# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

# FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

# **CHARLESTON DIVISION**

RICHARD C. DAVIS, an individual )  Plaintiffs, )  Vs. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, ) a joint venture of the Hearst ) Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC ) UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and ) DOES 1-20, inclusive )  Defendants. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, )  Counterclaim Plaintiff, )  Vs. )  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.)	TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, )	
Plaintiffs, ) VS. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, a joint venture of the Hearst ) Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and DOES 1-20, inclusive )  Defendants.  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, Counterclaim Plaintiff, ) VS. )  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )  PLAINTIFF, TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.'S, ANSWERS TO LOCAL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES  PLAINTIFF, TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.'S, ANSWERS TO LOCAL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES  PLAINTIFF, TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.'S, ANSWERS TO LOCAL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES	INC., a South Carolina corporation; )	Civil Action No.2:06-CV-2195-CWH
vs. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, ) a joint venture of the Hearst ) Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC ) UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and ) DOES 1-20, inclusive )  Defendants. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, )  Counterclaim Plaintiff, ) vs. )  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	RICHARD C. DAVIS, an individual)	
vs. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, ) a joint venture of the Hearst ) Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC ) UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and ) DOES 1-20, inclusive )  Defendants. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, )  Counterclaim Plaintiff, ) vs. )  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	)	
vs. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, ) a joint venture of the Hearst ) Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC ) UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and ) DOES 1-20, inclusive )  Defendants. )  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, )  Counterclaim Plaintiff, ) vs. )  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	Plaintiffs, )	
A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, ) a joint venture of the Hearst ) Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC ) UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and DOES 1-20, inclusive ) Defendants. ) A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, ) Counterclaim Plaintiff, ) vs. ) TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.'S, ANSWERS TO LOCAL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES	, ,	
a joint venture of the Hearst Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and DOES 1-20, inclusive  Defendants.  Counterclaim Plaintiff, vs.  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS,  INC.'S, ANSWERS TO LOCAL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES	vs.	
a joint venture of the Hearst Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and DOES 1-20, inclusive  Defendants.  Counterclaim Plaintiff, vs.  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS,  INC.'S, ANSWERS TO LOCAL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES	)	
a joint venture of the Hearst Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and DOES 1-20, inclusive  Defendants.  Counterclaim Plaintiff, vs.  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS,  INC.'S, ANSWERS TO LOCAL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES	A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS,	PLAINTIFF, TRADEMARK PROPERTIES,
Corporation, ABC INC. and NBC UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and DOES 1-20, inclusive Defendants.  Defendants.  Counterclaim Plaintiff, Outside Defendants Defend		
UNIVERSAL; DEPARTURE FILMS) an entity of unknown origin; and DOES 1-20, inclusive  Defendants.  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS,  Counterclaim Plaintiff,  vs.  1  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS,  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1	,	
an entity of unknown origin; and DOES 1-20, inclusive  Defendants.  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS,  Counterclaim Plaintiff,  vs.  1  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS,  1  Defendants.  Defend	± '	
DOES 1-20, inclusive  Defendants.  Defendants.  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS,  Counterclaim Plaintiff,  vs.  1  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS,  )		
Defendants.  Defendants.  A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS,  Counterclaim Plaintiff,  vs.  1  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS,  1  Defendants.  1  Counterclaim Plaintiff,  1  Counterclaim Pl		
A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS, )  Counterclaim Plaintiff, )  vs. )  TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	)	
Counterclaim Plaintiff, ) vs. ) TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	Defendants.	
Counterclaim Plaintiff, ) vs. ) TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	)	
vs. ) TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	A&E TELEVISION NETWORKS,	
vs. ) TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	)	
TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	Counterclaim Plaintiff,	
TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.) and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )		
and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	vs.	
and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	)	
and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	)	
)	TRADEMARK PROPERTIES, INC.)	
Counterclaim Defendants. )	and RICHARD C. DAVIS, )	
Counterclaim Defendants. )	Ó	
)	Counterclaim Defendants. )	
<del></del> /	)	

(A). State the full name, address, and telephone number of all persons or legal entities who may have a subrogation interest in each claim and state the basis and extent of said interest.

## None

(B) As to each claim, state whether it should be tried jury or nonjury and why.

The Plaintiff has requested a jury trial on all claims as the Plaintiff is seeking

#### a money judgment.

- (C) State whether the party submitting these responses is a publicly owned company and separately identify:
  - (1) each publicly owned company of which is a parent, subsidiary, partner, or affiliate;
  - (2) each publicly owned company which owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares or other indicia of ownership of the party; and
  - (3) each publicly owned company in which the party owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares.

# The Plaintiff is not a publicly owned company

(D) State the basis for asserting the claim in the division in which it was filed (or the basis of any challenge to the appropriateness of the division).

The Defendants removed the case to the Charleston Division of the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina pursuant to 28 U.S.C §1332 (a)(1).

- (E) Is this action related in whole or part to any other matter filed in this District, whether civil or criminal? If so, provide:
- (1) a shore caption and the full case number of the related action;
- (2) an explanation of how the matter are related; and
- (3) a statement of the status of the related action. Counsel should disclose any cases which may be related regardless of whether they are still pending. Whether cases are related such that they should be assigned to a single judge will be determined by the Clerk of Court based on a determination of whether the cases: arise from the same or identical transactions, happenings, or events; involve the identical parties or property; or for any other reason would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard b different judges.

## The Plaintiff is not aware of any at this time.

(F) [Defendants only.] If the defendant is improperly identified, give the proper identification and state whether counsel will accept service of an amended summons and pleadings reflecting the correct identification.

#### Not applicable.

(G) [Defendants only.] If you contend that some other person or legal entity is, in whole or in part, liable to you or the party asserting a claim against you in this matter, identify such person or entity and describe th basis of said liability.

Not applicable.

CISA & DODDS, LLP

By: s/ Frank M. Cisa

Frank M. Cisa (Federal ID No. 138)

Cisa & Dodds, LLP

622 Johnnie Dodds Blvd. Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464

Phone: (843) 881-3700 Fax: (843) 881-2511

E-Mail: <u>frank@cisadodds.com</u>

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina

October 2, 2006

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, HEREBY CERTIFY, that on this 2nd day of October, 2006 I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such to the following:

Robert H. Jordan, Esquire 151 Meeting Street/ Sixth Floor P.O. Box 1806 (29402) Charleston, SC 29401-2239 robert.jordan@nelsonmullins.com Attorney for Defendants

Richard Ashby Farrier, Jr., Esquire 151 Meeting Street/Sixth Floor P.O. Box 1806 (29402) Charleston, SC 29401-2239 raf@nmrs.com

Jeremy Feigelson, Esquire Debevoise & Plimpton, LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022 jfeigels@debevoise.com

S. Zev Parnass, Esquire Debevoise & Plimpton, LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY 1002 szparnas@debevoise.com

s/ Frank M. Cisa

October 2, 2006 Charleston, SC