INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY DEFENDANT TWIN GALAXIES, LLC

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

anticipated that further discovery, independent investigation, legal research and analysis will supply additional facts and add meaning to known facts, as well as establish entirely new factual conclusions and legal contentions, all of which may lead to substantial additions to, changes in and variations from the responses set forth herein.

These responses, while based on diligent inquiry and investigation by Responding Party, reflect only the current state of Responding Party's knowledge, understanding, and belief, based upon the information reasonably available to him at this time. As this action proceeds, and further investigation and discovery are conducted, additional or different facts and information could be revealed to Responding Party. Moreover, Responding Party anticipates that Propounding Party may make legal or factual contentions presently unknown to and unforeseen by Responding Party which may require Responding Party to adduce further facts in rebuttal to such contentions. Consequently, Responding Party may not yet have knowledge and may not fully understand the significance of information potentially pertinent to these responses. Accordingly, these responses are provided without prejudice to Responding Party's right to rely upon and use any information that he subsequently discovers, or that was omitted from these responses as a result of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. Without in any way obligating himself to do so, Responding Party reserves the right to modify, supplement, revise, or amend these responses, and to correct any inadvertent errors or omissions which may be contained herein, in light of the information that Responding Party may subsequently obtain or discover.

Nothing in this response should be construed as an admission by Responding Party with respect to the admissibility or relevance of any fact or document, or of the truth or accuracy of any characterization or statement of any kind contained in Propounding Party's interrogatories.

Each of the following responses is made solely for the purpose of this action. Each response is subject to all objections as to relevance, materiality, and admissibility, and to any and all objections on any ground that would require exclusion of any response if it were introduced in court. All objections and grounds are expressly reserved and may be interposed at the time of trial, hearing, or otherwise. Furthermore, each of the objections contained herein is incorporated by reference as though fully set forth in each response.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

The following objections and responses are made without prejudice to Responding Party's right to produce at trial, or otherwise, evidence regarding any subsequently discovered information. Responding Party accordingly reserves the right to modify and amend any and all responses herein as research is completed and contentions are made.

Nothing contained herein is to be construed as a waiver of any attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or doctrine. To the extent any interrogatory may be construed as calling for disclosure of information protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other privilege or protection, a continuing objection to each and every such interrogatory is hereby interposed.

#### **RESPONSES TO FORM INTERROGATORIES**

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 1.1:**

State the name, **ADDRESS**, telephone number, and relationship to you of each **PERSON** who prepared or assisted in the preparation of the responses to these interrogatories. (Do not identify anyone who simply typed or reproduced the responses.)

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 1.1:**

Anthony J. Ellrod, Esq. Linna T. Loangkote, Esq., and Billy Mitchell IV, Manning & Kass, Ellrod, Ramirez, Trester, LLP, 801 South Figueroa Street, 15th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90017, (213) 624-6900.

#### FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.1:

State:

- (a) your name;
- (b) every name you have used in the past; and
- 23 (c) the dates you used each name.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.1:**

- (a) William James Mitchell, III;
  - (b) William James Mitchell, III; and
- (c) Since birth to present.

1	FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.2:		
2	State the date and place of your birth.		
3	RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.2:		
4	July 16	5, 1965, in Holyoke, Massachusetts.	
5	FORM INTE	RROGATORY NO. 2.5:	
6	State:		
7	(a)	your present residence ADDRESS;	
8	(b)	your residence ADDRESSES for the past five years; and	
9	(c)	the dates you lived at each <b>ADDRESS</b> .	
10	RESPONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.5:	
11	Respon	nding Party objects to this interrogatory on the basis of privacy protected by the U.S.	
12	and California constitutions as Responding Party is a public figure.		
13	Subjec	t to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds:	
14	Responding P	arty may be contacted through his counsel of record.	
15	FORM INTE	RROGATORY NO. 2.6:	
16	State:		
17	(a)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of your present employer or place of	
18	self-employme	ent; and	
19	(b)	the name, ADDRESS, dates of employment, job title, and nature of work for each	
20	employer or so	elf-employment you have had from five years before the INCIDENT until today.	
21	RESPONSE '	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.6:	
22	(a)	Rickey's World Famous Hot Sauce,	
23		4799 Hollywood Blvd, Hollywood, Florida, 33021	
24		(954)-829-9464.	
25	(b)	Rickey's World Famous Hot Sauce,	
26		Founder and President.	
27	FORM INTE	RROGATORY NO. 2.7:	
28	State:		
	4869-3040-3109.1	4	

PLAINTIFF WILLIAM JAMES MITCHELL'S RESPONSE TO FIRST SET OF FORM INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY DEFENDANT TWIN GALAXIES, LLC

INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY DEFENDANT TWIN GALAXIES, LLC

	LLP	
	STER	
ASS	[RES	
3	3Z, ]	r Law
NINGO	MIRE	TORNETS A
AN	$R_{A}$	₹ 
Σ	OD,	
	LR	

(b) a description of your duties.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.11:**

No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.12:**

At the time of the **INCIDENT** did you or any other person have any physical, emotional, or mental disability or condition that may have contributed to the occurrence of the **INCIDENT**? If so, for each person state;

- (a) the name, **ADDRESS**, and telephone number;
- (b) the nature of the disability or condition; and
- (c) the manner in which the disability or condition contributed to the occurrence of the INCIDENT.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.12:**

Insofar as the responding party is aware, neither he nor any other person had any physical, emotional, or mental disability or condition that contributed to the occurrence of the incident.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.13:**

