

COPY

FILED

11 APR -4 AM 11:52

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES

BY:

1 GLENN D. POMERANTZ (SBN 112503)  
*Glenn.Pomerantz@mto.com*  
2 KELLY M. KLAUS (SBN 161091)  
*Kelly.Klaus@mto.com*  
3 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
355 South Grand Avenue, Thirty-Fifth Floor  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560  
Tel: (213) 683-9100; Fax: (213) 687-3702

5 DANIEL E. ROBBINS (SBN 156934)  
*Dan.Robbins@mpaa.org*  
6 BENJAMIN S. SHEFFNER (SBN 212629)  
*Ben.Sheffner@mpaa.org*  
7 15301 Ventura Boulevard, Building E  
8 Sherman Oaks, California 91403-3102  
Tel: (818) 995-6600; Fax: (818) 285-4403

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 WESTERN DIVISION

13  
14 WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT  
INC., COLUMBIA PICTURES  
15 INDUSTRIES, INC., DISNEY  
ENTERPRISES, INC., PARAMOUNT  
16 PICTURES CORPORATION,  
TWENTIETH CENTURY FOX FILM  
17 CORPORATION, and UNIVERSAL  
CITY STUDIOS PRODUCTIONS  
18 LLLP,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21 WTV SYSTEMS, INC. and WTV  
SYSTEMS, LLC d/b/a ZEDIVA, and  
22 VENKATESH SRINIVASAN,

23 Defendants.

CASE NO. **CV 11-02817** JFW(ER)  
**COMPLAINT FOR COPYRIGHT  
INFRINGEMENT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 The Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over all claims pursuant to  
2 17 U.S.C. §§ 101, *et seq.* and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). Plaintiffs Warner  
3 Bros. Entertainment Inc., Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc., Disney Enterprises,  
4 Inc., Paramount Pictures Corporation, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation,  
5 and Universal City Studios Productions LLLP (collectively, “Plaintiffs” or  
6 “Studios”), by their attorneys, for their complaint against WTV Systems, Inc. and  
7 WTV Systems, LLC d/b/a Zediva (“Zediva”), and Venkatesh Srinivasan  
8 (collectively, “Defendants”) allege, on personal knowledge as to themselves and  
9 information and belief as to others, as follows:

### 10 NATURE OF THE ACTION

11 1. Defendants operate a commercial video-on-demand (“VOD”) service—  
12 found at <http://www.zediva.com>—that streams Plaintiffs’ movies on demand to  
13 paying customers over the Internet. Defendants promote their service as bringing  
14 “new release and popular movies to the Internet”<sup>1</sup> and focus their marketing pitch on  
15 the fact that Zediva users can “instantly watch new movies much earlier (often  
16 several weeks or months)” than they can on authorized services such as Netflix.<sup>2</sup>

17 2. Unlike Netflix and other licensed online services, Defendants’ business  
18 is based on infringing Plaintiffs’ rights. Defendants transmit performances of  
19 Plaintiffs’ copyrighted works to members of the public without Plaintiffs’  
20 authorization. Defendants thereby infringe Plaintiffs’ exclusive rights to perform  
21 their works publicly, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101, 106(4). Plaintiffs and their affiliates invest  
22 billions of dollars in creating copyrighted motion pictures. Defendants exploit that  
23 investment without any authorization from Plaintiffs, while pocketing all of the  
24 money Defendants charge Zediva users for unauthorized performances of Plaintiffs’  
25 works.

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> <http://www.zediva.com/about> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).

28 <sup>2</sup> <http://www.zediva.com/faq> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).

1           3. Defendants claim they do not have to obtain a license from and  
2 compensate Plaintiffs for exploiting their rights because Zediva purportedly is a  
3 “movie rental service,” which involves a user “renting both a DVD and DVD player  
4 in [Defendants’] data center,”<sup>3</sup> and Zediva transmitting the movie to the user “over  
5 the Internet using streaming technologies.”<sup>4</sup>

6           4. Defendants’ comparison of the Zediva service to a rental store is  
7 disingenuous, and Defendants are attempting to rely on technical gimmicks in an  
8 effort to avoid complying with U.S. Copyright Law. Defendants operate an online  
9 VOD service, not a neighborhood rental store. Unlike Zediva, rental stores do not  
10 transmit performances of movies to the public “over the Internet using streaming  
11 technologies.”<sup>5</sup> A rental store or any other establishment would also need a license  
12 to do so.

