defendant Peters and a		
		disgruntled former colleague		
		have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
		claims. See ECF No. 133, Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
L				
11021643 202828-1		43	JOINT EX	HIBIT LI

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 46 of 72 Page ID #:10504

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

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 47 of 72 Page ID #:10505

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		"reversed" out certain expenses		Adm.
3			by attempting to offset them		
5			with the lease payments he was		
4			required to make on the studio		
5			he rented. Defendants' post-		
5			lawsuit financial transactions		
6			relating to Axanar Productions,		
7			including their manipulation of the financial statement, are		
7			irrelevant because they do not		
8			eliminate the fact that prior to		
			the filing of this lawsuit,		
9			Defendants profited from the		
10			business that they created.		
			Also, this financial statement		
11			was created by Defendants 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 potential costume have no		
10			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
17			Preliminary works are too		
18			unreliable in determining		
10			substantial similarity as to the		
19			final work. ECF No. 134,		
20			Defendants' MIL No. 6. It		
20			would be a waste of the jury's and the Court's time to review		
21			drawings related to draft scripts		
22			when there is no risk such		
			scripts will be used. Id.		
23	203	Depo. Ex. 203 - 10/12/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
24		Email from Alec Peters to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
24		Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
25		GOSSETT-EMAILS 001225.	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
26		001223.	any authority to support their		
26			position that the quality of the		
27			work, the careers or experience		
20			of the people who work on		
28					

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 48 of 72 Page ID #:10506

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	110.		them, or the colloquial use of		Aum.
3			the word "professional," have		
3			any impact on whether a work		
4			is infringing or improper under		
			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		
0		Email string between Alec	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
7		Peters and Christian Gossett.	(more prejudicial than		
		GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
8		001057-1058.	Concept drawings for a		
9			potential costume have no		
2			relevance to Plaintiffs' claims.		
10			Preliminary works are too		
1 1			unreliable in determining 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	205	Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
1 4		Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
14		McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
15			Defendants' use of the Star		
			Trek name or trademark is		
16			irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claim in		
17			this case, as Plaintiffs have not		
1/			alleged any counts of trademark		
18			infringement. See ECF No.		
10	201		136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
19	206	Depo. Ex. 206 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
20		Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
20		Alec Peters and Terry McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
21			Defendants' use of the Star		
22			Trek name or trademark is		
			irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claim in		
23			this case, as Plaintiffs have not		
_ ⊿∥			alleged any counts of trademark		
24			infringement. See ECF No.		
25	0.05		136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
	207	Depo. Ex. 207 - 11/23/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
26		Facebook Messenger	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
27		exchange between Alec	(more prejudicial than		
<i>∠</i> /		Peters and Terry McIntosh	probative, waste of time). Defendants' use of the Star		
28			Detendants use of the Star		

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 49 of 72 Page ID #:10507

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
2			Trek name or trademark is		
3			irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claim in		
			this case, as Plaintiffs have not		
4			alleged any counts of trademark		
5			infringement. See ECF No.		
5	200		136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
6	208	Depo. Ex. 208 - 5/26/14	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Facebook Messenger	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
7		exchange between Alec	(more prejudicial than		
8	• • • •	Peters and Terry McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
0	209	Depo. Ex. 209 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
9		Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Alec Peters and Terry McIntosh	(more prejudicial than		
10		wichtiosh	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs have not presented		
11			any authority to support their		
11			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		
14			or improper under copyright		
15			law. See ECF No. 137,		
1.0			Defendants' MIL No. 9.		
16	210	Depo. Ex. 210 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17		Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
1 /		Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
18		McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
10			Defendants' use, or nonuse, of		
19			the Star Trek name or		
20			trademark is irrelevant to		
			Plaintiffs' claim in this case, as		
21			Plaintiffs have not alleged any counts of trademark		
22			infringement. See ECF No.		
22			136, Defendants' MIL No. 8.		
23	211	Depo. Ex. 211 - Facebook	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		Messenger exchange between	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
24		Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
25		McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
25			Defendants' use, or nonuse, of		
26			the Star Trek name or		
			trademark is irrelevant to		
27			Plaintiffs' claim in this case, as		
28			Plaintiffs have not alleged any		
20					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 50 of 72 Page ID #:10508