Within 24 hours before the **INCIDENT** did you or any person involved in the **INCIDENT** use or take any of the following substances: alcoholic beverage, marijuana, or other drug or medication of any kind (prescription or not)? If so, for each person state:

- (a) the name, **ADDRESS**, and telephone number;
- the nature or description of each substance; (b)
- (c) the quantity of each substance used or taken;
- the date and time of day when each substance was used or taken; (d)
- the **ADDRESS** where each substance was used or taken; (e)
- (f) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each person who was present when each substance was used or taken; and
- (g) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of any HEALTH CARE **PROVIDER** who prescribed or furnished the substance and the condition for which it was prescribed or furnished.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 2.13:**

Insofar as the responding party is aware, neither he nor any other person involved in the incident used or took any of the following substances within 24 hours of the incident: alcoholic beverage, marijuana, or other drug or medication of any kind.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.1:**

Do you attribute any physical, mental, or emotional injuries to the **INCIDENT**? (If your answer is "no," do not answer interrogatories 6.2 through 6.7).

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.1:**

Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

28

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.2:**

Identify each injury you attribute to the **INCIDENT** and the area of your body affected.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.2:**

Responding party attributes atrial fibrillation and an inguinal hernia as injuries from the incident.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.4:**

Did you receive any consultation or examination (except from expert witnesses covered by Code of Civil Procedure section 2034.210-2034.310) or treatment from a **HEALTH CARE** 

**PROVIDER** for any injury you attribute to the **INCIDENT**? If so, for each **HEALTH CARE** 

#### **PROVIDER** state:

- (a) the name, **ADDRESS**, and telephone number;
- (b) the type of consultation, examination, or treatment provided;
- (c) the dates you received consultation, examination, or treatment; and
- (d) the charges to date.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.4:**

- 25 | Bassam Sayegh
- 26 | 224 Chimney Corner Lane, Jupiter, FL 33458
- 27 || (561) 743-7766

Initial Consultation for surgery of hernia.

INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY DEFENDANT TWIN GALAXIES, LLC

1	(e)	the cost to date.
2	RESPONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.5:
3	(a)	Xarelto, 20mg,
4	(b)	Brielle Cohen, PA
5	(c)	6/10/22
6	(d)	6/10/22 to Present
7	(e)	\$90.00
8	FORM INT	ERROGATORY NO. 6.6:
9	Are the	here any other medical services necessitated by the injuries that you attribute to the
10	INCIDENT	that were not previously listed (for example, ambulance, nursing, prosthetics)? If so,
11	for each serv	ice state:
12	(a)	the nature;
13	(b)	the date;
14	(c)	the cost; and
15	(d)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each provider.
16	RESPONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.6:
17	At thi	is time, Responding Party cannot identify any other medical services necessitated by
18	the injuries a	ttributed to the incident.
19	FORM INT	ERROGATORY NO. 6.7:
20	Has a	my <b>HEALTH CARE PROVIDER</b> advised that you may require future or additional
21	treatment for	any injuries that you attribute to the INCIDENT? If so, for each injury state:
22	(a)	the name and ADDRESS of each HEALTH CARE PROVIDER;
23	(b)	the complaints for which the treatment was advised; and
24	(c)	the nature, duration, and estimated cost of the treatment.
25	RESPONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 6.7:
26	At thi	is time, Responding Party's health care providers have not, advised that he may
27	require future	e or additional treatment for any injuries that he attributes to the incident.
28		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

4869-3040-3109.1

#### FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 7.1:

Do you attribute any loss of or damage to a vehicle or other property to the **INCIDENT**? If so, for each item of property:

- (a) describe the property;
- (b) describe the nature and location of the damage to the property;
- (c) state the amount of damage you are claiming for each item of property and how the amount was calculated; and
- (d) if the property was sold, state the name, **ADDRESS**, and telephone number of the seller, the date of sale, and the sale price.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 7.1:**

No.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 7.2:**

Has a written estimate or evaluation been made for any item of property referred to in your answer to the preceding interrogatory? If so, for each estimate or evaluation state:

- (a) the name, **ADDRESS**, and telephone number of the **PERSON** who prepared it and the date prepared;
- (b) the name, **ADDRESS**, and telephone number of each **PERSON** who has a copy of it; and
  - (c) the amount of damage stated.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 7.2:**

N/A

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 7.3:**

Has any item of property referred to in your answer to interrogatory 7.1 been repaired? If so, for each item state:

- (a) the date repaired;
- (b) a description of the repair;
- (c) the repair cost;
  - (d) the name, **ADDRESS**, and telephone number of the **PERSON** who repaired it;

	(e)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the PERSON who paid for the
repair.		
RESP	ONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 7.3:
	N/A	

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.1:**

Do you attribute any loss of income or earning capacity to the **INCIDENT**? (If your answer is "no," do not answer interrogatories 8.2 through 8.8).

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.1:**

Yes; Responding Party attributes loss of income and earning capacity to the incident in the form of lost employment for public appearances at videogame conventions, videogame festivals, and movie appearances. Additionally, Responding Party has lost revenue to his primary business, Rickey's World Famous Hot Sauce.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.2:**

State:

- (a) the nature of your work;
- (b) your job title at the time of the **INCIDENT**; and
- (c) the date your employment began.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.2:**

- (a) Responding is the President of Rickey's World Famous Hot Sauces, located at 4799 Hollywood Blvd, Hollywood, Florida 33021. As the company's founder, he is in charge of forming business strategy, day-to-day decision-making, and sales for the company. Responding party also works as a videogame and movie personality. Responding party appears at videogame conventions, videogame festivals, and in movies for income.
- (b) President of Rickey's World Famous Sauces and videogame and movie personality.
- (c) Responding Party has been President of Rickey's World Famous Sauces since 1991, and has been a videogame and movie personality since 1983.