13           5. Under the plain language of the Copyright Act, Defendants are  
14 exercising Plaintiffs’ exclusive rights to publicly perform their copyrighted works.  
15 Defendants’ transmissions of the performances of Plaintiffs’ works are to the public  
16 regardless of whether Defendants’ users receive those performances “in the same  
17 place or in separate places and at the same time or at different times.” 17 U.S.C.  
18 § 101 (definition of “[t]o perform ... a work ‘publicly,’” clause (2)). Exercising  
19 Plaintiffs’ exclusive rights without their permission—something Defendants do not  
20 have and claim they do not need—is copyright infringement.

21           6. Defendants’ flagrant violation of Plaintiffs’ exclusive rights directly  
22 undermines Plaintiffs’ present and continuing development of a legitimate market for  
23 the exploitation of Plaintiffs’ rights.

24  
25 

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.zediva.com/faq> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).

26 <sup>4</sup> Letter from Venkatesh Srinivasan to Julius Genachowski, FCC Chairman at 1  
27 (Dec. 10, 2010) (“FCC Letter”), <http://www.zediva.com/ZedivaFCCLetter-12102010.pdf> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).

28 <sup>5</sup> FCC Letter at 1.

1 **THE PARTIES**

2 7. Plaintiff Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. is a corporation duly  
3 incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of  
4 business located in Burbank, California.

5 8. Plaintiff Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc. is a corporation duly  
6 incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of  
7 business located in Culver City, California.

8 9. Plaintiff Disney Enterprises, Inc. is a corporation duly incorporated  
9 under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business located in  
10 Burbank, California.

11 10. Plaintiff Paramount Pictures Corporation is a corporation duly  
12 incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of  
13 business located in Los Angeles, California.

14 11. Plaintiff Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation is a corporation duly  
15 incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of  
16 business located in Los Angeles, California.

17 12. Plaintiff Universal City Studios Productions LLLP is a limited liability  
18 limited partnership duly organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with its  
19 principal place of business located in Universal City, California.

20 13. Plaintiffs and/or their affiliates own or control the copyrights and/or the  
21 relevant exclusive rights in the works at issue in this case under the United States  
22 copyright laws. Plaintiffs or their licensors have obtained Certificates of Copyright  
23 Registration from the Register of Copyrights for their works. Attached hereto as  
24 Exhibit A is a list of certain of Plaintiffs' copyrighted works that Defendants have  
25 infringed by the acts complained of herein. Exhibit A identifies by number the  
26 Certificates of Copyright Registration issued to Plaintiffs or their licensors.

27  
28



1           20. Plaintiffs own or have the exclusive rights in the United States to,  
2 among other things, publicly perform the copyrighted works at issue in this action,  
3 including by means of streaming those works over the Internet to the public.  
4 Defendants have not received any authorization, permission or consent to publicly  
5 perform the Plaintiffs' copyrighted works at issue in this lawsuit.

6           21. Plaintiffs, either directly or through their affiliates and/or licensees,  
7 distribute and publicly perform their copyrighted works in various forms, including,  
8 without limitation, for exhibition in theaters; through television broadcasts; through  
9 cable and direct-to-home satellite services (including basic, premium, "pay-per-  
10 view" and "video on demand" services); and through authorized, licensed Internet-  
11 based services such as Netflix, Apple iTunes, Amazon VOD services, Microsoft  
12 Xbox LIVE Marketplace, Blockbuster On Demand, CinemaNow, and the Sony  
13 Playstation Network. Plaintiffs also distribute their works to the home viewing  
14 market, including by selling copies of the motion pictures on tangible products, such  
15 as DVDs and Blu-ray discs, and by licensing digital downloads through various  
16 services.