Н

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2			counts of trademark		
3			infringement. See ECF No.		
5			136, Defendants' MIL No. 8		
4	212	Depo. Ex. 212 - 4/12/15	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
F		Facebook Messenger	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
5		exchange between Alec	(more prejudicial than		
6		Peters and Terry McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
			Defendants' use of the Star		
7			Trek name or trademark is		
8			irrelevant to Plaintiffs' claim in this case, as Plaintiffs have not		
0			alleged any counts of trademark		
9			infringement. See ECF No.		
			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		
11		Alec Peters and Terry	(more prejudicial than		
12		McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
10			Preliminary works are too		
13			unreliable in determining		
14			substantial similarity as to the		
17			final work. See ECF No. 134,		
15			Defendants' MIL No. 6.		
1.6	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		
17		McIntosh	probative, waste of time).		
18			Evidence that Defendant Peters'		
10			career aspirations is not relevant		
19			to Plaintiffs' claims. See ECF No. 137, Defendants' MIL No.		
20			9.		
	215	Depo. Ex. 215 - 3/7/15 Email	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
21		from Alec Peters to	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
22		christian@axanarproductions.	(more prejudicial than		
		com. GOSSETT-EMAILS	probative, waste of time).		
23		00422.	Evidence of disputes between		
			Defendant Peters and a		
24			disgruntled former colleague		
25			have no relevance to Plaintiffs'		
23			claims. See ECF No. 133,		
26			Defendants' MIL No. 5.		
27					
28					
20					
Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations	11021643.2 202828-100		48	JOINT EX	HIBIT LIST

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 51 of 72 Page ID #:10509

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	No. 220	Depo. Ex. 220 - August 16	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		Aam.
3	220	Star Trek Fan Film	(Relevance). FRE 403		
5		Guidelines Focus Group	(prejudicial). FRE 602 (Lacks		
4		Report Prepared for CBS and	foundation). The Star Trek		
_		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		
U			argue that the Axanar film is a		
7			fan film. While Defendants		
8			label the Axanar Works as a "fan film," no court has ever		
0			held that a "fan film" (whether		
9			or not that label is accurate,		
10			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		
15		"Fan Film" Concepts.	(Hearsay). An internal CBS		
14		PL0013110 - PL0013111.	email about other films is not		
1 -			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"		
			(whether or not that label is		
17			accurate, which in this case it is		
18			not) has any impact on the		
10			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	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
21		Adams re Star Trek	(Hearsay). An internal CBS		
		Continues with attachment. PL0012993.	email about another film that is not at issue in this case has no		
22		PL0012995.	relevance to this case.		
23			Defendants intend to submit		
23			this exhibit in order to argue		
24			that the Axanar film is a fan		
25			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		
_0					

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 52 of 72 Page ID #:10510

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	1100		impact on the copyright		110111
3			infringement analysis.		
			Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
4			have sued other "fan film"		
5			creators is legally irrelevant as well.		
	223	Depo. Ex. 223 - 5/11/10 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
6		Email from John Van Citters	(Relevance). FRE 403		
7		to Liz Kalodner; Bill Burke;	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
0		Ian Spellin re James Cawley;	(Hearsay). A CBS email about		
8		Fan Films. PL0013083.	another film that is not at issue in this case has no relevance to		
9			this case. Defendants intend to		
10			submit this exhibit in order to		
10			argue that the Axanar film is a		
11			fan film. While Defendants		
12			label the Axanar Works as a		
12			"fan film," no court has ever held that a "fan film" (whether		
13			or not that label is accurate,		
14			which in this case it is not) has		
14			any impact on the copyright		
15			infringement analysis.		
16			Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
10			have sued other "fan film" creators is legally irrelevant as		
17			well.		
18	224	Depo. Ex. 224 - 9/20/12	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
		Redacted Email from Bill	(Relevance). FRE 403		
19		Burke to Ian Spelling re	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
20		huston huddleston.	(Hearsay). An internal CBS		
		PL0007895. CONFIDENTIAL	email about doing a piece on Alec Peters and discussing how		
21			he is a licensee is not relevant to		
22			this case.		
22	225	Depo. Ex. 225 - 2/25/15 Email string from Bill Burke			
23		to John Van Citters re Vul-			
		Con. PL0007016 - PL0007017.			
25		CONFIDENTIAL			
26					
27					
28					
	11021643		50		HIBIT I IST