	RESTER 11P	THE PART OF THE		
E	HITROD, KAMIREZ. II	Company of the	- ATTORNETS AT LAW -	
	TIROD.	(CONTRACTOR		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

FORM INTERROGATORY	NO.	8.3
--------------------	-----	-----

State the last date before the **INCIDENT** that you worked for compensation.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.3:**

April 11, 2018.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.4:**

State your monthly income at the time of the **INCIDENT** and how the amount was calculated.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.4:**

Responding Party receives variable income in the form of appearance fees for public appearances at videogame conventions, videogame festivals, and participation in film productions. Responding Party also receives a variable income from his business, Rickey's World Famous Hot Sauce, as his monthly revenue relies on the total sales volume for each month. With consideration for his variable incomes, Responding Party estimates his monthly income at an average of \$16,500.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.5:**

State the date you returned to work at each place of employment following the

#### 17 INCIDENT.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.5:**

April 15, 2018.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.6:**

State the dates you did not work and for which you lost income as a result of the

#### 22 INCIDENT.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.6:**

None, as Responding Party is not a salaried or wage worker.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.7:**

State the total income you have lost to date as a result of the **INCIDENT** and how the amount was calculated.

7

8

9

1

2

## 101112

13

14

#### 15 16

17

18 19

### 2021

22

2324

25

27

26

28

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.7:**

Responding Party lost \$926,236 as a result of the incident. Responding Party arrives at this number by totaling the amount of lost income in public appearances from videogame conventions, videogame festivals, and movie appearances to the amount of lost income to his business, Rickey's World Famous Hot Sauce.

Responding Party calculates the amount of lost income in public appearances from the videogame conventions, videogame festivals, and movie opportunities by totaling the average number of yearly public appearances lost as a result of the incident. Responding party calculates the amount of lost income to his business, Rickey's World Famous Hot Sauce, by demonstrating the drop in revenue and loss of customers immediately after the incident. Rickey's World Famous Hot Sauce averaged \$800,216 in revenue from 2013 to 2017. In 2017, it generated \$796,068. As a result of the Twin Galaxies statements, the company revenue dropped to \$410,267 in 2018. In 2019, the revenue dropped to \$364,435.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.8:**

Will you lose income in the future as a result of the **INCIDENT**? If so, state:

- (a) the facts upon which you base this contention;
- (b) an estimate of the amount;
- (c) an estimate of how long you will be unable to work; and
- (d) how the claim for future income is calculated.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 8.8:**

Responding will lose income in the future as a result of the incident:

- (a) Responding Party bases its contention for future losses on the fact that the damage to his reputation resulting from the false and malicious statements by Twin Galaxies will restrict his ability in perpetuity to receive employment at videogame conventions, videogame festivals, and movie appearances.
- (b) Responding Party will lose income in the future as a result of the incident in the form of lost videogame conventions, videogame festivals, and movie appearances because the defamatory statements by Twin Galaxies will discourage videogame

26

27

28

1		conventions, videogame festivals, and movie producers from employing
2		Responding Party. Responding Party has already experienced this effect from April
3		12, 2018, to the date of this response to form interrogatories.
4	(c)	Responding Party believes that he will be unable to work without restraint until
5		Twin Galaxies admits that the statement from April 12, 2018, was false.
6	(d)	Responding Party is unable, at this time, to accurately calculate the magnitude of
7		the future income lost as a result of the incident. However, Responding Party
8		estimates that his loss of future income equals \$250,000.
9	FORM INTE	ERROGATORY NO. 9.1:
10	Are th	ere any other damages that you attribute to the INCIDENT? If so, for each item of
11	damage state:	
12	(a)	the nature;
13	(b)	the date it occurred;
14	(c)	the amount; and
15	(d)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each PERSON to whom an
16	obligation wa	s incurred.
17	RESPONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 9.1:
18	No.	
19	FORM INTE	ERROGATORY NO. 9.2:
20	Do an	y <b>DOCUMENTS</b> support the existence or amount of any item of damages claimed
21	in interrogato	ry 9.1? If so, describe each document and state the name, <b>ADDRESS</b> , and telephone
22	number of the	PERSON who has each DOCUMENT.
23	RESPONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 9.2:
24	N/A	

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 10.1**:

At any time before the **INCIDENT** did you have complaints or injuries that involved the same part of your body claimed to have been injured in the **INCIDENT**? If so, for each state:

(a) a description of the complaint or injury;

1	(b) the dates it began and ended; and		
2	(c) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each HEALTH CARE		
3	PROVIDER whom you consulted or who examined or treated you.		
4	RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 10.1:		
5	No.		
6	FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 10.2:		
7	List all physical, mental, and emotional disabilities you had immediately before the		
8	<b>INCIDENT</b> . (You may omit mental or emotional disabilities unless you attribute any mental or		
9	emotional injury to the INCIDENT.)		
10	RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 10.2:		
11	Responding Party did not have any physical, mental, or emotional disabilities immediately		
12	before the incident.		
13	FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 10.3:		
14	At any time after the INCIDENT, did you sustain injuries of the kind for which you are		
15	now claiming damages? If so, for each incident giving rise to an injury state:		
16	(a) the date and the place it occurred;		
17	(b) the name, <b>ADDRESS</b> , and telephone number of any other <b>PERSON</b> involved;		
18	(c) the nature of any injuries you sustained;		
19	(d) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each HEALTH CARE		
20	PROVIDER who you consulted or who examined or treated you; and		
21	(e) the nature of the treatment and its duration.		
22	RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 10.3:		
23	No.		
24	FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 11.1:		
25	Except for this action, in the past 10 years have you filed an action or made a written claim		
26	or demand for compensation for your personal injuries? If so, for each action, claim, or demand		
27	state:		
28	(a) the date, time, and place and location (closest street <b>ADDRESS</b> or intersection) of		