17           22. Plaintiffs have invested (and continue to invest) substantial sums of  
18 money and effort each year to develop, produce, distribute and publicly perform their  
19 motion pictures which are protected under copyright and other laws. Defendants'  
20 illegal actions, as described herein, infringe upon Plaintiffs' exclusive rights and  
21 deprive Plaintiffs of the economic value of those rights.

22       **The Zediva Service**

23               *Defendants Transmit Plaintiffs' Copyrighted Content to the Public*

24           23. Defendants operate Zediva, a web site located on the Internet at [http://](http://www.zediva.com)  
25 [www.zediva.com](http://www.zediva.com). Defendants officially launched their service on March 16, 2011.<sup>6</sup>  
26

27           <sup>6</sup> <http://zedivamovies.blogspot.com/2011/03/weve-launched.html> (last visited Apr.  
28 1, 2011).

1           24. Defendants describe their service as a way to “watch new movies  
2 online. Just pick the movie you want to watch and enjoy.”<sup>7</sup> As Defendant  
3 Srinivasan states, “[o]ur goal is to have the top 100 movies of the last 12 months at  
4 any time,” providing “immediate access to the most current and popular  
5 blockbusters.”<sup>8</sup> Defendants’ “Terms & Conditions of Use” refer to Plaintiffs as  
6 purported “third party content providers”<sup>9</sup> whose content is critical to Defendants’  
7 business.

8           25. Defendants’ advertising clearly shows they offer to transmit  
9 performances of popular motion picture releases:



25 <sup>7</sup><http://www.facebook.com/apps/application.php?id=163946686950855#!/apps/application.php?id=163946686950855&sk=info> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).

26 <sup>8</sup> <http://alltopstartups.com/2011/03/23/zediva-is-the-new-netflix-with-a-controversial-twist/> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011); <http://www.xconomy.com/san-francisco/2011/03/16/zediva-launches-online-dvd-viewing/> (same).


27 <sup>9</sup> <http://www.zediva.com/tou> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**ZEDIVA**  
NEW MOVIES NOW

[Browse Selections](#)   [Pricing](#)   [How It Works](#)



WATCH  
*The Social Network*  
TONIGHT

Watch the latest DVDs over the internet right now!

**ZEDIVA**   Like 173   Movies   My Account

NEW MOVIES NOW

**New Releases**

Top 10

All DVDs

Coming Soon

Jackass 3 in 2D



Rent Now

Morning Glory



Rent Now

The Next Three Days



Rent Now

Burlesque



Rent Now

10

<sup>10</sup> <http://w1.zediva.com/splash/index.php> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011);  
<http://w1.zediva.com/splash/works.html> (same).



1           26. Defendants promote their unauthorized service as allowing users to  
2 watch new movies much earlier—“often several weeks or months”—than they could  
3 with authorized online services. Defendants currently charge as little as a dollar per  
4 streamed work, when a user purchases a “bundle” of streams of 10 different  
5 movies.<sup>11</sup> Defendants’ prices may be half (or less than half) of the prices that  
6 licensed services charge.

7           27. As *Time Magazine* noted on its “Techland” blog, the reason that  
8 Defendants can “shave[] down” their pricing is because they “cut[] movie studios out  
9 of the equation” and do not “negotiat[e] streaming rights.”<sup>12</sup>

10           28. Defendants digitally transmit content to members of the public through  
11 Internet streaming, much the same as authorized services that have licensed these  
12 rights from Plaintiffs.

13           29. Defendants stream performances of Plaintiffs’ copyrighted works from  
14 the same DVD to numerous different members of the public.

15           30. By way of example, Defendants’ website describes a basic “rental”  
16 period of 14 days. The user has access to the movie on the DVD for four hours at a  
17 time, or until the user’s playback is paused for an extended time period; in either  
18 event, Defendants’ service deems the particular DVD to be “returned” and available  
19 for streaming to other users.<sup>13</sup>

20           ***Defendants’ Announced Plans to Expand Their Service***

21           31. Defendants plan to expand their user base by increasing the number of  
22 devices to which they will stream Plaintiffs’ works. Defendants state that the Zediva  
23 service is “limited to PC, MAC and Google TV” and handheld, cellular “Android  
24

25 <sup>11</sup> <http://www.zediva.com/faq> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011);  
<http://w1.zediva.com/splash/pricing.html> (same).