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 53 of 72 Page ID #:10511

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Iu.	Adm.
2	226	Depo. Ex. 226 - 2/25/15			
3		Email string from Bill Burke			
4		to			
4		mallory@thelicensingshop.co m re Vulcan Question.			
5		PL0007897 - PL0007899.			
6		CONFIDENTIAL			
	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.			
	229	CONFIDENTIAL	Diff. EDE 401 402		
11	228	Depo. Ex. 228 - 12/18/13 Redacted Email String from	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
12		Bill Burke to	(prejudicial). A CBS email		
10		Ianspellin@aol.com; Yasmin	discussing CBS not being		
13		Elachi re Addresses.	happy with Peters in 2013, prior		
14		PL0010034.	to the fundraising for the		
15		CONFIDENTIAL	Axanar Works, is not relevant to this case.		
15	229	Depo. Ex. 229 - 7/29/15	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
16		Email string from Bill Burke	(Relevance). FRE 403		
17		to Travis Pierson [Redacted]	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
1/		re Nimoy Documentary.	(Hearsay). An email discussing		
18		PL0010249. CONFIDENTIAL	Peters' work on a documentary about Leonard Nimoy is not		
19		CONFIDENTIAL	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	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
		Winterholler; Yasmin Elachi re Vulcan Harp app - crowd	(Hearsay). A CBS email about other films is not relevant to		
22		funding. PL0013041 -	this case. Defendants intend to		
23		PL0013042.	submit this exhibit in order to		
2^{1}			argue that the Axanar film is a		
24			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		
-0					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 54 of 72 Page ID #:10512

1	ſ	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2		No.				Adm.
				infringement analysis. Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
3				have sued other "fan film"		
4				creators is legally irrelevant as		
5	-	0.01		well.		
5		231	Depo. Ex. 231 - 7/31/14 Email string from Pill Purke	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
6			Email string from Bill Burke to Leslie Ryan cc: Brian	(Relevance). FRE 403 (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	this case. Defendants intend to		
9			call tomorrow with me and John? PL0012988 -	submit this exhibit in order to argue that the Axanar film is a		
10			PL00129992.	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 have sued other "fan film"		
15				creators is legally irrelevant as		
16				well.		
17		300	Depo. Ex. 300 - Justin Lin	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
1/			Tweet. AX000057.	(Relevance). FRE 403		
18				(prejudicial). A tweet by the director of Star Trek Beyond, a		
19				Star Trek motion picture, is not		
				relevant to this case. Lin is not a		
20				copyright holder, nor is he an		
21				employee of Plaintiffs. At the time of this statement, Lin had		
22				not seen Prelude or the Vulcan		
				scene.		
23		302	Depo. Ex. 302 - 4/14/16	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
24			Email string from Justin Lin to JJ Abrams cc: Rob Moore;	(Relevance). FRE 403		
			Lindsey Weber; Martin	(prejudicial). A draft press release about Plaintiffs' newest		
25			Kelley; Katherine Rowe;	Star Trek motion picture, Star		
26			Morgan Dameron; Megan	Trek Beyond, is not relevant to		
27			Colligan re Star Trek Beyond	this case.		
			Fan Event - Press Release, draft for approval.			
28			and abbro (and			

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 55 of 72 Page ID #:10513

Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
1.00	PL0012788.			
303	Depo. Ex. 303 - Transcript of	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	J.J. Abrams Statement	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		(prejudicial). Abrams is not a		
		copyright holder, nor is he an		
		employee of Plaintiffs. At the		
		time of this statement, Abrams		
		had only seen a short clip of		
2 04		Prelude.		
304	Depo. Ex. 304 - 5/20/16 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	Email from Liz Kalodner to	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	John Wentworth cc: Bill	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
	Burke; Leslie Ryan; Yasmin	(Hearsay). CBS emails about		
	Elachi; John Van Citters re CBS/Paramount Statement.	statements made by Justin Lin and J.J. Abrams are not		
	PL0012809 - PL0012810.	relevant. Neither of them are		
	CONFIDENTIAL	the copyright holders, nor are		
	CONTIDENTIAL	they employees of Plaintiffs.		
305	Depo. Ex. 305 - Social	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
505	Media Posts	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		(prejudicial). Tweets by Axanar		
		Productions made after this		
		lawsuit about Plaintiffs' newest		
		motion picture, Star Trek		
		Beyond, are not relevant to this		
		case.		
306	Depo. Ex. 306 - 6/27/16 -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	Email from Rob Moore to	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	Megan Colligan re Update.	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
	PL0012799.	(Hearsay). Paramount emails		
		about other films are not		
		relevant 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.		
11021643. 202828-10		53	JOINT EX	HIBIT LI

