

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
3 CHARLESTON DIVISION

4
5 RIGHTHAVEN LLC, a Nevada limited-
6 liability company,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 DANA EISER, an individual,

10 Defendant.
11

Case No.: 2:10-cv-3075-RMG

12
13 **PLAINTIFF’S ANSWERS TO LOCAL
14 CIVIL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES**

15
16 In compliance with Local Civil Rule 26.01, Plaintiff, Righthaven LLC (“Righthaven”) submits the following answers to interrogatories for the Court’s consideration:

17 (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.

18
19
20 Answer: None

21
22 (B) As to each claim, state whether it should be tried jury or nonjury and why.

23
24 Answer: The claim of copyright infringement should be tried before a jury because random sampling of the Defendant’s peers to decide this issue will allow for a fair and just adjudication of facts relevant to this case. Additionally, requesting a jury trial preserves the legal right to said jury trial.
25
26
27
28

1
2 (C) State whether the party submitting these responses is a publicly owned company
3 and separately identify: (1) each publicly owned company of which it is a parent,
4 subsidiary, partner, or affiliate; (2) each publicly owned company which owns ten
5 percent or more of the outstanding shares or other indicia of ownership of the
6 party; and (3) each publicly owned company in which the party owns ten percent
7 or more of the outstanding shares.
8

9 Answer: Righthaven LLC, is a **privately held** Nevada limited-liability company.

- 10 1. Righthaven is not a publically held company.
11 2. No **public entity** owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares
12 or other indicia of ownership in Righthaven.
13 3. No **public entity** owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares
14 of Righthaven.
15

16 (D) State the basis for asserting the claim in the division in which it was filed (or the
17 basis of any challenge to the appropriateness of the division). See Local Civil
18 Rule 3.01.
19

20 Answer: Venue is appropriate in the Charleston Division because (i) on
21 information and belief, Defendant resides in Summerville, South Carolina; and
22 (ii) on information and belief, a substantial part of the events giving rise to the
23 copyright infringement claim at issue took place in Summerville, South Carolina.
24

25 (E) Is this action related in whole or in part to any other matter filed in this District,
26 whether civil or criminal? If so, provide: (1) a short caption and the full case
27 number of the related action; (2) an explanation of how the matters are related;
28 and (3) a statement of the status of the related action. Counsel should disclose any

1 cases which may be related regardless of whether they are still pending. Whether
2 cases are related such that they should be assigned to a single judge will be
3 determined by the Clerk of Court based on a determination of whether the cases:
4 arise from the same or identical transactions, happenings, or events; involve the
5 identical parties or property; or for any other reason would entail substantial
6 duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

7
8 Answer: No civil or criminal matters related to this case have been filed in the
9 District.

10
11 CHARLESTON, SC

12 December 2, 2010

13
14 FENNO LAW FIRM, LLC

15 By: s/Edward T. Fenno

16 Edward T. Fenno (Bar No.
7498)

17 Fenno Law Firm, LLC
18 171 Church Street, Suite 160
19 Charleston, SC 29401
20 Telephone: 843-720-3747
21 Fax: 843-577-0460
22 efenno@fennolaw.com

23
24
25
26
27
28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Righthaven LLC*