26 <sup>12</sup> <http://techland.time.com/2011/03/16/zedivas-movie-rentals-are-50-cheaper-than-itunes/#ixzz1HqSGXafx> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).

27 <sup>13</sup> <http://www.zediva.com/faq> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011). Defendants say that this  
28 “is out of consideration to other users who may be waiting to rent the DVD.” *Id.*

1 devices,” and is “working hard to add support for iPhone/iPad and game consoles  
2 like Xbox, PS3,” and “hope[s] to quickly expand the number of platforms and  
3 devices we can serve in 2011.”<sup>14</sup>

4 ***Zediva Founder and CEO Venkatesh Srinivasan’s Active Participation in***  
5 ***and Control of Zediva’s Infringing Activities***

6 32. Defendant Srinivasan is Zediva’s Founder and CEO. Srinivasan directs,  
7 controls, ratifies, and participates in Zediva’s infringing activity.

8 33. Srinivasan has been personally involved in and personally responsible  
9 for (a) Zediva’s decision to stream the Plaintiffs’ copyrighted works over the Internet  
10 without Plaintiffs’ consent; (b) the development of Zediva’s business model and  
11 technological systems employed by Zediva in the infringement of Plaintiffs’  
12 copyrights; (c) the solicitation of financial support for the infringing Zediva service;  
13 (d) the widespread promotion of Zediva’s infringing service through public  
14 appearances and statements to the press and others; and (e) the decision to continue  
15 and to expand Zediva’s infringing activity despite widespread reports regarding the  
16 service’s illegal nature. Srinivasan spent several years leading a team that developed  
17 the infringing Zediva service; he has personally supervised, and has a direct and  
18 personal financial interest in, its infringing activities.

19 34. As Srinivasan personally posted on Zediva’s blog,  
20 <http://zedivamovies.blogspot.com/>, he created and developed Zediva’s infringing  
21 business model, and the “rest as they say is history. We set out to build that service -  
22 and with a few tweaks here, and a modification there, Zediva was born.”<sup>15</sup>  
23 Srinivasan played a central role in the development of Zediva’s technology which  
24 facilitates its infringing conduct. He is listed as an “inventor” on the patent  
25

26 <sup>14</sup> <http://www.zediva.com/about> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011);  
27 <http://www.zediva.com/faq> (same).

28 <sup>15</sup> <http://zedivamovies.blogspot.com/2011/03/genesis-of-zediva.html> (last visited  
Apr. 1, 2011).

1 application for the technology underlying the Zediva service.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, in many  
2 respects, Zediva and Srinivasan are one and the same. According to Zediva's own  
3 SEC "Form D" filing, Defendant WTV Systems, LLC (along with WTV Systems,  
4 Inc., "Zediva") and Defendant Srinivasan share the same address.

5 35. Srinivasan plays a core, central role in Zediva's infringing activities.  
6 Zediva's website lists five key employees, and Srinivasan is at the top of even that  
7 short list.<sup>17</sup> Srinivasan is intimately involved in the company's day-to-day  
8 operations. After Zediva's servers crashed when the company launched out of beta,  
9 Srinivasan personally posted on Zediva's blog that the company's news blitz "drove  
10 huge volumes of traffic our way, and our servers got overwhelmed," but that they  
11 were "back in business just after midnight" and will "build the service you want, and  
12 get you off that waiting list as soon as we can."<sup>18</sup>

13 36. Srinivasan has been quoted in a flurry of press on Zediva's recent  
14 launch. Srinivasan repeatedly (and erroneously) has compared Zediva to using a  
15 long remote control over the Internet.<sup>19</sup> Srinivasan also has promoted the Zediva  
16 service as allowing users to avoid "pay[ing] premium prices" for online streaming,<sup>20</sup>  
17 and as allowing users to watch movies earlier than other streaming sites because "we  
18 are not party" to those "contractual agreement[s]" that the Studios have with  
19 authorized streaming services.<sup>21</sup>

20 <sup>16</sup> Remote Rental of Digital Content Peripheral Storage Entities, U.S. Patent  
21 Application No. US 2010/0125529 AI, at 1 (filed May 20, 2010)..

