Daniel M. Cislo Esq., No. 125,378 1 dancislo@cislo.com
David B. Sandelands, No. 198,252 dsandelands@cislo.com CISLO & THOMAS LLP 12100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1700 Los Angeles, California 90025 Telephone: (310) 451-0647 Telefax: (310) 394-4477 3 4 5 Attorneys for Defendant, 6 Pepperdine University 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 WESTERN DIVISION 11 Dr. Elliot McGucken, an individual,) CASE NO. 2:22-cv-02851 GW(JCx) 12 [Hon. George H. Wu] 13 Plaintiff, 14 PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY'S v. **ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE** 15 **DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFF'S** Pepperdine University, a California FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT nonprofit corporation; and Does 1-10, 16 inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Defendant Pepperdine University ("Pepperdine"), by and through its counsel, and for itself alone, hereby answers the First Amended Complaint of Plaintiff Elliot McGucken ("McGucken") dated May 18, 2022, as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. Pepperdine admits that Plaintiff premises that this action arises under the Copyright Act of 1976, Title 17 U.S.C., § 101 *et seq.*, and nothing more.
- 2. Pepperdine admits that Plaintiff premises that this Court has federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 1338 (a)-(b), and nothing more.
- 3. Pepperdine admits that Plaintiff premises that venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 139l(c) and1400(a) on the grounds that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions giving rise to the claims allegedly occurred, and nothing more.
- 4. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 4 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 5. Pepperdine admits that is a California Non-Profit corporation doing business in Los Angeles County and has a principal place of business at 24255 Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu, California 90263, and nothing more.

27 ///

- 6. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 6 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 7. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 7 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.

CLAIMS RELATED TO MCGUCKEN'S PHOTOGRAPH

- 8. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 8 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 9. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 9 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 10. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 10 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 11. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 11 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein. Pepperdine notes that U.S. Copyright Registration No. VA 2089200 is for a group work comprising 43,600 photographs. Plaintiff provides no evidence that the photograph depicted in Exhibit A to the First Amended Complaint is one of the 43,600 photographs

- 12. Pepperdine admits that it published a work entitled "The Orange Book: 2021 Academic Planning Guide." Pepperdine admits the planning guide was distributed to law students during the academic year 2021. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 12 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 13. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 13 of the First Amended Complaint, and specifically whether Exhibit B is an accurate photograph of the 2021 Academic Planning Guide, and therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 14. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 14 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 15. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 15 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.

26 ///

16. Pepperdine admits that it received a letter from Plaintiff's counsel regarding the subject photograph. Pepperdine avers that it requested that Plaintiff provide proof that it had a copyright registration for the subject photograph. Plaintiff willfully and in bad faith refused to provide any such evidence. As of the date of this answer, Plaintiff has failed to provide any proof that the subject photograph is one of the 43,600 photographs that comprises Plaintiff's Copyright Registration. As such, Plaintiff is prosecuting this action in bad faith. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny any of the remaining allegations of paragraph 16 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(For Copyright Infringement - Against all Defendants, and Each)

- 17. In response to paragraph 17, Pepperdine restates and incorporates in their entirety its answers to paragraphs 1 through 16 above.
- 18. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 18 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 19. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 19 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 20. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 20 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.

- 21. Pepperdine denies each and every allegation of paragraph 21 of the First Amended Complaint.
- 22. Pepperdine denies each and every allegation of paragraph 22 of the First Amended Complaint.
- 23. Pepperdine denies each and every allegation of paragraph 23 of the First Amended Complaint.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(For Vicarious and/or Contributory Copyright Infringement – Against all Defendants, and Each)

- 24. In response to paragraph 24, Pepperdine restates and incorporates in their entirety its answers to paragraphs 1 through 23 above.
- 25. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 25 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 26. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 26 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 27. Pepperdine denies each and every allegation of paragraph 27 of the First Amended Complaint.

- 28. Pepperdine denies each and every allegation of paragraph 28 of the First Amended Complaint.
- 29. Pepperdine denies each and every allegation of paragraph 29 of the First Amended Complaint.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(For Violations of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act – Against all Defendants, and Each)

- 30. In response to paragraph 30, Pepperdine restates and incorporates in their entirety its answers to paragraphs 1 through 29 above..
- 31. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 31 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 32. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 32 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 33. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 32 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 34. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 34 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.

- 35. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 35 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 36. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 36 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 37. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 37 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 38. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 38 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 39. Pepperdine presently lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 39 of the First Amended Complaint, and, therefore, on that basis, denies each allegation contained therein.
- 40. Pepperdine denies each and every allegation of paragraph 40 of the First Amended Complaint.
- 41. Pepperdine denies each and every allegation of paragraph 41 of the First Amended Complaint.