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 56 of 72 Page ID #:10514

Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
307	Depo. Ex. 307 -5/21/16 Email	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	string to JJ from Rob Moore.	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	PL0012793.	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
		(Hearsay). Abrams is not a		
		copyright holder, nor is he an		
		employee of Plaintiffs. At the		
		time of this statement, Abrams		
		had only seen a short clip of		
		Prelude.		
310	Depo. Ex. 310 - Axanar	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	Tweets	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		(prejudicial). Tweets by Axanar		
		Productions made after this		
		lawsuit about Plaintiffs' newest		
		motion picture, Star Trek		
		Beyond, are not relevant to this		
311	Depo. Ex. 311 - 6/28/16	case. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
511	Email chain to JJ Abrams	(Relevance). FRE 403		
	from Rob Moore.	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
	PL0012794.	(Hearsay). Abrams is not a		
	1 20012794.	copyright holder, nor is he an		
		employee of Plaintiffs. At the		
		time of this statement, Abrams		
		had only seen a short clip of		
		Prelude.		
312	Depo. Ex. 312 -11/9/16- Fan	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	Film Guidelines	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		(prejudicial). Lacks foundation.		
		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		
500	Concept of AV020741	analysis.		
500	Concept art. AX028741. CONFIDENTIAL	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance) Fed. P. Evid. 403		
		(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
		probative, waste of time).		
		probative, waste of time).		
11021643.:	2	54	JOINT EX	HIBITL

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 57 of 72 Page ID #:10515

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
	501	[Dkt 72-15] Exhibit M to 11/16/16 Grossman			
3		Declaration - Prelude to			
4		Axanar The Illustrated Script			
5	500	of the Short Film			
5	502	[Dkt 72-50] Exhibit UU to 11/16/16 Grossman			
6		Declaration - 12/16/1986			
7		Copyright registrations for			
		the Original Series (1966-			
8		1969), Star Trek: The Next Generation (1987-1994), Star			
9		Trek: Deep Space Nine			
10		(1993-1999), Star Trek:			
		Voyager (1995-2001), and			
11		Star Trek: Enterprise (2001- 2005). Collectively, the "Star			
12		Trek Television Series."			
	503	[Dkt 72-54] Exhibit VV to			
13		11/16/16 Grossman			
14		Declaration - 12/12/1979			
15		Copyright registrations for Star Trek – The Motion			
		Picture (1979), Star Trek II –			
16		The Wrath of Khan (1982),			
17		Star Trek III The Search for			
10		Spock (1984), Star Trek IV: The Voyage Home (1986),			
18		Star Trek V: The Final			
19		Frontier (1989), Star Trek VI			
20		- The Undiscovered Country			
		(1991), Star Trek Generations (1994), Star Trek: First			
21		Contact (1996), Star Trek:			
22		Insurrection (1998), Star Trek			
23		Nemesis (2002), Star Trek (2009), Star Trek Into			
23		Darkness (2013), Star Trek			
24		Beyond (16). Collectively,			
25		the "Star Trek Motion			
		Pictures."			
26					
27					
28					
nership	11021643.	2	55	JOINT EX	THIBIT LIST
nal	202828-10	048			

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

202828-10048

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 58 of 72 Page ID #:10516

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	504	[Dkt 72-55] Exhibit WW to			
3		11/16/16 Grossman			
4		Declaration - 4/18/03 Copyright registration for			
4		Garth of Izar			
5	505	[Dkt 72-56] Exhibit XX to			
6		11/16/16 Grossman			
7		Declaration - 8/26/06 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	507	769.			
12	507	[Dkt 72-62] Exhibit BBB to 11/16/16 Van Citters	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
12		Declaration -10/27/16	(more prejudicial than		
13		Copyright registration to The	probative, waste of time).		
14		Four Years War	Plaintiffs should be precluded from relying on evidence		
15			relating to allegedly infringed		
			works they failed to claim in		
16			their First Amended Complaint. See ECF No. 130, Defendants'		
17			MIL No. 3. Plaintiffs attempt		
18			to rely on evidence improperly		
			withheld from Defendants, as		
19			Plaintiffs failed to timely produce this evidence during		
20			the discovery period. See ECF		
21			No. 128, Defendants' MIL No.		
	508	[Dkt 86-2] Unredacted	2. Pltfs: FRE 403 (prejudicial).		
22	500	Version of Exhibit 3 to	FRE 802 (Hearsay). FRE 702		
23		11/16/16 Oki Declaration -	(Lacks basis for expert		
24		Expert Report of Christian Tregillis, CPA, ABV, CFF,	opinion). Lacks foundation. Mr.		
		CLP	Tregillis lacks competence or expertise to opine on the topics		
25			covered in his report.		
26					
27					
28					
ership	11021643.		56	JOINT EX	HIBIT LIST