22 <sup>17</sup> <http://www.zediva.com/about> (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).

23 <sup>18</sup> <http://zedivamovies.blogspot.com/2011/03/launch-day-recap.html> (last visited  
24 Apr. 1, 2011).

25 <sup>19</sup> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/faster-forward/post/zediva-offers-new-  
26 approach-to-online-movies/2011/03/16/AB3sX6e\\_blog.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/faster-forward/post/zediva-offers-new-approach-to-online-movies/2011/03/16/AB3sX6e_blog.html) (last visited Apr. 1,  
27 2011) ("It's like watching with a long cable and a long remote control."); FCC  
28 Letter at 1 (Zediva like "a really really long video cable and really long remote  
control cable connected to the DVD player.").

<sup>20</sup> [http://hollywooddaily.us/2011/03/17/zediva-streams-new-releases-before-  
netflix-and-redbox/](http://hollywooddaily.us/2011/03/17/zediva-streams-new-releases-before-netflix-and-redbox/) (last visited Apr. 1, 2011).

<sup>21</sup> <http://business.financialpost.com/2011/03/16/zediva-launches-netflix-rival/> (last  
visited Apr. 1, 2011).

1 37. Srinivasan has been and is the primary actor in the activities of Zediva  
2 that give rise to Plaintiffs' claims; he has had knowledge of, consented to and  
3 exercised control over Zediva's infringing activities.

4 ***Defendants' Conduct Causes Immediate and Irreparable Harm to***  
5 ***Plaintiffs***

6 38. The significant harm caused by Defendants' conduct is both immediate  
7 and irreparable to Plaintiffs' exclusive rights protected under federal law. The  
8 Zediva service directly supplants and undermines Plaintiffs' and their authorized  
9 licensees' offering of digital Studio content to consumers, including authorized  
10 online streaming services, video-on-demand channels, DVD rentals, and other  
11 platforms. Indeed, in a recent letter to the FCC, Srinivasan conceded that Zediva  
12 "may be perceived to directly compete with the Video-on-Demand service,  
13 PayPerView or other PayTV services offered by cable providers and, in some cases,  
14 the providers of fiber networks and wireless networks."<sup>22</sup> Defendants' illegal service  
15 threatens to undermine these present and potential legitimate channels, at significant  
16 cost to Plaintiffs and their licensees.

17 39. By characterizing Zediva as a legitimate and lawful competitor to  
18 licensed online services and as "fully compliant with the law,"<sup>23</sup> Defendants threaten  
19 to confuse customers and the public and drive up early and immediate adoption of  
20 the Zediva service by numerous additional end users, causing even greater immediate  
21 and irreparable injury to Plaintiffs.

22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Copyright Infringement, 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(4) and 501)**

24 40. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference each and every averment  
25 contained in paragraphs 1 through 39 inclusive.

26 <sup>22</sup> FCC Letter at 1.

27 <sup>23</sup> [http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/03/22/BU6Q1IE40J.DTL&type=tech)  
28 [bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/03/22/BU6Q1IE40J.DTL&type=tech](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/03/22/BU6Q1IE40J.DTL&type=tech) (last visited Apr.  
1, 2011).

1 41. Through their conduct averred herein, Defendants have infringed  
2 Plaintiffs' copyrights in their works by publicly performing Plaintiffs' copyrighted  
3 works, without authorization from Plaintiffs, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§106(4) and  
4 501.

5 42. Each infringement by Defendants of Plaintiffs' copyrighted works  
6 constitutes a separate and distinct act of infringement.

7 43. Defendants' acts of infringement are willful, in disregard of and with  
8 indifference to the rights of Plaintiffs.

9 44. As a direct and proximate result of the infringements by Defendants,  
10 Plaintiffs are entitled to damages and Defendants' profits in amounts to be proven at  
11 trial which are not currently ascertainable.

