the Motion for Protective Order as to Tabitha Marks and Lily Chandler. Alex E. Cunny, Esq.

appeared on behalf of the Plaintiff, Sean Hardy, Esq. appeared on behalf of non-party Jonathan

27

28

Spence and Marion Fox, Gerald Siegel, Esq. appeared on behalf of non-parties Lily Chandler and Tabitha Marks, and Jonathan Steinsapir, Esq. appeared on behalf of Defendants MJJ Productions, Inc. and MJJ Ventures, Inc. The Court issued a Minute Order on December 4, 2020 and all three (3) motions for reconsideration were denied. A true and correct copy of the December 4, 2020 MANLY, STEWART & FINALDI

Attorneys of Record for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT "1"

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Civil Division

West District, Santa Monica Courthouse, Department M

BC508502 WADE ROBSON VS DOE 1 ET AL December 4, 2020 9:00 AM

Judge: Honorable Mark A. Young CSR: Kristin Cyphers, CSR# 13518

Judicial Assistant: K. Metoyer ERM: None

Courtroom Assistant: S. Mixon Deputy Sheriff: None

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff(s): Vince William Finaldi By: Alex Cunny Video)

For Defendant(s): Onc. MJJ Ventures By: Jonathan Steinsapir (Telephonic)

Other Appearance Notes: Lily Chandler (Interested Party): By Gerald Siegel (Video), Marion

Fox (Interested Party): By Sean Hardy (Telephonic)

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: Hearing on Motion for Reconsideration Of Order Granting Non-Party Marion Fox's Motion For Protective Order; Hearing on Motion for Reconsideration Of Order Granting Non-Party Jonathan Spence's Motion For Protective Order; Hearing on Motion for Reconsideration Of Order Granting Non-Party Lily Chandler's and Tabitha Rose Marks' Motion For Protective Order; Hearing on Ex Parte Application to Advance Hearing on MSJ

Pursuant to Government Code sections 68086, 70044, and California Rules of Court, rule 2.956, Kristin Cyphers, CSR# 13518, certified shorthand reporter is appointed as an official Court reporter pro tempore in these proceedings, and is ordered to comply with the terms of the Court Reporter Agreement. The Order is signed and filed this date.

The matters are called for hearing.

The Court has read and considered all documents filed hereto regarding the above-captioned motions and provides counsel with its written Tentative Ruling. Counsel are given the opportunity to argue. All counsel submit on the Tentative Ruling. The Court adopts its Tentative Ruling as the Final Ruling as follows:

FINAL RULING

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Wade Robson seeks reconsideration of the orders granting protective orders in favor of non-parties Marion Fox, Jonathan Spence, Lily Chandler and Tabitha Rose Marks.

LEGAL STANDARD

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Civil Division

West District, Santa Monica Courthouse, Department M

BC508502 WADE ROBSON VS DOE 1 ET AL December 4, 2020 9:00 AM

Judge: Honorable Mark A. Young CSR: Kristin Cyphers, CSR# 13518

Judicial Assistant: K. Metoyer ERM: None

Courtroom Assistant: S. Mixon Deputy Sheriff: None

A court may reconsider a prior ruling if the party affected provides notice within 10 days of the order it seeks reconsideration of "new or different facts, circumstances, or law." (Code Civ. Proc. §1008(a).)

"[F]acts of which the party seeking reconsideration was aware at the time of the original ruling are not 'new or different." (In re Marriage of Herr (2009) 174 Cal.App.4th 1463, 1468 [citing Garcia v. Hejmadi (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 674, 690].) "The party making the application shall state by affidavit what application was made before, when and to what judge, what order or decisions were made, and what new or different facts, circumstances, or law are claimed to be shown." (Code Civ. Proc., § 1008(a).)

REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

Plaintiff filed three requests for judicial notice. Plaintiff seeks judicial notice of Exhibit 6 to the Pendry declarations and Exhibit 8 to the declaration of Taylor Boren. Exhibits 6 and 8 contain a copy of the prior version of Code of Civil Procedure section 340.1. The Court takes judicial notice of the prior version of section 340.1.

EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS

Non-party Marion Fox's objections to the declaration of Courtney Pendry, Objections 1-9 are SUSTAINED.

Non-party Johnathan Spence's objections to the declaration of Courtney Pendry, Objections 1 – 4 are SUSTAINED.

ANALYSIS

The declarations provided by counsel fail to meet the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 1008(a), which requires a party moving for reconsideration to state by affidavit "what application was made before, when and to what judge, what order or decisions were made, and what new or different facts, circumstances, or law are claimed to be shown." Here, Plaintiff does not state this information by affidavit, but attempts to rely upon exhibits to the affidavits, including transcripts and other documents that contain the necessary information. That is insufficient under section 1008(a), and as a result, Plaintiff has failed to meet the jurisdictional requirement for the Court to consider these motions and reconsider its prior rulings. (See Civ. Proc. § 1008(e).)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Civil Division

West District, Santa Monica Courthouse, Department M

BC508502 WADE ROBSON VS DOE 1 ET AL December 4, 2020 9:00 AM

Judge: Honorable Mark A. Young CSR: Kristin Cyphers, CSR# 13518

Judicial Assistant: K. Metoyer ERM: None

Courtroom Assistant: S. Mixon Deputy Sheriff: None

Moreover, even if Plaintiff's declarations complied with section 1008, Plaintiff has not presented new or different facts, circumstances, or law that were not already known to Plaintiff prior to the September 24, 2020 hearing.

Therefore, the motions for reconsideration are DENIED.

END OF FINAL RULING

The Ex Parte Application to Advance Hearing on MSJ filed by MJJ Ventures, Inc., MJJ Productions, Inc. on 12/02/2020 is Granted.

Pursuant to the request of defendant, the Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment scheduled for 05/04/2021 is advanced to this date and continued to 02/24/21 at 08:30 AM in Department M at Santa Monica Courthouse.

Notice is waived.

MANLY, STEWART & FINALDI ATTORNEYS AT LAW 19100 Von Karman Ave., Suite 800 Irvine, California 92612 Telephone: (949) 252-9990

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

I am employed in the county of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 19100 Von Karman Ave., Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92612.

On December 11, 2020, I served the following document described as NOTICE OF RULING AS TO MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION HEARD ON DECEMBER 4, 2020 on the interested parties to this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows:

SEE ATTACHED MAILING LIST

[X] BY U.S. MAIL

I deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.

[X] I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice 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.

[X] BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION I caused the documents to be sent to the persons on the e-mail addresses as listed below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

[X] (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

[] (Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

Executed on December 11, 2020, at Irvine, California.

Kathy Frederiksen
Kathy Brederiksen

2