

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>STATEMENT OF FACTS</u></b> .....	1
A. Actions For The Classic Tort Of Conversion Of A Trade Secret, From Which Evolved The Additional Common-Law Tort Of Misappropriation Of A Trade Secret.....	1
B. Regarding <i>Karls v. The Bank of New York</i> –.....	7
B-1. Superior Court Judge Curtis E.A. Karnow’s “Pre-Packaged Appeal” of <i>Karls v. Wachovia Trust Co. of Cal.</i> , supra, and <i>Karls v. Wells Fargo &amp; Co.</i> , supra.....	7
B-2. Pre-Emption By The California Uniform Trade Secrets Act Raised And Abandoned Under California Choice-Of-Law Principles By The Defendants In <i>Karls v. The Bank of New York, et. al.</i> , (Cal. Sup. Ct. No. 489460, Cal. Ct. App. No. 127444).....	9
C. Updating The “Certificate Of Interested Entities Or Persons” With Regard To Additional On-Going Efforts To Contribute Gratis All Rights Against The 15 Groups Of Defendants To Benefit The Education Of 10 Million California Inner-City Children In Accordance With A Long-Term Preexisting Legally-Binding Obligation.....	12
<b>II. <u>ARGUMENT –</u></b>	
<b><u>THE BANK OF NEW YORK ISSUE -</u></b>	
<b><u>CONVERSION:</u></b> .....	15
A. Standard For Review.....	15
B. The Supreme Court Should Not Ignore The Admissions That Court of Appeal Justice Martin Jenkins Elicited From Defendants’ Counsel During Oral Argument That –	
• Both <i>Freemont Indemnity Company v. Freemont General Corporation, et. al.</i> , 55 Cal.3d 621, 148 Cal.App.4th 97 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2007) and <i>Thrifty-Tel, Inc. v. Bezenek</i> , 54 Cal.3d 468, 46 Cal.App.4th 1559 (Cal.App.	

Fourth Dist. 1996) Recognized That The Unauthorized Taking of “A Document In Which Intangible Rights Are Merged” is Actionable As Conversion, and

- The Plaintiff’s Complaint For Conversion Is Well Within This Rule.....15

C. Every Case Cited By The Defendants And The Court of Appeal In Both This Case And The Related Combined Cases of *Karls v. Wachovia/Wells Fargo*, Ibid., Support The Plaintiff’s Position That The Unauthorized Taking Of “A Document In Which Intangible Rights Are Merged” Is Actionable As Conversion.....18

D. The Plaintiff’s Unaltered Position From The Beginning Has Been That The Unauthorized Taking Of “A Document In Which Intangible Rights Are Merged” Is Actionable As Conversion.....22

E. The Court of Appeal’s “House of Cards” – All Other Objections By The Court of Appeals Regarding Conversion Depend On Its Erroneous Premise That The Plaintiff Does Not Have A Cause Of Action For Common-Law Conversion For “A Document In Which Intangible Rights Are Merged”.....25

E-1. The FAC Alleges Substantial Interference (Opinion § IV-B).....25

E-2. Federal Copyright Preemption (Opinion § IV-C).....28

### **III. ARGUMENT –**

**THE MELLON CAPITAL MANAGEMENT ISSUE - WHETHER AN UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATION FORMED PURSUANT TO AN ELECTION BY ITS MEMBERS UNDER FEDERAL LAW AND ACTING AS A CRIMINAL GANG CAN BE SUED UNDER THE NAME BY WHICH IT IS KNOWN**.....31

A. Standard For Review.....31

B. The Clearly-Erroneous Factual Finding Of The Superior Court.....	32
C. The Attempt Of The Court Of Appeal To Justify The Decision Of The Superior Court On Other Grounds That Were Also Clearly Erroneous.....	33
C-1. The Requirements Of Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 369.5(a) And Cal. Corporations Code. § 18035(a) Were Satisfied Because (A) Plaintiff’s Complaint Designates The Defendant <i>Mellon</i> Unincorporated Association By The Name By Which It Is Known and (B) Plaintiff’s Complaint Describes The Defendant <i>Mellon</i> Unincorporated Association As Acting As A Criminal Gang -- And Defendants Did Not Introduce One Scintilla Of Evidence To Dispute Either Fact.....	33
C-2. The Court Of Appeal Abused Its Discretion In Requiring, Without The Citation Of Any Authority, Additional Allegations In The Complaint That (A) The Name By Which The Defendant Unincorporated Association Designated Was The Name By Which It Was Known and (B) The Legal Conclusion That The Elements Of The Crime Of Receiving Stolen Property Described In The Complaint Did Indeed Constitute That Crime – Since The Original Complaint Has Never Been Amended And Routine Practice For Regular American Citizens (vs. California’s Inner-City Children) Would Have Been To Permit Amendments If The Court Had Thought Them Necessary.....	36
D. The Complete Dismissal of The <i>Mellon</i> Action Is Diametrically Opposed To Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10 And <i>The People ex rel. John Garamendi vs. American Autoplan, Inc., et. al.</i> (Second Appellate District 1993).....	38
IV. <b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b> .....	39
Appendix 1 Nov. 12, 2009 Superior Court Order – <i>Bank of NY</i> ....	App. p. 1
Appendix 2 Sep. 14, 2009 Superior Court Order – <i>Mellon</i> .....	App. p. 3