26 ///

27 ///

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Pepperdine denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief sought.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

As separate and distinct defenses to each of the claims set forth in the First Amended Complaint, Pepperdine sets forth the following and asserts that each are at issue or will be at issue after an opportunity to conduct discovery.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Innocent Infringement and Good Faith)

1. As a first and separate affirmative defense to the First Amended Complaint, and to each cause of action therein, Pepperdine alleges that to the extent that Plaintiff's work was infringed, Pepperdine acted in good faith, innocent of any knowledge or intent to infringe Plaintiff's rights. If such good faith and lack of intent does not, as a matter of law, preclude a finding of liability, any general or statutory damages awarded to Plaintiff should be correspondingly reduced.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Fair Use)

2. As a second and separate affirmative defense to the First Amended Complaint, and to each cause of action therein, Pepperdine alleges that to the extent, if any, that Pepperdine used the subject photograph, such use was a fair use as the photograph was used for nonprofit and educational purposes only and such use had no material impact on the market value, if any, for the photograph.

///

27 ///

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Transformative Use)

3. As a third and separate affirmative defense to the First Amended Complaint, and to each cause of action therein, Pepperdine alleges that to the extent that Pepperdine used the subject photograph, if any, such use was a transformative use as the original image was so altered as to create a new expression, meaning, or message, so as not to be a substitute for the original image or use of the image.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Lack of Notice)

4. As a fourth and separate affirmative defense to the First Amended Complaint, and to each cause of action therein, Pepperdine, upon information and belief, alleges that Plaintiff failed to properly mark its alleged copyrighted material and failed to give Pepperdine notice of the allegedly infringing activities prior to the filing of this lawsuit.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Lack of Registration)

5. As a fifth and separate affirmative defense to the First Amended Complaint, and to each cause of action therein, Pepperdine, upon information and belief, alleges that the allegedly infringed photograph, i.e. Exhibit A to the First Amended Complaint is not copyrighted. Plaintiff alleges that the subject photograph forms part of the deposit sample for U.S. Copyright Registration No. VA 2089200. This registration is for a group work comprising 43,600 photographs. Despite repeated requests that Plaintiff provide evidence that the allegedly infringed photograph is part of the deposit sample of the claimed registration, Plaintiff willfully and in bad faith has refused to provide any such

CISLO & THOMAS LLP

Attorney at Law
12100 Wilshire Blvd., suite 1700
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: (310) 979-9190
www.cislo.com

///

///

///

///

///

evidence. Pepperdine has requested that the U.S. Copyright Office provide the deposit sample for Plaintiff's claimed registration. However, even when received, Pepperdine is aware of no practical way in which to determine whether the allegedly infringed image forms part of the deposit sample. In the absence of proof by Plaintiff that the allegedly infringed image is copyrighted, this case should be dismissed and Pepperdine should be awarded its fees and costs.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Speculative Damages)

6. As a sixth and separate affirmative defense to the First Amended Complaint, and to each cause of action therein, to the extent Plaintiff has suffered any damages, which is denied, any such damages are speculative and uncertain.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Pepperdine prays for judgment against Plaintiff as follows:

- 1. That Plaintiff take nothing by reason of its First Amended Complaint;
- 2. That Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint be summarily dismissed with prejudice;
- 3. That Pepperdine be awarded its costs of suit herein;

- 4. That Pepperdine be awarded its attorneys' fees incurred defending this action; and
- 5. That Pepperdine be awarded such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

CISLO & THOMAS LLP

Dated: July 13, 2021 By: /s/Daniel Cislo

Daniel M. Cislo, Esq. David B. Sandelands, Esq.

Attorneys for Defendant PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

PROOF OF SERVICE 2 I am over the age of eighteen (18) years, employed in the County of Los Angeles, and not a party to the above-entitled action. My business address is 12100 3 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1700, Los Angeles, CA 90025-7103. 4 5 On July 13, 2022, I served the following document: PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE **DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT** 8 9 **BY SERVICE PROVIDER**: I caused a copy of such document to be sent via electronic service to the addressee(s) shown below using a service 10 provider, such as Express Networks, and: 11 \boxtimes BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: I caused a copy of such document to be sent 12 via the Court's electronic filing system: 13 14 Scott Alan Burroughs, Esq. Trevor W. Barrett, Esq. 15 Frank R. Treschsel, Esq. 16 DONIGER / BURROUGHS 603 Rose Avenue 17 Venice, California 90291 18 scott@donigerlawfirm.com; tbarrett@donigerlawfirm.com; 19 ftreschsel@donigerlawfirm.com 20 21 I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that 22 the foregoing is true and that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of 23 this Court at whose direction the service was made. 24 Executed on July 13, 2022 at Los Angeles, California. 25 26 /s/Christopher Eckart 27 Christopher Eckart 28