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 59 of 72 Page ID #:10517

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
	509	[Dkt 75-6] Exhibit 4 to	Pltfs: FRE 403 (prejudicial).		
3		11/16/16 Oki Declaration - Report of Henry Jenkins	FRE 802 (Hearsay). FRE 702 (Lacks basis for expert		
4		Report of Henry Jenkins	opinion). Lacks foundation.		
-			Mr. Jenkins lacks competence		
5			or expertise to opine on what		
C			aids or competes with motion		
6			pictures and television		
7			programming, and he does not		
0			use any data to support his		
8			opinions. Further, he purports		
9			to claim that Prelude to Axanar is transformative with no		
			expertise in the area, and he		
10			admits although he is		
11			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.		
15	510	[Dkt 86-7] Unredacted	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
14		version of Exhibit 3 to 11/16/16 Peters Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
15		Script: "The Undying One"	(Hearsay). FRE 403		
15		(aka "AXANAR") Part 1.	(prejudicial). This script, which		
16		AX031943 - AX031989.	was created after this litigation		
17			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		
			weight and is prejudicial.		
21	511	[Dkt 86-8] Unredacted	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
22		version of Exhibit 3 to	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		11/16/16 Peters Declaration -	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
23		Script: "The Undying One"	(Hearsay). FRE 403		
24		(aka "AXANAR") Part 2. AX031990 - AX032066.	(prejudicial). This script, which		
		AA031990 - AA032000.	was created after this litigation was filed, bears no relevance to		
25			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		
20					

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 60 of 72 Page ID #:10518

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		this litigation, has no probative		Adm.
2			weight and is prejudicial.		
3	512	[Dkt 75-23] Exhibit 4 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
4		11/16/16 Peters Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403		
_		7/21 Star Trek Beyond	(prejudicial). A tweet by Mr.		
5			Peters made after this lawsuit		
6			telling people to see Star Trek		
			Beyond, Plaintiffs' most recent		
7			motion picture, has no relevance to this case.		
8			Moreover, this document was		
0			never produced by Defendants		
9			in this case.		
10	513	[Dkt 75-24] Exhibit 5 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
10		11/16/16 Peters Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403		
11		Axanar Tweet	(prejudicial). A tweet by Mr.		
10			Peters made after this lawsuit		
12			about Star Trek Beyond,		
13			Plaintiffs' most recent motion		
			picture, has no relevance to this case. Moreover, this document		
14			was never produced by		
15			Defendants in this case.		
	514	[Dkt 75-26] Exhibit 1 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
16		11/16/16 Lane Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403		
17		January 16 Executive	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
		Summary a History of STAR	(Hearsay). FRE 602 (Lacks		
18		TREK fan films Part 1. AX000213 - AX000304.	foundation). FRE 701-703 (Purported "expert" opinion by		
19		AA000213 - AA000304.	a witness not qualified as an		
			expert). This summary of other		
20			films has no relevance to this		
21			case. Defendants intend to		
			submit this exhibit in order to		
22			argue that the Axanar film is a		
23			fan film. While Defendants label the Axanar Works as a		
23			"fan film," no court has ever		
24			held that a "fan film" (whether		
25			or not that label is accurate,		
25			which in this case it is not) has		
26			any impact on the copyright		
27			infringement analysis.		
27			Moreover, whether Plaintiffs have sued other "fan film"		
28		1			

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 61 of 72 Page ID #:10519

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.		creators is legally irrelevant as		Adm.
3			well.		
5	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			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		
			argue that the Axanar film is a		
10			fan film. While Defendants		
11			label the Axanar Works as a		
10			"fan film," no court has ever		
12			held that a "fan film" (whether or not that label is accurate,		
13			which in this case it is not) has		
14			any impact on the copyright		
14			infringement analysis.		
15			Moreover, whether Plaintiffs		
16			have sued other "fan film"		
10			creators is legally irrelevant as well.		
17	516	[Dkt 75-29] Exhibit 1 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
18		11/16/16 Watkins Declaration	(Relevance). FRE 403		
		- Screen Shot Axanar Fan	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
19		Group Page	(Hearsay). FRE 602 (Lacks		
20			foundation). These post- litigation posts on the Axanar		
			Fan Group page have no		
21			relevance to this case.		
22			Moreover, this document was		
23			never produced by Defendants in this case.		
23	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		
27			states that a "mockumentary" is sometimes defined as a parody.		
			Mr. Peters however, testified		
28					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 62 of 72 Page ID #:10520

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.	-			Adm.
			that Prelude to Axanar was not		
3	518	[Dkt 94-5] Unredacted	a parody. Pltfs: With respect to bates		
4	510	Exhibit 1 to 11/28/16 Peters	range, AX035571 - AX035737:		
		Declaration Financial	FRE 401, 402 (Relevance).		
5		Summary. AX035571 -	FRE 403 (prejudicial). Lacks		
6		AX035737.	foundation. FRE 802 (Hearsay).		
			In response to Plaintiffs'		
7			document requests, Defendants produced a financial statement.		
8			Then, after Mr. Peters' first		
			deposition, he altered the		
9			financial statement Peters		
10			"reversed" out certain expenses		
11			by attempting to offset them with the lease payments he was		
11			required to make on the studio		
12			he rented. Defendants' post-		
12			lawsuit financial transactions		
13			relating to Axanar Productions,		
14			including their manipulation of the financial statement, are		
15			irrelevant because they do not		
15			eliminate the fact that prior to		
16			the filing of this lawsuit,		
17			Defendants profited from the		
			business that they created. Also, this financial statement was		
18			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 -			
28		PL0013788.			

