

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>STATEMENT OF FACTS</u>	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> , <i>supra</i> , and <i>Karls v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i> , <i>supra</i>	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 American Inner-City Children In Accordance With A Long-Term Preexisting Legally- Binding Obligation.....	12
<u>II. ARGUMENT – THE BANK OF NEW YORK ISSUE - CONVERSION:</u>	15
A. Standard For Review	15
B. The Court of Appeal Should Not Ignore The Admissions Justice Martin Jenkins Elicited From Defendants’ Counsel During Oral Argument That:.....	15
• 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 Claim For Conversion Is Well Within This Rule.	
B-1. Every Case Cited By The Defendants And The Court of Appeal In Both This Case And The Related Combined Cases of <i>Karls v. Wachovia/Wells Fargo</i> , Ibid., Support The Plaintiff’s Position That The Unauthorized Taking Of “A Document In Which Intangible Rights Are Merged” Is Actionable As Conversion.....	18
B-2. 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
C. 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”.....	27
C-1. The FAC Alleges Substantial Interference (Opinion § IV-B).....	27
C-2. Federal Copyright Preemption (Opinion § IV-C).....	30
III. <u>ARGUMENT – THE MELLON CAPITAL 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</u>	31
A. Standard For Review.....	31
B. Plaintiff’s Complaint Alleges That The Defendant <i>Mellon</i> Unincorporated Association Was Formed Pursuant To An Election By Its Members Under Federal Law – Defendants Did Not Introduce One Scintilla Of Evidence To Dispute This Fact.....	31

C. Plaintiff Introduced Expert Testimony That (1) There Has Been Only One Case In 43 Years Of A U.S. Parent Corporation And Its Subsidiaries NOT Filing Consolidated U.S. Income Tax Returns and (2) One Reason Why U.S. Companies Always File Consolidated U.S. Income Tax Returns Is That It Would Otherwise Be Impossible To Obtain Directors’ and Officers’ Liability Insurance – Defendants Did Not Introduce One Scintilla Of Evidence To Dispute These Facts.....	32
D. Plaintiff’s Complaint Designates The Defendant <i>Mellon</i> Unincorporated Association By The Name By Which It Is Known – Defendants Did Not Introduce One Scintilla Of Evidence To Dispute This Fact.....	33
E. Plaintiff’s Complaint Alleges That The Defendants Were Acting As A Criminal Gang Since The Complaint Alleges That The Defendants Had Received Stolen Property And That The Defendants Had Been Reckless In Their Failure To Obtain Permission Of The Plaintiff To Use His Property (A Felony At Common Law And, Since The Defendants Are American And The Thieves Are Alleged To Be British, A Crime Under Federal Statutory Law As Well) – Defendants Did Not Introduce One Scintilla Of Evidence To Dispute The Fact That They Had Been Operating As A Criminal Gang.....	38
F. If The Court of Appeal Believes That Plaintiff’s Complaint Is Deficient Then, Since The Complaint Has Never Been Amended And The Superior Court’s Decision Did Not Grant Leave To Amend, In The Interests Of Justice Leave To Amend Should Be Granted – Especially Since The Court Of Appeal’s Decision Filed December 15, 2010 Is Refusing To Enforce Cal. Corporations Code § 18035 As Written.....	42
G. Whether The Defendant <i>Mellon</i> Unincorporated Association Is A Partnership, As Alleged In The Complaint, Is Irrelevant To The Conclusion Of The Court Of Appeal That An Unincorporated Association Acting As A Criminal Gang Cannot Be Sued In The Name By Which It Is Known – Moreover, The Defendant <i>Mellon</i> Unincorporated Association Was Acting As A Common-Law Partnership As Alleged.....	43