28

(a)

the **INCIDENT**; 4869-3040-3109.1

2	(b)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each PERSON against whom the
3	claim or dema	and was made or the action filed;
4	(c)	the court, names of the parties, and case number of any action filed;
5	(d)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of any attorney representing you;
6	(e)	whether the claim or action has been resolved or is pending; and
7	(f)	a description of the injury.
8	RESPONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 11.1:
9	No.	
10	FORM INTE	CRROGATORY NO. 11.2:
11	In the	past 10 years have you made a written claim or demand for workers' compensation
12	benefits? If so	, for each claim or demand state:
13	(a)	the date, time, and place of the INCIDENT giving rise to the claim;
14	(b)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of your employer at the time of the
15	injury;	
16	(c)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurer
17	and the claim	number;
18	(d)	the period of time during which you received workers' compensation benefits;
19	(e)	a description of the injury;
20	(f)	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of any HEALTH CARE
21	PROVIDER	who provided services; and
22	(g)	the case number at the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.
23	RESPONSE	TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 11.2:
24	No.	
25	FORM INTE	CRROGATORY NO. 12.1:
26	State t	he name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each individual:

the INCIDENT giving rise to the action, claim, or demand;

who witnessed the INCIDENT or the events occurring immediately before or after

2

(b)

(c)

4869-3040-3109.1

3	scene; and	
4	(d) w	tho YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF claim has knowledge
5	of the INCIDEN	NT (except for expert witnesses covered by Code of Civil Procedure section 2034).
6	RESPONSE TO	O FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.1:
7	(a) R	esponding Party, Walter Day, Billy Mitchell IV, Jace Hall, Carlos Pineiro, and
8	Steven Kleisath;	
9	(b) R	esponding Party, Walter Day, Jace Hall, Carlos Pineiro, and Steven Kleisath;
0	(c) R	esponding Party, Walter Day, Billy Mitchell IV, Jace Hall, Carlos Pineiro, and
1	Steven Kleisath;	
2	(d) R	esponding Party, Walter Day, Billy Mitchell IV, Jace Hall, Carlos Pineiro, and
3	Steven Kleisath.	
4	FORM INTERI	ROGATORY NO. 12.2:
5	Have <b>YO</b>	OU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF interviewed any individual
6	concerning the I	NCIDENT? If so, for each individual state:
7	(a) th	ne name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the individual interviewed;
8	(b) th	ne date of the interview; and
9	(c) th	ne name, ADDRESS and telephone number of the PERSON who conducted the
20	interview.	
21	RESPONSE TO	O FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.2:
22	No.	
23	FORM INTERI	ROGATORY NO. 12.3:
24	Have <b>YO</b>	OU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF obtained a written or
25	recorded stateme	ent from any individual concerning the INCIDENT? If so, for each statement
26	state:	
27	(a) th	ne name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the individual from whom the
28	statement was ob	otained;

who made any statement at the scene of the **INCIDENT**;

who heard any statements made about the INCIDENT by any individual at the

1	(b) 1	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the individual who obtained the
2	statement;	
3	(c) 1	the date the statement was obtained; and
4	(d) 1	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each PERSON who has the
5	original stateme	ent or a copy.
6	RESPONSE T	O FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.3:
7	No.	
8	FORM INTER	RROGATORY NO. 12.4:
9	Do YO	U OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF know of any photographs,
10	films, or videot	apes depicting any place, object, or individual concerning the INCIDENT or
11	plaintiff's injuri	es? If so, state:
12	(a) 1	the number of photographs or feet of film or videotape;
13	(b) 1	the places, objects, or persons photographed, filmed, or videotaped;
14	(c) 1	the date the photographs, films, or videotapes were taken;
15	(d) 1	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the individual taking the
16	photographs, fi	lms, or videotapes; and
17	(e) 1	the name, ADDRESS and telephone number of each PERSON who has the
18	original or a co	py of the photographs, films, or videotapes.
19	RESPONSE T	O FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.4:
20	No.	
21	FORM INTER	RROGATORY NO. 12.5:
22	Do YO	U OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF know of any diagram,
23	reproduction, or	r model of any place or thing (except for items developed by expert witnesses
24	covered by Coc	de of Civil Procedure section 2034.210-2034.310) concerning the INCIDENT? If
25	so, for each iter	m state:
26	(a) 1	the type (i.e., diagram, reproduction, or model);
27	(b) 1	the subject matter; and
28	(c) 1	the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each PERSON who has it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.5:** No.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.6:**

Was a report made by any PERSON concerning the INCIDENT? If so, state:

- (a) the name, title, identification number, and employer of the PERSON who made the report;
  - the date and type of report made; (b)
- (c) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the PERSON for whom the report was made: and
- (d) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each PERSON who has the original or a copy of the report.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.6:**

No.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.7:**

Have YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF inspected the scene of the **INCIDENT**? If so, for each inspection state:

- (a) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the individual making the inspection (except for expert witnesses covered by Code of Civil Procedure section 2034.210-2034.310); and
  - (b) the date of the inspection.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 12.7:**

No.

