

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION

|                                 |   |                         |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| UMG RECORDINGS, INC., et al.    | § |                         |
|                                 | § |                         |
| Plaintiffs,                     | § |                         |
|                                 | § | <b>Civil Action No.</b> |
| v.                              | § | <b>4-06CV-860--Y</b>    |
|                                 | § |                         |
| BRENTON JAMES GREUBEL,          | § |                         |
| ADAM GREUBEL, NICHOLAS GREUBEL, | § |                         |
| and E.G., A Minor               | § | <b>JUDGE MEANS</b>      |
|                                 | § |                         |
| Defendants.                     | § |                         |

**ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT  
FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT**

Adam Greubel (“Adam Greubel”), by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby answers the First Amended Complaint for Copyright Infringement (“Amended Complaint”) filed by Plaintiffs Arista Records LLC, Capitol Records Inc., UMG Recordings, Inc., Elektra Entertainment Group Inc., and Warner Bros. Records, Inc. (“Plaintiffs”) as follows:

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1. This is a civil action seeking damages and injunctive relief for copyright infringement under the copyright laws of the United States (17 U.S.C. §101 et seq.).

**ANSWER:** Adam Greubel admits that Plaintiffs have alleged violation of 17 U.S.C. § 101 et seq. and that Plaintiffs seek damages and injunctive relief. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel denies all remaining allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint.

2. This Court has jurisdiction under 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*; 28 U.S.C. §1331 (federal question); and 28 U.S.C. §1338(a) (copyright).

**ANSWER:** As the allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel denies all remaining allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants, and venue in this District is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a), in that the Defendants reside in this District, and the acts of infringement complained of herein occurred in this District.

**ANSWER:** Adam Greubel admits that he resides in this District. As to the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint that call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel denies all remaining allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

4. Plaintiff UMG Recordings, Inc. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in the State of California.

**ANSWER:** Adam Greubel is without information or knowledge sufficient to

form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

5. Plaintiff Capitol Records, Inc. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in the State of New York.

**ANSWER:** Adam Greubel is without information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

6. Plaintiff Elektra Entertainment Group, Inc. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in the State of New York.

**ANSWER:** Adam Greubel is without information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

7. Plaintiff Arista Records, LLC is a limited liability company duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in the State of New York.

**ANSWER:** Adam Greubel is without information or knowledge sufficient to

form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

8. Plaintiff Warner Bros. Records, Inc. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in the State of California.

**ANSWER:** Adam Greubel is without information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

9. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants are individuals residing in this District.

**ANSWER:** As to Plaintiffs' belief, Adam Greubel is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of what Plaintiffs believe in Paragraph 9 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, and therefore denies the allegations concerning Plaintiffs' belief in Paragraph 9 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. Adam Greubel admits that he resides in this District. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 9 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel denies all remaining allegations in Paragraph 9 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

**COUNT I  
INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHTS**

10. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by this reference each and every allegation contained in each paragraph above.

**ANSWER:** Adam Greubel hereby incorporates his responses to Paragraphs 1 through 9 above as if fully set forth herein.

11. Plaintiffs are, and at all relevant time have been, the copyright owners or licensees of exclusive rights under United States copyright with respect to certain copyrighted sound recordings (the "Copyrighted Recordings"). The Copyrighted Recordings include but are not limited to each of the copyrighted sound recordings identified in Exhibit A attached hereto, each of which is the subject of a valid Certificate of Copyright Registration issued by the Register of Copyrights. In addition to the sound recordings listed on Exhibit A, Copyrighted Recordings also include certain of the sound recordings listed on Exhibit B which are owned by or exclusively licensed to one or more of the Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs' affiliate record labels, and which are subject to valid Certificates of Copyright Registration issued by the Register of Copyrights.

**ANSWER:** As to the allegations in Paragraph 11 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint that call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 11 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel is without information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of the Plaintiffs'

Amended Complaint.