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 63 of 72 Page ID #:10521

1	-				
1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	520	[Dkt 90-14] Exhibit 4 to			Aum.
3	020	11/28/16 Peters Declaration -			
5		Facebook posts. PL0013517.			
4	521	[Dkt 90-15] Exhibit 5 to			
5		11/28/16 Peters Declaration -			
5		Email re Fan Films Facebook			
6		Posts. PL0013502 - PL0013503.			
7	522	[Dkt 90-16] Exhibit 6 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
	522	11/28/16 Peters Declaration -	(Relevance). FRE 403		
8		Press Release - Unique Trek	(prejudicial). FRE 802		
9		Project Marks the Return of	(Hearsay). FRE 1002 (Best		
9		Garth of Izar	evidence). A purported Axanar		
10			Productions Press Release		
11			stating that "[t]wo major players in the universe of Star		
11			Trek fan films" planned to		
12			collaborate is irrelevant. While		
13			Defendants label the Axanar		
15			Works as a "fan film," no court		
14			has ever held that a "fan film"		
15			(whether or not that label is		
13			accurate, which in this case it is not) has any impact on the		
16			copyright infringement analysis.		
17			Moreover, this document was		
1/			never produced by Defendants		
18			in this case.		
19	523	[Dkt 90-17] Exhibit 7 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration -	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
17		Facebook Response.	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
20		PL0011822.	(Hearsay). FRE 1002 (Best		
21			evidence). A Facebook post by		
			Axanar claiming that CBS has		
22			laid out unofficial rules for Star		
23			Trek fan films is irrelevant. 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		
27			the copyright infringement		
			analysis.		
28					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 64 of 72 Page ID #:10522

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
	No.		Jeen	Dutt Iui	Adm.
2	524	[Dkt 94-6] Unredacted			
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 - Blog Post. PL0005973 -			
6		PL0005989.			
7	526	[Dkt 90-21] Exhibit 11 to			
8		11/28/16 Peters Declaration - Comic Con Document re			
9		Axanar. PL0000106 -			
9		PL0000134.			
10	527	[Dkt 90-23] Exhibit 13 to Peters Declaration in Support	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
11		of Opposition to Plaintiffs'	(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		1 051	films is not relevant to this case.		
14			Moreover, this document was		
15			never produced by Defendants in this case.		
16	528	[Dkt 90-24] Exhibit 14 to	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
		11/28/16 Peters Declaration - Twitter Post	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
17			(Hearsay). A twitter post from		
18			Defendant Axanar Productions,		
19			Inc. after this lawsuit stating 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			
23		Exhibit 15 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration - 8/20/16 Email			
		string from Bill Burke to John			
24		Van Citters re The Wrap is			
25		inquiring about the Kickstarter Star Trek fan			
26		film. PL0012814 -			
27		PL0012816.			
28					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 65 of 72 Page ID #:10523

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
	530	[Dkt 94-9] Exhibit 16 to 11/28/16 Peters Declaration -			
3		8/8/15 Email string from			
4		Marian Cordry to Holly			
5		Amos, John Citters re SIGH.			
5	531	PL0008689.	Defet End D Exid 401 402		
6	551	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	(more prejudicial than		
		Series (1966-1969)	probative, waste of time).		
8			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
9			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
			failed to timely produce this		
10			evidence during the discovery		
11			period. See ECF No. 128,		
12	532	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants' MIL No. 2. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	352	DVDs of Star Trek Television	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
13		Series titled Star Trek: The	(more prejudicial than		
14		Next Generation (1987-1994)	probative, waste of time).		
			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
15			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
16			failed to timely produce this		
17			evidence during the discovery		
1/			period. See ECF No. 128,		
18	533	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants' MIL No. 2. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
19	555	DVDs of Star Trek Television	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Series titled Star Trek: Deep	(more prejudicial than		
20		Space Nine (1993-1999)	probative, waste of time).		
21			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
22			failed to timely produce this		
23			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	554	DVDs of Star Trek Television	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
26		Series titled Star Trek:	(more prejudicial than		
		Voyager (1995-2001)	probative, waste of time).		
27			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
28			evidence improperly withheld		