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 13.1:**

Have YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF conducted surveillance of any individual involved in the **INCIDENT** or any party to this action? If so, for each surveillance, state:

- the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the individual or party; (a)
- (b) the time, date, and place of the surveillance;

1	(c) the name, <b>ADDRESS</b> , and telephone number of the individual who conducted the
2	surveillance; and
3	(d) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each PERSON who has the
4	original or a copy of any surveillance photograph, film, or videotape.
5	RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 13.1:
6	No.
7	FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 13.2:
8	Has a written report been prepared on the surveillance? If so, for each written report state:
9	(a) the title;
10	(b) the date;
11	(c) the name, <b>ADDRESS</b> , and telephone number of the individual who prepared the
12	report; and
13	(d) the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of each PERSON who has the
14	original or a copy.
15	RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 13.2:
16	No.
17	FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 14.1:
18	Do YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF contend that any PERSON
19	involved in the INCIDENT violated any statute, ordinance, or regulation and that the violation
20	was a legal (proximate) cause of the INCIDENT? If so, identify the name, ADDRESS, and
21	telephone number of each PERSON and the statute, ordinance, or regulation that was violated.
22	RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 14.1:
23	No.
24	FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 15.1:
25	Identify each denial of a material allegation and each special or affirmative defense in your
26	pleadings and for each:
27	(a) state all facts upon which you base the denial or special or affirmative defense;
28	(b) state the names, <b>ADDRESSES</b> , and telephone numbers of all <b>PERSON</b> S who have

knowledge of those facts; and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

(c) identify all **DOCUMENTS** and other tangible things that support your denial or special or affirmative defense, and state the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the PERSON who has each DOCUMENT.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 15.1:**

Responding Party objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that the definition of "INCIDENT" is defined as "the circumstances and events surrounding the alleged accident or injury giving rise to your claims in the First Amended Complaint," and accordingly, with respect to the First Amended Complaint, Responding Party does not plead any special or affirmative defenses. As applicable to special or affirmative defenses pled in response to Propounding Party's Cross-Complaint, Responding Party provides responses in his "RESPONSE TO SECOND SET OF FORM INTERROGATORIES."

#### **FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:**

Is your response to each request for admission served with these interrogatories an unqualified admission? If not, for each response that is not an unqualified admission:

- (a) state the number of the request;
- state all facts upon which you base your response; (b)
- state the names, ADDRESSES, and telephone numbers of all PERSONS who have (c) knowledge of those facts; and
- (d) identify all **DOCUMENTS** and other tangible things that support your response and state the name, ADDRESS, and telephone number of the PERSON who has each **DOCUMENT** or thing.

#### **RESPONSE TO FORM INTERROGATORY NO. 17.1:**

- (a) Request for Admission No. 1
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "call" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that he did call Jason Hall that day with the help of Isaiah TriForce Johnson on Skype.
- (c) Responding Party, Isaiah TriForce Johnson, Jace Hall 4869-3040-3109.1

N/A

(d)

1

2						
3	(a)	Request for Admission No. 2				
4	(b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "call" as they are vague,					
5	ambiguous, a	nd overbroad. Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that he last called Jason				
6	Hall on April	12, 2018, at 1:50AM EST (10:50PM PST).				
7	(c)	Responding Party, Jace Hall				
8	(d)	N/A				
9						
10	(a)	Request for Admission No. 4				
11	(b)	Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "dispute claim" as they are				
12	vague, ambig	guous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request				
13	is impermissi	bly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding				
14	Party respond	ds: Admit that Responding Party visited the Twin Galaxies offices on or about				
15	January 19, 2	018, and that Mr. Hall noted in passing that someone opened a score dispute against				
16	one of Mitche	ell's high-scores, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party has made				
17	a reasonable	inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information				
18	known or rea	dily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.				
19	Respo	onding Party bases its inability to admit the remainder of the Request on the fact that				
20	Mr. Hall neit	her identified the identity of the claimant, his/her background, nor any particular				
21	allegations al	leged in the dispute claim.				
22	(c)	Responding Party, Jace Hall, Ryan Burger				
23	(d)	N/A				
24						
25	(a)	Request for Admission No. 5				
26	(b)	Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "dispute claim" as they are				
27	vague, ambig	guous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request				
28	is impermissi	bly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding				
	4869-3040-3109.1	22				
		AINTIFF WILLIAM JAMES MITCHELL'S RESPONSE TO FIRST SET OF FORM STERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY DEFENDANT TWIN GALAXIES, LLC				

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

Party responds: Admit that Responding Party visited the Twin Galaxies offices on or about January 19, 2018, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that none of the information cited was explained to him by Jace Hall on January 19, 2018.

- (c) Responding Party, Jace Hall, Ryan Burger
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 6
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "dispute claim" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that Responding Party visited the Twin Galaxies offices on or about January 19, 2018, and that Mr. Hall noted in passing that someone opened a score dispute against one of Mitchell's high-scores, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the remainder of the Request on the fact that Mr. Hall neither identified the identity of the claimant, his/her background, any particular allegations alleged in the dispute claim, nor invited him to provide information on the matter to Twin Galaxies.

- (c) Responding Party, Jace Hall, Ryan Burger
- N/A (d)
- Request for Admission No. 7 (a)
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "dispute claim" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that Responding Party visited the Twin Galaxies offices on or about 4869-3040-3109.1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

January 19, 2018, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Mr. Hall neither identified the identity of the claimant, his/her background, nor any particular allegations alleged in the dispute claim; and further, Mr. Hall neither invited Responding Party to provide information on the topic nor did Responding Party decline to participate at that time.

