

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>I. ARGUMENT – THE BANK OF NEW YORK ISSUE -</u>	
<u>CONVERSION:</u>	1
A. Review Is Necessary To Secure Uniformity Of Decision Regarding Conversion of “A Document In Which Intangible Rights Are Merged”.....	1
A-1. Defendants’ Counsel Admitted In Oral Argument In The Court of Appeal 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	
• Well Within This Rule Is The Plaintiff’s Complaint For Conversion Of His Trade Secret Which, Per The Complaint, Was Not Only Required To Be Contained In The Report Which Was Stolen, But Also Could Not Even Be Comprehended Without The Transaction Steps, Technical Analysis and Diagrams That Were Contained In The Report That Was Stolen	1
A-2. Moreover, The Court Of Appeal Decision Is Diametrically Opposed To <i>Gladstone v. Hillel</i> , 250 Cal. 372, 203 Cal.App.3d 977 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1988)	3
B. Review Is Necessary To Secure Uniformity Of Decision Regarding Federal Copyright Law Preemption Because The Court Of Appeal Decision Is Diametrically Opposed To <i>Gladstone v. Hillel</i> , 250 Cal. 372, 203 Cal.App.3d 977 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1988) And The Extensive Authorities Cited Therein	4

C. Review Is Necessary To Secure Uniformity Of Decision Regarding Extent Of The “Mere-Intermeddling” Landlord-Tenant Disputes.....	6
D. The Supreme Court Should Not Avoid The Lack Of Uniformity By Attempting On Its Own Motion To Rationalize A Failure To Accept The Appeal On The Basis Of, For Example, Preemption Under The Uniform Trade Secrets Act.....	8
 II. <u>ARGUMENT – MELLON CAPITAL MANAGEMENT</u>	
<u>ISSUE –</u>	
<u>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.....</u>	9
A. Review Is Necessary To Secure Uniformity Of Decision Because The Court Of Appeal Decision Is Diametrically Opposed To <i>People ex. rel. Totten v. Coplinia Chiques</i> , 156 Cal.App.4th 31 (Second District 2007) and <i>Barr v. United Methodist Church</i> , 153 Cal. 322, 90 Cal.App.3d 259 (Cal.App. Fourth Dist. 1979) That An Unincorporated Association Operating As A Criminal Gang Can Be Sued Under The Name By Which It Is Known	9
B. If <i>People ex. rel. Totten v. Coplinia Chiques</i> , 156 Cal.App.4th 31 (Second District 2007) And <i>Barr v. United Methodist Church</i> , 153 Cal. 322, 90 Cal.App.3d 259 (Cal.App. Fourth Dist. 1979) Are Honored, Then There Is Not Even Reached The Diametric Opposition Of The Court Of Appeal Decision To <i>The People ex rel. John Garamendi vs. American Autoplan, Inc., et. al.</i> , 20 Cal.App.4th 760 (Second Dist. 1993) Regarding The Use Of Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(c) To Justify A Dismissal Of The <i>Mellon</i> Action.....	14

III. <u>ARGUMENT – UNDER CAL. RULES OF COURT § 8.500(b)(1), THE DENIAL OF “EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW” IN VIOLATION OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION IS AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF LAW</u>	15
A. The Intentional Refusal To Permit 10 Million California Inner-City Children To Enjoy The Protection Of The Law That Is Routinely Accorded First-Class American Citizens Is A Violation Of The Fourteenth Amendment Of The U.S. Constitution	15
A-1. Facing A Holocaust Was Not A Required Element Of Common-Law Conversion In <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) or <i>Gladstone v. Hillel</i> , 250 Cal. 372, 203 Cal.App.3d 977 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1988)	15
A-2. The 10 Million California Inner-City Children Are Indeed Facing A Kind Of Holocaust Which Comprises “A Fate Worse Than Death”	16
B. The Use Of Cal. Rules Of Court, Rule 8.1115, To Prohibit Publication And Prohibit Citation Of Court Opinions That Deny 10 Million California Inner-City Children The Enjoyment Of The Protection Of The Law That Is Routinely Accorded First-Class American Citizens Is A Violation Of The Fourteenth Amendment Of The U.S. Constitution.....	18
IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>	19