

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ARGUMENT</u>	1
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 <i>Freemont Indemnity General Corporation</i> (Cal.App. 2d Dist. 2007) and <i>Thrifty-Tel, Inc. v. Bezenek</i> (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 -- <i>Freemont Indemnity General Corporation</i> (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2007) and <i>Thrifty-Tel, Inc. v. Bezenek</i> (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 <i>Gladstone v. Hillel</i> (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

<i>Dielsi v. Falk</i> , 916 F.Supp. 985 (C.D.Cal. 1996).....	10
<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).....	4, 5, 6, 7, 18
<i>Gladstone v. Hillel</i> , 250 Cal. 372, 203 Cal.App.3d 977 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1988).....	8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19
<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..	7
<i>Melchior v. New Line Productions</i> , 131 Cal. 482, 106 Cal.App.4th 779 (Cal.App. Second Dist. 2003).....	10
<i>Minniear v. Tors</i> , 72 Cal. 287, 266 Cal.App.2d 495 (Second Dist. 1968).....	10
<i>Mosk v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County</i> , 25 Cal.3d 474 (Supreme Court In Bank 1979).....	2
<i>Oakes v. Suelynn Corp.</i> , 100 Cal. 838, 24 Cal. App.3d 345 (Cal.App. First Dist. 1972).....	10
<i>Thrifty-Tel, Inc. v. Bezenek</i> , 54 Cal.3d 468, 46 Cal.App.4th 1559 (Cal.App. Fourth Dist. 1996).....	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 19
<i>Zaslow v. Cronert</i> , 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 <i>Conversion § 7: Tangible and Intangible Property, Generally</i> (2010).....	7
Nimmer, <i>The Law of Copyright</i> (1978).....	14, 15, 16
Restatement of Torts, Second § 242.....	7, 8