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 66 of 72 Page ID #:10524

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
2	No.				Adm.
			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
3			failed to timely produce this		
1			evidence during the discovery period. See ECF No. 128,		
4			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
5	535	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	555	DVDs of Star Trek Television	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
6		Series titled Star Trek:	(more prejudicial than		
7		Enterprise (2001-2005)	probative, waste of time).		
			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
8			evidence improperly withheld		
0			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
9			failed to timely produce this		
10			evidence during the discovery		
			period. See ECF No. 128,		
11	526	Dhyping Erskihit, [D1-, 70, 60]	Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
12	536	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63] DVD of Star Trek Motion	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevance) Fed. P. Evid. 403		
12		Picture titled Star Trek – The	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
13		Motion Picture (1979)	probative, waste of time).		
1.4		Wotion Picture (1979)	Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
14			evidence improperly withheld		
15			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
			failed to timely produce this		
16			evidence during the discovery		
17			period. See ECF No. 128,		
1/			Defendants' MIL No. 2		
18	537	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
10		DVD of Star Trek Motion Picture titled Star Trek II –	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
19		The Wrath of Khan (1982)	(more prejudicial than probative, waste of time).		
20		The wrath of Khan (1982)	Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
			evidence improperly withheld		
21			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
22			failed to timely produce this		
			evidence during the discovery		
23			period. See ECF No. 128,		
24			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 The Secret for Speek (1084)	(more prejudicial than		
26		The Search for Spock (1984)	probative, waste of time). Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
27			evidence improperly withheld		
			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
28	L	I			

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 67 of 72 Page ID #:10525

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date
	No.	Description	Objections	Date Iu.	Adm.
2			failed to timely produce this		
3			evidence during the discovery		
			period. See ECF No. 128,		
4	520		Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
5	539	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63] DVD of Star Trek Motion	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402 (relevence) Fed. P. Evid. 403		
5		Picture titled Star Trek IV:	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403 (more prejudicial than		
6		The Voyage Home (1986)	probative, waste of time).		
7			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
1			evidence improperly withheld		
8			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
9			failed to timely produce this		
9			evidence during the discovery		
10			period. See ECF No. 128,		
11	540	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defendants' MIL No. 2. Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
11	540	DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
12		Picture titled Star Trek V:	(more prejudicial than		
10		The Final Frontier (1989)	probative, waste of time).		
13			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
14			evidence improperly withheld		
			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
15			failed to timely produce this		
16			evidence during the discovery period. See ECF No. 128,		
			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
17	541	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
18	0.11	DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
		Picture titled Star Trek VI –	(more prejudicial than		
19		The Undiscovered Country	probative, waste of time).		
20		(1991)	Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
20			evidence improperly withheld from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
21			failed to timely produce this		
22			evidence during the discovery		
			period. See ECF No. 128,		
23			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
24	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). Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
26			evidence improperly withheld		
27			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
			failed to timely produce this		
28					

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 68 of 72 Page ID #:10526

1	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
2	110.		evidence during the discovery		Aum.
3			period. See ECF No. 128,		
3			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
4	543	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
_		DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
5		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		
0			evidence during the discovery		
9			period. See ECF No. 128,		
10			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		
		Picture titled Star Trek:	(more prejudicial than		
12		Insurrection (1998)	probative, waste of time).		
13			Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
15			evidence improperly withheld		
14			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
15			failed to timely produce this evidence during the discovery		
13			period. See ECF No. 128,		
16			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
1 7	545	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
17		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		
20			evidence improperly withheld		
			from Defendants, as Plaintiffs failed to timely produce this		
21			evidence during the discovery		
22			period. See ECF No. 128,		
			Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
23	546	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
		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		
			evidence during the discovery		
28	٢	1			

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 69 of 72 Page ID #:10527

Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Dat Adn
1100		period. See ECF No. 128,		11411
		Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
547	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
	DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Picture titled Star Trek Into	(more prejudicial than		
	Darkness (2013)	probative, waste of time).		
		Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
		evidence improperly withheld		
		from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
		failed to timely produce this		
		evidence during the discovery		
		period. See ECF No. 128, Defendants' MIL No. 2		
548	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
540	DVD of Star Trek Motion	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	Picture titled Star Trek	(more prejudicial than		
	Beyond (2016)	probative, waste of time).		
		Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
		evidence improperly withheld		
		from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
		failed to timely produce this		
		evidence during the discovery		
		period. See ECF No. 128,		
		Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
549	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]			
	DVD of Prelude to Axanar			
550	(8/15/14)			
550	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63] DVD of Vulcan Scene			
	(4/28/16)			
551	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 72-63]	Defs: Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402		
551	Book titled Garth of Izar	(relevance). Fed. R. Evid. 403		
	(2003)	(more prejudicial than		
		probative, waste of time).		
		Plaintiffs attempt to rely on		
		evidence improperly withheld		
		from Defendants, as Plaintiffs		
		failed to timely produce this		
		evidence during the discovery		
		period. See ECF No. 128,		
<i></i>		Defendants' MIL No. 2.		
552	Physical Exhibit: Trailer for			
	Axanar feature available at https://www.youtube.com/wat			
	ch?v=Np_PVbW6y64			