12. Among the exclusive rights granted to each Plaintiff under the Copyright Act are the exclusive rights to reproduce the Copyrighted Recordings and to distribute the Copyrighted Recordings to the public.

**ANSWER:** As to the allegations in Paragraph 12 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint that call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 12 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel is without information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants, without the permission or consent of Plaintiffs, have used, and continue to use, an online media distribution system to download the Copyrighted Recordings, to distribute the Copyrighted Recordings to the public, and/or to make the Copyrighted Recordings available for distribution to others. In doing so, Defendants have violated Plaintiffs' exclusive rights of reproduction and distribution. Defendants' action constitute infringement of Plaintiffs' copyrights and exclusive rights under copyright.

**ANSWER:** As to Plaintiffs' belief, Adam Greubel is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of what Plaintiffs believe in

Paragraph 13 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, and therefore denies the allegations concerning Plaintiffs' belief in Paragraph 13 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. As to the allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint that call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel denies all remaining allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

14. Plaintiffs have placed proper notices of copyright pursuant to 17 U.S.C § 401 on each respective album cover of each of the sound recordings identified in Exhibit A. These notices of copyright appeared on published copies of each of the sound recordings identified in Exhibit A. These published copies were widely available, and each of the published copies of the sound recording identified in Exhibit A was accessible by Defendant.

**ANSWER:** As to the allegations in Paragraph 14 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint that call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 14 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel is without information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the foregoing acts of infringement have been willful and intentional, in disregard of and with indifference to the rights of Plaintiffs.

**ANSWER:** As to Plaintiffs' belief, Adam Greubel is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of what Plaintiffs believe in Paragraph 15 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, and therefore denies the allegations concerning Plaintiffs' belief in Paragraph 15 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. As to the allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint that call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel denies all remaining allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

16. As a result of Defendants' infringement of Plaintiffs' copyrights and exclusive rights under copyright, Plaintiffs are entitled to statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c) for Defendant's infringement of each of the Copyrighted Recordings. Plaintiffs further are entitled to their attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.

**ANSWER:** As to the allegations in Paragraph 16 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint that call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 16 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 16 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

17. The conduct of Defendants is causing and, unless enjoined and restrained by this Court, will continue to cause Plaintiffs great and irreparable injury that cannot fully be compensated or measured in money. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §§ 502 and 503, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from further infringing Plaintiffs' copyrights, and ordering Defendants to destroy all copies of sound recordings made in violation of Plaintiffs' exclusive rights.

**ANSWER:** As to the allegations in Paragraph 17 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint that call for legal conclusions, Adam Greubel lacks sufficient knowledge or expertise to respond to such legal conclusions and, therefore, denies them. As to all remaining allegations in Paragraph 17 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Adam Greubel denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. Adam Greubel further denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.

For these reasons, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. For an injunction providing:

“Defendants shall be and hereby are enjoined from directly or indirectly infringing Plaintiffs' rights under federal or state law in the Copyrighted Recordings and any sound recording, whether now in existence or later created, that is owned or controlled by Plaintiffs (or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate record label of Plaintiffs) (“Plaintiffs' Recordings”), including without limitation by using the Internet or any online media distribution system to reproduce (*i.e.*, download) any of Plaintiffs' Recordings, to distribute (*i.e.*, upload) any of Plaintiffs' Recordings, or to make any of Plaintiffs' Recordings available for distribution to the public, except pursuant to a lawful license or with the express authority of Plaintiffs. Defendants also shall destroy all copies of Plaintiffs' Recordings that Defendants have downloaded onto any computer hard drive or server without Plaintiffs' authorization and shall destroy all copies of those downloaded recordings transferred onto any physical medium or device in Defendants' possession, custody, or control.”

2. For statutory damages for each infringement of each Copyrighted Recording pursuant to 17 U.S.C. Section 504.
3. For Plaintiffs' costs in this action.
4. For Plaintiffs' reasonable attorneys' fees incurred herein.
5. For such other and further relief, either at law or in equity, general or special, to which they may be entitled.