- (c) Responding Party, Jace Hall, Ryan Burger
- N/A (d)
- Request for Admission No. 9 (a)
- Responding Party objects to the phrase "childhood friend" as it is vague, (b) ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party met Mr. Childs when they each were above the age of eighteen, making them both adults.

- Responding Party, Robert Childs (c)
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 10
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "witness to the event" and "technician who (b) performed the game and equipment set up" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Further, Responding Party objects to the Request on the basis that it seeks a legal conclusion and not an admission of fact. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that Robert Childs was a witness to the 1,047,200 point Donkey Kong Arcade high-score (the "King of Kong Score") and that he performed set up and was a witness to the 1,062,800 point Donkey Kong Arcade high-score (the "Boomer's Score"), but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Mr. Childs did not help perform set up 4869-3040-3109.1

for the 1,047,200 point Donkey Kong Arcade high-score (the "King of Kong Score"), and he did not perform set up or witness the 1,050,200 point Donkey Kong Arcade high-score (the "Mortgage Broker's Score").

- Responding Party, Robert Childs (c)
- (d) N/A

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (a) Request for Admission No. 11
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "witness to the event" and "technician who (b) performed the game and equipment set up" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that he is unaware of what Mr. Childs did or did not supply to the public and Twin Galaxies.

- (c) Responding Party, Robert Childs
- (d) N/A
  - (a) Request for Admission No. 12
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "layman's" and "method of hook-up (b) utilizing the game/equipment set up" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Further, Responding Party objects to the Request on the basis that it seeks a legal conclusion and not an admission of fact. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that he is unaware of what Mr. Childs publicly provided.

- (c) Responding Party, Robert Childs
- N/A (d)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (a) Request for Admission No. 13
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "\$5000 CHALLENGE" and "disprove his (b) explanation with respect to the dispute concerning your Donkey Kone score performances" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that he is unfamiliar with the alleged "explanation" given by Robert Childs.

- (c) Responding Party, Robert Childs
- N/A (d)
- (a) Request for Admission No. 14

Responding Party objects to the phrases "layman's" and "method of hook-up utilizing the game/equipment set up" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Further, Responding Party objects to the Request on the basis that it seeks a legal conclusion and not an admission of fact. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that he is unaware of 4869-3040-3109.1

what Mr. Childs publicly provided.

- (c) Responding Party, Robert Childs
- (d) N/A

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (a) Request for Admission No. 16
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "3 lives perfect pac-man" and "conspired" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Further, Responding Party objects to the Request on the basis that it seeks a legal conclusion and not an admission of fact. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that nobody achieved a "3 lives perfect pacman" game before July 3, 1999 on original unmodified Pac-Man arcade hardware.

- (c) Responding Party
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 17
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "3 lives perfect pac-man" and "conspired" (b) as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Further, Responding Party objects to the Request on the basis that it seeks a legal conclusion and not an admission of fact. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that Responding Party proposed a plan to send a non-player-attributed videotaped performance to Twin Galaxies, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party denies that the plan was detailed and intentional or that the purpose was to generate misdirection and confusion to discredit the Twin Galaxies organization, Mr. Hall, or both.

- (c) **Responding Party**
- (d) N/A

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(a)	Rec	quest for	Admis	sion	No.	1	8
-----	-----	-----------	-------	------	-----	---	---

Responding Party objects to the phrase "bonus footage and commentary" as it is (b) vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party acknowledges he is reasonably acquainted with the general contents of the film, but Responding Party has never directly watched the film in its entirety, including the bonus footage commentary found the DVD release.

- (c) Responding Party
- King of Kong Film (d)
- (a) Request for Admission No. 19
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "run or own any significant part" and (b) "economically impactful" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Further, Responding Party objects to the Request on the basis that it seeks a legal conclusion and not an admission of fact. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that Responding Party does not run Rickey's Restaurant, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies and that Responding Party had made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party lacks ownership of any significant part of Rickey's Restaurant because Responding Party only owns a partial stake in the business alongside his father and four siblings. Accordingly, Responding Party is unable to admit or deny, however, if the defamatory statements by Twin Galaxies from April 12, 2018, impacted Rickey's Restaurant economically, because he does not participate in the operations of the 4869-3040-3109.1

KASS	TRESTER LLP	
MANNING	DD, RAMIREZ,	
	ELLRC	

re	es	ta	111	ra	n	t
ı١	$ \circ$	ιa	u	ıa	.11	L.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- **Responding Party** (c)
- (d) N/A

(a) Request for Admission No. 20

(b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "image/likeness" and "involvement or association" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the remaining on the fact that although Responding party owns a partial stake in Rickey's Restaurant, and receives income from Rickey's Restaurant, Responding party does not participate in the operations of Rickey's Restaurant and is not familiar with the marketing strategy of Rickey's Restaurant.

- (c) Responding Party
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 21
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "historically publicly known web address" (b) and "defunct" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that the web address to purchase Rickey's World Famous Louisiana Hot Sauce was http://www.800hotsauce.com/, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the remaining on the fact that the web link and site dedicated to Rickey's Hot Sauce was disabled by a cyber-attack in April 2018, but the web link and site dedicated to Rickey's Hot Sauce was accessible as late as March 2, 2018. 4869-3040-3109.1

	R LLP	
SS	ESTE	
KA	T E	
NGO	IREZ,	
ANNI	$\stackrel{RAM}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{\wedge}}}}{\overset{\scriptscriptstyle{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}{\overset{}}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{}}}{\overset{$	
Ž	OD, ]	
	ELLR	
	_	

(	(c)	Resp	onding	2 Party

- N/A (d)
- 3 4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

- Request for Admission No. 22 (a)
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "bound" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that Responding Party has never owned an account on http://www.TwinGalaxies.com/ or been notified of a "Player Agreement" in connection with high-score submissions. Moreover, the link referenced in the Request for admission is defunct.