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 70 of 72 Page ID #:10528

	Ex. No.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date Adm.
55	53	Physical Exhibit: Trailer for			
		Axanar feature available at https://www.youtube.com/wat			
		ch?v=T_4W5ywBTpE			
55	54	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 75-20]			
		DVD of Prelude to Axanar. AX031132.			
55	55	Physical Exhibit: [Dkt 75-21] DVD of Vulcan Scene.			
		AX031131.			
55	56	Physical Exhibit: Source Video. AX035895.	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Balavanaa) EBE 403		
		video. AA055895.	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
			(Hearsay). This video was produced on November 3, after		
			the close of discovery and after		
			the second court-ordered deposition of Mr. Peters, which		
			was ordered by the Court		
			because of his failure to		
			produce documents in discovery. This video, which		
			contains clips from some television shows and films, has		
			no relevance to this case. It		
			appears to have been prepared for this litigation.		
55	57	Physical Exhibit: Axanar	Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
		Motion Picture Directors WIP Reel. AX035807.	(Relevance). FRE 403 (prejudicial). FRE 802		
		Reci. 111055007.	(Hearsay). This video is a		
			"work in progress" of Axanar. This video was produced on		
			November 3, after the close of		
			discovery and after the second court-ordered deposition of Mr.		
			Peters, which was ordered by the Court because of his failure		
			to produce documents in		
			discovery.		
			68		

Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 71 of 72 Page ID #:10529

Н

1	Ex.	Description	Objections	Date Id.	Date A dm
2	No. 558		$\mathbf{D} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{f}_{0}, \mathbf{E} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{A} 0 1 \mathbf{A} 0 2$		Adm.
	538		Pltfs: FRE 401, 402 (Relevance). FRE 403		
3			(prejudicial). FRE 802		
4			(Hearsay). A video showing		
4			Justin Lin and J.J. Abrams after		
5			this lawsuit is not relevant.		
<i>.</i>			Neither of them are the		
6			copyright holders, nor are they		
7			employees of Plaintiffs. At the		
			time of this statement, Abrams		
8			had only seen a short clip of		
9			Prelude. At the time of this		
9			statement, Lin had not seen		
10	559	Physical Exhibit: Parody	Prelude or the Vulcan scene. Pltfs: FRE 401, 402		
1 1	559	Video. AX035744.	(Relevance). FRE 403		
11		· 1000. / 12/2033/ ++.	(prejudicial). Lacks foundation.		
12			FRE 802 (Hearsay). This		
			cartoon video, which		
13			Defendants refer to as a "parody		
14			video" and appears to be a		
			parody of Prelude to Axanar,		
15			has no relevance to this case.		
1.0	560	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'			
16		Demonstrative			
17	561	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'			
	5.00	Demonstrative			
18	562	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'			
19	562	Demonstrative Placebolder Plaintiffs'			
	563	Placeholder - Plaintiffs' Demonstrative			
20	564	Placeholder - Plaintiffs'			
21	304	Demonstrative			
Δ1					
22					
	Dated:	December 19, 2016	LOEB & LOEB LLP		
23		- 7	JONATHAN ZAVIN		
24			DAVID GROSSMAN		
			JENNIFER JASON		
25			By:/s/ David Grossman		
26			By: <u>/s/ David Grossman</u> David Grossman	•	
20			Attorneys for Plaintiff PARAMOUNT PICT	S LIDEC	
27			CORPORATION and	CBS STU	DIOS
20			INC.		
28					
Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership	11021643.2		69	JOINT EX	HIBIT LIST
Including Professional Corporations	202828-100)48			

Case 2:15-cv-09938-RGK-E Document 158-2 Filed 12/29/16 Page 72 of 72 Page ID #:10530

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Dated: December 19, 2016	WINSTON & S ERIN R. RANA DIANA HUGHI KELLY N. OKI By: <u>/s/ Erin R. Rana</u> Attorneys fo AXANAR F ALEC PETH	HAN ES LEIDEN
8			
9 10			
10			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21 22			
22			
23			
25			
26			
27			
28			
Loeb & Loeb A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations	11021643.2 202828-10048	70	JOINT EXHIBIT LIST