Adam Greubel denies any and all allegations contained in Plaintiffs' Request for Relief and specifically denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief stated therein.

**AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

ADAM GREUBEL asserts the following affirmative defenses:

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

**JOINT and SEVERAL LIABILITY/  
SATISFACTION OF ANY LIABILITY**

1. Adam Greubel asserts as an affirmative defense that the Plaintiffs have been fully satisfied for any liability and damages arising from the alleged conduct of Adam Greubel through their settlement with Sharman Networks and the application of joint and several liability to the claims for copyright infringement brought against Adam Greubel and Sharman Networks.
2. Plaintiffs, by and through themselves, their representatives, and/or their agents, filed suit against Sharman Networks Ltd. and other related parties (collectively, "Sharman Networks") relating to the distribution and sale of the Peer-to-Peer ("P2P") platform, product, and network KaZaA (collectively, "KaZaA"), an online media distribution system.
3. Plaintiffs alleged that individuals used KaZaA ("KaZaA Users") to download and upload (or share) Plaintiffs' copyrighted sound recordings without their permission or license.

4. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs alleged that Sharman Networks was liable to Plaintiffs for copyright infringement arising from the alleged infringing conduct of KaZaA Users.

5. Plaintiffs, by and through themselves, their representatives, and/or their agents, have entered into a settlement agreement with Sharman Networks in which Sharman Networks shall, upon information and belief, remit a settlement payment of \$115,000,000.

6. In this action, Plaintiffs have alleged that Adam Greubel used an online media distribution system to infringe the copyrights of their copyrighted sound recordings and seek recovery of damages for alleged damages arising therefrom.

7. Although Adam Greubel denies the factual and legal allegations in Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, any recovery from Adam Greubel for alleged copyright infringement arising from the use of KaZaA would be duplicative of the damages obtained from Sharman Networks.

8. Although Adam Greubel denies the factual and legal allegations in Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, defendants who have joined in or contributed to particular infringements of particular copyrighted works (such as those identified in Exhibit A and B of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint) are jointly and severally liable for such copyright infringement. 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); Fitzgerald Publishing Co. v. Baylor Publ. Co., 807 F.2d 1110 (2d Cir. 1986).

9. Through the settlement with Sharman Networks, the Plaintiffs have elected to accept a settlement that fully compensates them for the injuries allegedly caused by Adam Greubel, among others.

10. The settlement with Sharman Networks bars Plaintiffs' ability to recover any damages from Adam Greubel.

11. The settlement with Sharman Networks fully satisfies any liability arising from the alleged conduct of David Brenton.

12. Plaintiffs have received satisfaction for any alleged injuries caused by Defendant David Brenton through the settlement with Sharman Networks.

13. For these reasons, this matter should be dismissed with prejudice.

## **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

### **UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATUTORY DAMAGES AS APPLIED**

14. Adam Greubel further asserts the affirmative defense that the statutory damages sought by Plaintiffs are unconstitutionally excessive as applied.

15. Plaintiffs seek statutory damages of \$750.00 per song for the songs set forth in Exhibit A of their Amended Complaint.

16. The total cost of licensing the songs would have been 99 cents per song.

17. The total revenue to Plaintiffs from the licensing of the songs would have been even less – approximately 70 cents per song.

18. Plaintiffs seek statutory damages equivalent to 1,071 times the amount of their actual damages.

19. As courts have recognized statutory damages to be punitive in nature, On Davis v. The Gap, Inc., 246 F.3d 152, 172 (2d Cir. 2001), statutory damages must necessarily have a reasonable relationship to the Plaintiffs' alleged actual damages caused by the alleged infringement (not some ephemeral speculation on the cause of lost CD sales). See Peer Int'l Corp. v. Luna Records, Inc., 887 F.Supp. 560, 568 (S.D.N.Y 1995); RSO Records, Inc. v. Peri,

596 F.Supp. 849, 826 (S.D.N.Y. 1984); Dae Han Video Production, Inc. v. Chun, 1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18496, \*22 (D. Va. June 18, 1990).