12 45. Alternatively, Plaintiffs are entitled to the maximum statutory damages  
13 in the amount of \$150,000 per statutory award, or for such other amounts as may be  
14 proper under 17 U.S.C. § 504.

15 46. Plaintiffs further are entitled to recover their attorneys' fees and full  
16 costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.

17 47. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing acts and conduct,  
18 Plaintiffs have sustained and will continue to sustain substantial, immediate and  
19 irreparable injury, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless enjoined  
20 and restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to infringe Plaintiffs' rights in  
21 their copyrighted works. Plaintiffs are entitled to preliminary and permanent  
22 injunctive relief.

23 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants and against  
25 all of their affiliates, agents, servants, employees, partners and all persons in active  
26 concert or participation with them, for the following relief:  
27  
28





# **Exhibit A**

Plaintiff	Title	U.S. Copyright Registration Number
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Book of Eli, The	PA 1-659-118
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Cop Out	PA 1-703-015
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Dark Knight, The	PA 1-606-857
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Hereafter	PRE000003929
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Invention of Lying, The	PA 1-647-143
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Invictus	PA 1-684-663
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Life As We Know It	PA 1-709-859
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Sherlock Holmes	PA 1-656-999
Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.	Yogi Bear	PRE000004120
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	Bounty Hunter, The	PA 1-667-359
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	Eat Pray Love	PA 1-689-770
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	Grown Ups	PA 1-682-702
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	How Do You Know	PA 1-712-186
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	Karate Kid, The	PA 1-680-527
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	Other Guys, The	PA 1-689-167
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	Salt	PA 1-687-265
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	Social Network, The	PA 1-698-016
Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.	Tourist, The	PA 1-712-189
Disney Enterprises, Inc.	Alice in Wonderland	PA 1-675-924
Disney Enterprises, Inc.	Last Song, The	PA 1-679-726
Disney Enterprises, Inc.	Prince of Persia: The Sands of Time	PA 1-689-164
Disney Enterprises, Inc.	Secretariat	PA 1-706-963
Disney Enterprises, Inc.	Sorcerer's Apprentice, The	PA 1-691-405
Disney Enterprises, Inc.	Toy Story 3	PA 1-688-323
Disney Enterprises, Inc.	When in Rome	PA 1-667-869
Disney Enterprises, Inc.	You Again	PA 1-702-216
Paramount Pictures Corporation	Jackass 3D	PA 1-700-556
Paramount Pictures Corporation	Last Airbender, The	PA 1-683-283
Paramount Pictures Corporation	Morning Glory	PA 1-706-205
Paramount Pictures Corporation	Paranormal Activity 2	PA 1-701-514
Paramount Pictures Corporation	Shutter Island	PA 1-663-207
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	127 Hours	PA 1-705-419

Plaintiff	Title	U.S. Copyright Registration Number
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	A-Team, The	PA 1-679-727
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Avatar	PA 1-395-488
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Crazy Heart	PA 1-655-279
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Date Night	PA 1-669-165
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Diary of a Wimpy Kid	PA 1-667-079
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Knight and Day	PA 1-681-723
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Love and Other Drugs	PA 1-706-799
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Marmaduke	PA 1-678-666
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Predators	PA 1-683-294
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Ramona and Beezus	PA 1-687-191
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Unstoppable	PA 1-705-418
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Vampires Suck	PA 1-689-743
Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation	Wall Street: Money Never Sleeps	PA 1-693-817
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	American, The	PA 1-697-735
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	Babies	PA 1-690-561
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	Charlie St. Cloud	PA 1-690-720
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	Despicable Me	PRE000003604
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	Get Him to the Greek	PRE000003528
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	It's Complicated	PA 1-656-395
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	Kids Are All Right, The	PAu 3-457-290
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	Love Happens	PA 1-644-272
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	MacGruber	PA 1-685-732
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	My Soul to Take	PA 1-703-035
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	Robin Hood	PRE000003429
Universal City Studios Productions LLLP	Scott Pilgrim vs. the World	PA 1-692-200