- Responding Party (c)
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 23
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "bound" as they are vague, (b) ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that Responding Party has never owned an account on http://www.TwinGalaxies.com/ or been notified of a "Player Agreement" in connection with high-score submissions.

N/A (c)

4869-3040-3109.1

1	(d)	N/A
2		
3	(a)	Request for Admission No. 24
4	(b)	Responding Party objects to the phrases "you" and "bound" as they are vague,
5	ambiguous, a	nd overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is
6	impermissibly	y compound.
7	Subje	ct to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds:
8	Responding F	Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request,
9	and that the in	nformation known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to
10	admit the mat	tter.
11	Respo	onding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that Mitchell has never
12	owned an acc	ount on http://www.TwinGalaxies.com/ or been notified of a "Player Agreement" in
13	connection w	ith high-score submissions.
14	(c)	N/A
15	(d)	N/A
16		
17	(a)	Request for Admission No. 25
18	(b)	Responding Party objects to the phrase "ownership interest" as it is vague,
19	ambiguous, a	nd overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding
20	Party respond	ls: Deny.
21	Respo	onding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that he never held an
22	ownership int	terest in Twin Galaxies. In the 1980s, Responding Party owned a laser tag venue that
23	was named "	Twin Galaxies," a completely separate entity and venture from Twin Galaxies
24	Scoreboard.	
25	(c)	Responding Party, Walter Day, Jace Hall
26	(d)	N/A
27		
28	(a)	Request for Admission No. 26

09.1

PLAINTIFF WILLIAM JAMES MITCHELL'S RESPONSE TO FIRST SET OF FORM INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY DEFENDANT TWIN GALAXIES, LLC

(b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "submissions" and "same stringent rules" as they is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is overbroad as to time. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that Responding Party followed the rules of utilizing original unmodified hardware in each and every record obtained by him that was featured on the Twin Galaxies scoreboard, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the remainder on the fact that Responding Party bases its inability to admit the remainder on the fact that Responding party is not familiar with the ruleset of each and every recordkeeping track for every game on the Twin Galaxies scoreboard or the circumstances behind the records of each and every other player on the Twin Galaxies scoreboard.

- (c) N/A
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 27
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "Twin Galaxies Database" and "automatically followed the ruling" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that Propounding Party has not provided a location – physical, digital, or otherwise – for the quoted information cited in the request, and the location is unknown to the Responding Party.

- (c) N/A
- (d) N/A

KASS	TRESTER LLP
MANNING	ELLROD, RAMIREZ,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(	(a)	) Rec	quest for	Admi	ssion	No.	29
	u	, 100	1 acst 101	7 1 WIIII		110.	

(b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "Twin Galaxies Database" and "automatically followed the ruling" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that Responding Party is not familiar with the exact verbiage of Twin Galaxies' rules in 1999 for recorded games.

- (c) Responding Party
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 30
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrase "visit" as it is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that Pete Bouvier was present Boomer's Arcade at some times on Saturday, July 31, 2010, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies that he was present for the entire duration of the date.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Mr. Bouvier was not present at Boomer's Arcade at all times for the duration of Saturday, July 31, 2010.

- (c) Responding Party, Pete Bouvier
- (d)
  - (a) Request for Admission No. 34
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "ALL" and "Twin Galaxies Sanctioned events" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that although Responding Party achieved many of his records at organized and advertised Twin Galaxies events, the 1,050,200 point Donkey Kong Arcade world record occurred at an event organized and advertised by the Florida Association of Mortgage Brokers. While Twin Galaxies took part in the event, and notably oversaw Responding Party verifying his hardware with the Senior Engineer of Nintendo, Wayne Shirk, Twin Galaxies was not the organizer and advertiser of the convention itself.

- Responding Party (c)
- N/A (d)
- (a) Request for Admission No. 36
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "ALL" and "Twin Galaxies Sanctioned events" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party recorded his Perfect Pac-Man score on July 3, 1999, on three videotapes due to the constraints imposed by the technology of the time. The third videotape, which shows approximately the final third of the performance, showed a final score of 3,333,360 points.

- (c) Responding Party
- Three Videotapes (d)
- (a) Request for Admission No. 37
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "3rd July 1999" and "photo" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Responding Party has made a reasonable inquiry concerning the matter in the particular request, and that the information known or readily obtainable is insufficient to enable Responding Party to admit the matter.

Responding Party bases its inability to admit the matter on the fact that Responding Party did not personally capture a picture of the game screen displaying a score of (3),333,360 points, and Responding Party cannot ascertain if any other individual did so.

N/A (c)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (d) N/A
- Request for Admission No. 38 (a)
- Responding Party objects to the phrase "given an award" as it is vague, ambiguous, (b) and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Masaya Nakamura, who represented both NAMCO and JAMMA, awarded him the "Video Game Player of the Century" award in conjunction with Walter Day.

- Responding Party, Walter Day, Masaya Nakamura (c)
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 39
- Responding Party objects to the phrases "deliberately and repeatedly misled the (b) public" and "assigned an award" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Further, Responding Party objects to the Request on the basis that it seeks a legal conclusion and not an admission of fact. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Masaya Nakamura, who represented both NAMCO and JAMMA, awarded him the "Video Game Player of the Century" award in conjunction with Walter Day.