H. Dismissal Is Not Permitted By Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10 Unless The <i>Mellon</i> Defendants Are “The Same Parties” As The <i>Bank of New York</i> Defendants Since, Even If The Unincorporated-Association Defendants Are Dismissed From Both Cases, the “Same Parties” Requirement Is Still Not Satisfied – The Court Of Appeal Has Failed To Address Superior Court Judge Woolard’s Supposition That The Defendants In <i>Bank of New York</i> (NYSE Symbol - BK) Can Be Sued After The Statute of Limitations Has Run For The Unlawful Behavior Of <i>Mellon Financial Corporation</i> (NYSE Symbol - MEL) And Its Subsidiaries.....	46
IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>	50
A. The <i>Bank of New York</i> Conversion Issue.....	50
B. The <i>Mellon Capital Management</i> Unincorporated-Association Issues.....	51
C. The Estimated 10 Million California Inner-City Children For Whose Education 100% Of Any Proceeds From <i>Karls v. The Bank of New York, et. al.</i> , and <i>Karls v. Mellon Capital Management Corp., et. al.</i> , and All Of The Virtually-Identical Lawsuits Are Dedicated In Legally-Binding Fashion.....	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Barr v. United Methodist Church</i> , 153 Cal. 322, 90 Cal.App.3d 259 (Cal.App. Fourth Dist. 1979).....	40
<i>Dielsi v. Falk</i> , 916 F.Supp. 985 (C.D.Cal. 1996).....	22
<i>Freemont Indemnity Company v. Fremont General Corporation, et. al.</i> , 55 Cal.3d 621, 148 Cal.App.4th 97 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2007).....	2, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 26, 29, 50
<i>Gladstone v. Hillel</i> , 250 Cal. 372, 203 Cal.App.3d 977 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1988).....	8, 9, 11, 24, 30
<i>Italiani v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Corporation</i> , 45 Cal.App.2d 464, 466, 114 P.2d 370 (Cal. App. Third Dist. 1941) quoting 13 Corpus Juris, p. 948, sec. 5-a.	8, 24, 29
<i>Jordan v. Talbot</i> , 55 Cal.2d 597 (S.Ct. 1961).....	28
<i>Melchior v. New Line Productions</i> , 131 Cal. 482, 106 Cal.App.4th 779 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2003).....	21, 22
<i>Minniear v. Tors</i> , 72 Cal. 287, 266 Cal.App.2d 495 (Second Dist. 1968).....	22
<i>Oakes v. Suelynn Corp.</i> , 100 Cal. 838, 24 Cal. App.3d 345 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1972).....	22
<i>Payne v. Elliott</i> , 54 Cal. 339 (S.Ct. 1880).....	19, 21
<i>People ex. rel. John Garamendi v. American Autoplan, Inc., et. al.</i> , 20 Cal.App.4th 760 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 1993).....	47
<i>Simonian v. Patterson</i> , 32 Cal.2d 722, 27 Cal.App.4th 773 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 1994).....	27

<i>Thrifty-Tel, Inc. v. Bezenek</i> , 54 Cal.3d 468, 46 Cal.App.4th 1559 (Cal.App. Fourth Dist. 1996).....	2, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 29, 50
<i>Totten v. Colonia Chiques, et. al.</i> , 67 Cal.3d 70, 156 Cal.App.4th 31 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2007).....	42
<i>Zaslow v. Cronert</i> , 29 Cal.2d 541 (S.Ct. 1946).....	28

CONSTITUTION – STATUTES – RULES

26 U.S. Code § 482.....	45
26 Code of Federal Regulations § 1.482-9.....	45
26 U.S. Code § 1501.....	34, 50
26 U.S. Code § 1504.....	32, 34, 35, 50
Cal. Civil Code § 3426.7.....	9
Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 338(c).....	25
Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 369.5(a).....	33, 39
Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10.....	46, 47, 49, 52
Cal. Corporations Code § 18035(a).....	39, 40, 44, 53

PUBLICATIONS

18 Am.Jur.2d <i>Conversion § 7: Tangible and Intangible Property, Generally</i> (2010).....	1, 17, 24, 26, 29, 50
1 Melvin F. Jager, <i>Trade Secrets Law, Ch. 2: The Historical Development Of Trade Secret Concepts</i> (West Publishing Company – Looseleaf © 2010).....	1

2 Melvin F. Jager, <i>Trade Secrets Law, Chapter 50: The Trade Secrets Law of New York</i> (West Publishing Company – Looseleaf © 2010).....	3
2 Melvin F. Jager, <i>Trade Secrets Law, Chapter 56: The Trade Secrets Law of Pennsylvania</i> (West Publishing Company – Looseleaf © 2010).....	3
Restatement of Torts § 242.....	2, 19, 26, 29