

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARGUMENT1

A. Cal. Rules Of Court § 8.500(b)(2) And The U.S. Constitution’s Fourteenth Amendment “Due Process” Clause Were Violated Because Two Of The Three Justices Participating In The Court Of Appeal Decision Were Demonstrably Prejudiced.....1

B. Defendants And The Court Of Appeal Have Been Unable To Cite A Single Authority That Undercuts Plaintiff’s Position From The Outset That The Wrongful Taking Of “Intangible Property That Is Merged In, Or Identified With” Tangible Property (Quoting *Freemont Indemnity General Corporation* (Cal.App. 2d Dist. 2007) and *Thrifty-Tel, Inc. v. Bezenek* (Cal.App. 4th Dist. 1996)) Is Actionable As Conversion.....4

B-1. Plaintiff’s Position According To The Complaints, Etc.4

B-2. The Two Most-Recent Court Of Appeal Decisions -- *Freemont Indemnity General Corporation* (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2007) and *Thrifty-Tel, Inc. v. Bezenek* (Cal.App. Fourth Dist. 1996) Support The Plaintiff.....5

B-3. Am.Jur.2d, Corpus Juris And The Second Restatement Of Torts All Support Plaintiff’s Position.....7

B-4. The First Appellate District’s Own Decision In *Gladstone v. Hillel* (Cal.App. First Dist. 1988) Is Not An “Inapt Analogy” But Directly “On Point” For Plaintiff When Considered Together With The Legislative Intent Of Cal. Code Civ. Proc. 338(c).....8

B-5. All Other Authorities Cited By The Defendants Are Consistent With Plaintiff’s Position Which Is Well-Settled Law.....10

C. The Petition For Review Demonstrated That All Of The Other Arguments Of The Court Of Appeal Comprised A “House Of Cards” Because Each Was Predicated On The Erroneous Premise That “Intangible Property” Merged In, Or Identified With, Tangible Property Is Not Actionable As Conversion -- The Defendants’ Attempts In Their Answer To Make Three Cards In The “House Of Cards” Stand Up Again Are Fatally Flawed.....	11
C-1. Statute Of Limitations.....	11
C-2. Copyright Preemption.....	12
C-3. Intermeddling – Also Deprivation Of Plaintiff’s Exclusive Right To Exploit His Trade Secret.....	16
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Dielsi v. Falk, 916 F.Supp. 985 (C.D.Cal. 1996)...10

Freemont Indemnity Company v. Fremont General Corporation, et al., 55 Cal.3d 621, 148 Cal.App.4th 97 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2007).....4, 5, 6, 7, 18

Gladstone v. Hillel, 250 Cal. 372, 203 Cal.App.3d 977 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1988).....8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19

Italiani v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Corporation, 45 Cal.App.2d 464, 466, 114 P.2d 370 (Cal. App. Third Dist. 1941) quoting 13 Corpus Juris, p. 948, sec. 5-a..7

Melchior v. New Line Productions, 131 Cal. 482, 106 Cal.App.4th 779 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2003).....10

Minniear v. Tors, 72 Cal. 287, 266 Cal.App.2d 495 (Second Dist. 1968).....10

Mosk v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County, 25 Cal.3d 474 (Supreme Court In Bank 1979).....2

Oakes v. Suelynn Corp., 100 Cal. 838, 24 Cal. App.3d 345 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1972).....10

Thrifty-Tel, Inc. v. Bezenek, 54 Cal.3d 468, 46 Cal.App.4th 1559 (Cal.App. Fourth Dist. 1996).....4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 19

Zaslow v. Cronert, 29 Cal.2d 541 (S.Ct. 1946).....16

CONSTITUTION – STATUTES – RULES

U.S. Const. Amendment 14.....3, 19

Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 338(c).....4, 8, 11, 12

Cal. Rules of Court § 8.500(b).....3, 18, 19

Cal. Rules of Court § 8.504(b)(3).....3

PUBLICATIONS

18 Am.Jur.2d *Conversion § 7: Tangible and Intangible Property, Generally* (2010).....7

Nimmer, *The Law of Copyright* (1978).....14, 15, 16

Restatement of Torts, Second § 242.....7, 8