- (c) Responding Party, Walter Day, Masaya Nakamura
- N/A (d)

KASS	TRESTER LLP
MANNING	OD, RAMIREZ,
	ELLR

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(	(a)	) Rec	uest for	Admi	ssion	No.	40

(b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "Mortgage Brokers event" and "open and available to convention goers/public to witness" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is overbroad as to time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that the Mortgage Brokers event was open and available to convention goers and the public, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party achieved that Donkey Kong Arcade world record of 1,050,200 points on Saturday, July 14, 2007.

- (c) Responding Party
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 41
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "Guinness" and "official 'Billy Mitchell Reinstatement Video" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that the Request is impermissibly compound. Further, Responding Party objects to the Request on the basis that it seeks a legal conclusion and not an admission of fact. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that he has never knowingly allowed Guinness World Records to acknowledge a false achievement.

- (c) Responding Party
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 42
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrases "visit" and "King Off 6 event" as they are vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Carlos Pineiro shared a hotel room with 4869-3040-3109.1

Isaiah TriForce Johnson.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Responding Party, Carlos Pinero, Isaiah TriForce Johnson (c)
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 43
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrase "completed" as it is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party did not complete a Donkey Kong Junior world record game on July 3, 2010.

- (c) Responding Party
- N/A (d)
- (a) Request for Admission No. 47
- Responding Party objects to the phrase "original master video tapes" as it is vague, (b) ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Admit that Responding Party is not aware of anyone who could be in possession of the original master videotapes, but as to the remainder of the Request, Responding Party denies.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Twin Galaxies lost the original master videotapes of Responding Party's videotaped Donkey Kong performances of 1,047,200 points and 1,050,200 points and cannot locate it.

- Responding Party (c)
- (d) N/A
- (a) Request for Admission No. 49
- Responding Party objects to the phrase "played Donkey Kong for Carlos Pineiro" (b) as it is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party has never played Donkey Kong for the purpose of helping anyone test the validity of the claims against his Donkey Kong score performances that are at issue in this case.

- Responding Party, Carlos Pineiro (c)
- (d) N/A

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (a) Request for Admission No. 50
- Responding Party objects to the phrase "played Donkey Kong for Steven Kleisath" (b) as it is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party has never played Donkey Kong for the purpose of helping anyone test the validity of the claims against his Donkey Kong score performances that are at issue in this case.

- Responding Party, Steven Kleisath (c)
- N/A (d)
- (a) Request for Admission No. 51
- (b) Responding Party objects to the phrase "played Donkey Kong for Carlos Pineiro" as it is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Responding Party also objects on the grounds that this Request has been asked and answered. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding Party responds: Deny.

Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party has never played Donkey Kong for the purpose of helping anyone test the validity of the claims against his Donkey Kong score performances that are at issue in this case.

- Responding Party, Carlos Pineiro (c)
- N/A (d)
  - (a) Request for Admission No. 52

4869-3040-3109.1

1

(b)

2 it is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, 3 Responding Party responds: Deny. 4 Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party never obtained a 5 television for Carlos Pineiro to test the allegations that he cheated to achieve the Donkey Kong 6 score performances that are at issue in this case. After Mr. Pineiro made a general request for a 7 television, Responding Party texted Mr. Pineiro, without knowledge of the purpose of the request, 8 a picture of an old leftover television in his home with an offer to give it to Mr. Pineiro. Mr. 9 Pineiro, on his own accord, and without instruction from Responding Party, stated that he would 10 use the television for testing purposes. 11 Responding Party, Carlos Pineiro (c) 12 N/A (d) 13 14 Request for Admission No. 53 (a) 15 Responding Party objects to the phrase "assisted for Carlos Pineiro" as it is vague, (b) 16 ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Responding 17 Party responds: Deny. 18 Responding Party bases its denial on the fact that Responding Party neither participated in 19 Carlos Pineiro's technical testing nor did Responding Party play Donkey Kong for the purpose of assisting Mr. Pineiro. 20 21 Responding Party, Carlos Pineiro (c) 22 (d) N/A 23 DATED: August 24, 2022 MANNING & KASS ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP 24 Jurgangfeil 25 By: Anthony J. Ellrod 26 Linna T. Loangkote 27 Attorneys for Plaintiff WILLIAM JAMES MITCHELL

Responding Party objects to the phrase "obtained a television for Carlos Pineiro" as

VERIFICATION

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

#### STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. My business address is 801 S. Figueroa St, 15th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017-3012.

On August 24, 2022, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as **PLAINTIFF WILLIAM JAMES MITCHELL'S RESPONSE TO FIRST SET OF FORM INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY DEFENDANT TWIN GALAXIES, LLC** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

David Tashroudian, Esq.	Attorney for Defendants
Mona Tashroudian, Esq.	Twin Galaxies
TASHROUDIAN ĹAŴ GROUP, APC	
12400 Ventura Blvd. Suite 300	
Studio City, CA 91604	
Telephone: (818) 561-7381	
Facsimile: (818) 561-7381	
Email: david@tashlawgroup.com	
Email: mona@tashlawgroup.com	
11 1	

**BY MAIL:** I enclosed the document(s) in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in the Service List and placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with the practice of Manning & Kass, Ellrod, Ramirez, Trester LLP for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope was placed in the mail at Los Angeles, California.

BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I caused a copy of the document(s) to be sent from e-mail address shc@manningllp.com to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed in the Service List. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 24, 2022, at Los Angeles, California.

Steve Chang

28 ||