20. As the Supreme Court has held, due process will prohibit an award of statutory damages meeting or exceeding a proportion of ten times or more actual damages. See State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Campbell, 538 U.S. 408, 123 S. Ct. 1513, 1524 (2003); see also Parker v. Time Warner Entertainment Co., 331 F. 3d 13, 22 (2nd Cir. 2003); In Re Napster, Inc., 2005 WL 1287611, 77 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1833, 2005 Copr. L. Dec. P 29,020 (N.D. Cal. 2005). In fact, an award of statutory damages at four times actual damages “might be close to the line of constitutional impropriety.” Id.

21. Pursuant to applicable law concerning the constitutionality of statutory damages, the Plaintiffs’ recovery, if any, must necessarily have a reasonable relationship to the Plaintiffs’ alleged actual damages caused by the alleged infringement.

22. The ratio of Plaintiffs’ recovery, if any, to its actual damages must be limited such that the ratio and the recovery comport with due process.

23. At the minimum, the Plaintiffs’ recovery, if any, must not exceed nine (9) times the amount of their actual damages to so comport with due process and constitutional propriety.

24. Adam Greubel contends that the Plaintiffs’ recovery, if any, must not exceed four (4) times the amount of their actual damages to so comport with due process and constitutional propriety.

25. For these reasons, this Court must limit Plaintiffs’ recovery, if any, to a ratio that comports with due process and constitutional propriety.

**THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

**ESTOPPEL**

26. Plaintiffs are barred from maintaining their claims on obtaining the relief sought in the case at bar under the doctrine of estoppel.

**FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

**STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS**

27. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part by the appropriate statute of limitations.

**FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

**LACHES**

28. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of laches.

**SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

**DOCTRINE OF WAIVER**

29. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of waiver.

**SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

**FAILURE TO MITIGATE**

30. Plaintiffs failed to mitigate their damages, if any.

**EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

31. Adam Greubel did not intentionally or otherwise deprive or cause Plaintiffs to be deprived of any of their rights.

**NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

32. Adam Greubel did not violate or cause the violation of any of Plaintiffs' rights.

**TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

33. Adam Greubel specifically denies all allegations, if any, and conclusions of law, if any, to which he did not specifically reply in the Answer to the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

34. Adam Greubel reserves his right to plead additional defenses that may be identified during investigation and/or course of discovery.

**ADAM GREUBEL'S DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Adam Greubel asserts his rights under the Seventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and demands, in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38, a trial by jury on all issues.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, ADAM GREUBEL respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' claims against Adam Greubel; sustaining Adam Greubel's affirmative defenses; and granting Adam Greubel such other and further relief, in law and in equity, to which Adam Greubel may show himself to be entitled.

Dated: Chicago, Illinois  
August 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,  
ADAM GREUBEL

By: s/Charles Lee Mudd Jr.  
CHARLES LEE MUDD JR.

Illinois State Bar No. 6257957  
Mudd Law Offices  
3114 West Irving Park Road, Suite 1W  
Chicago, Illinois 60618  
(773) 588-5410/ (773) 588-5440 facsimile

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Charles Lee Mudd, Jr., do hereby certify that service of this ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT was accomplished pursuant to Electronic Case Filing as to ECF Filing Users and shall be served upon other parties listed below by sending said documents via postage pre-paid U.S. mail on the 13th day of August 2007:

All Parties are represented by counsel who are ECF Filing Users.

s/Charles Lee Mudd Jr.  
Charles Lee Mudd Jr.

Mudd Law Offices  
3114 West Irving Park Road, Suite 1W  
Chicago, Illinois 60618  
773.588.5410  
773.588.5440 Facsimile  
Illinois State Bar No. 6257957