

1 **KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP**  
 2 Karl S. Kronenberger (Bar No. 226112)  
 3 Henry M. Burgoyne, III (Bar No. 203748)  
 4 Jeffrey M. Rosenfeld (Bar No. 222187)  
 5 150 Post Street, Suite 520  
 6 San Francisco, CA 94108  
 7 Telephone: (415) 955-1155  
 8 Facsimile: (415) 955-1158  
 9 karl@KBInternetLaw.com  
 10 hank@KBInternetLaw.com  
 11 jeff@KBInternetLaw.com  
 12  
 13 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 14 Art of Living Foundation  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
 150 Post Street, Suite 520  
 San Francisco, CA 94108  
 www.KBInternetLaw.com

**ART OF LIVING FOUNDATION,**

Plaintiff,

vs.

**DOES 1-10, inclusive,**

Defendants.

Case No. 10-cv-5022-LHK-HRL

**PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO  
 DEFENDANTS DOE/KLIM AND  
 DOE/SKYWALKER'S SECOND  
 SPECIAL MOTION TO STRIKE;  
 EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS**

Date: December 8, 2011  
 Time: 1:30 PM  
 Ctrm: Courtroom 4, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 Judge: The Honorable Lucy H. Koh

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

BACKGROUND ..... 2

    A. Plaintiff & Plaintiff’s Teachings ..... 2

    B. Plaintiff’s Training of its Teachers & Plaintiff’s Trade Secrets ..... 3

    C. Plaintiff’s Students Must Sign Confidentiality Agreements ..... 4

    D. The Wordpress Blog ..... 4

    E. Procedural History ..... 5

ARGUMENT ..... 7

    A. The Court has already found that the Manuals and Teaching Notes constitute trade secrets and that Skywalker published them ..... 8

    B. Contrary to Defendants’ argument, Plaintiff owns the Manuals and the Teaching Notes ..... 9

    C. The designated portions of the Manuals and Teaching Notes constitute trade secrets where they are not generally known to the public ..... 9

        1. Plaintiff’s students must agree not to disclose the contents of Plaintiff’s courses ..... 10

        2. Even if students did not sign confidentiality agreements, courts have found that teaching procedures can constitute trade secrets ..... 11

        3. The Panchakosha Guided Meditation downloaded by Defendants differs from the Panchakosha process in Plaintiff’s Manuals ..... 13

        4. While Plaintiff’s trade secrets refer to traditional Hindu concepts, they also include specific, novel, and proprietary teaching methods ..... 14

    D. Contrary to Defendants’ argument, Plaintiff need not disentangle its trade secrets from religious issues to enjoy trade secret protection ..... 15

    E. Plaintiff has already established that it takes reasonable measures to protect its trade secrets ..... 17

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
150 Post Street, Suite 520  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
www.KBInternetLaw.com

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

F. Plaintiff has already established that the Manuals and Teaching Notes have independent economic value ..... 18

G. Skywalker has admitted to posting materials designated by Plaintiff as trade secrets ..... 19

H. Plaintiff does not need to quantify its damages, but is prepared to do so after discovery ..... 19

EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS ..... 21

CONCLUSION ..... 23

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
150 Post Street, Suite 520  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
www.KBInternetLaw.com

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

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

*Ajaxo Inc. v. E\*Trade Fin. Corp.*, 187 Cal. App. 4th 1295 (2010) ..... 20

*Bridge Publ'ns, Inc. v. Vien*, 827 F. Supp. 629 (S.D. Cal. 1993) ..... 11, 15-16

*DocMagic, Inc. v. Ellie Mae, Inc.*, 745 F. Supp. 2d 1119 (N.D. Cal. 2010) ..... 8, 20

*Grewal v. Jammu*, 191 Cal. App. 4th 977 (2011) ..... 7

*Harvey Barnett, Inc. v. Shidler*, 338 F.3d 1125 (10th Cir. 2003) ..... 11, 14

*In re Providian Credit Card Cases*, 96 Cal. App. 4th 292, 306 (2002) ..... 18

*Maktab Tarighe Oveyssi Shah Maghsoudi, Inc. v. Kianfar*, 179 F.3d 1244 (9th Cir. 1999) ..... 15-16

*Marijanovic v. Gray, York & Duffy*, 137 Cal. App. 4th 1262 (2006) ..... 7

*Moore v. Shaw*, 116 Cal. App. 4th 182 (2004) ..... 7, 21

*O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.*, 420 F. Supp. 2d 1070 (N.D. Cal. 2006) ..... 14

*Overstock.com, Inc. v. Gradient Analytics, Inc.*, 151 Cal. App. 4th 688 (2007) ..... 7

*Paiva v. Nichols*, 168 Cal. App. 4th 1007 (2008) ..... 7

*Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Netcom On-Line Communication Serv.*, 923 F. Supp. 1231 (N.D. Cal. 1995) ..... *passim*

*Religious Tech. Ctr., Church of Scientology Int'l, Inc. v. Scott*, 869 F.2d 1306 (9th Cir.1989) ..... 15

*San Jose Const., Inc. v. S.B.C.C., Inc.*, 155 Cal. App. 4th 1528 (2007) ..... 10, 15

*Smith v. Adventist Health Sys./West*, 190 Cal. App. 4th 40 (2010) ..... 7

*Smokenders, Inc. v. Smoke No More, Inc.*, 184 U.S.P.Q. 309, 1974 WL 20234 (S.D. Fla. 1974) ..... 12

*State ex rel. Perrea v. Cincinnati Pub. Sch.*, 916 N.E.2d 1049 (2009) ..... 12

*Thompson v. Impaxx, Inc.*, 113 Cal. App. 4th 1425 (2003) ..... 10

*Unilogic, Inc. v. Burroughs Corp.*, 10 Cal. App. 4th 612 (1992) ..... 20

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
150 Post Street, Suite 520  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
www.KBIInternetLaw.com

1 *United Christian Scientists v. Christian Sci. Bd. of Dir., First Church of Christ Scientist,*  
 2 829 F.2d 1152 (D.C.Cir.1987) ..... 15  
 3 *Vergos v. McNeal*, 146 Cal. App. 4th 1387 (2007) ..... 21  
 4 *Verizon Delaware, Inc. v. Covad Communications Co.*, 377 F.3d 1081 (9th Cir. 2004) . 8  
 5 *Yield Dynamics, Inc. v. TEA Sys. Corp.*, 154 Cal. App. 4th 547 (2007) ..... 18  
 6

7 **Federal Statutes and Other Authorities**

8 CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §3426 *et seq.*, ..... 8, 20  
 9 CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 425.16 ..... 1, 5, 8  
 10 CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 2019.210 ..... 6  
 11 FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE 602 ..... 21-22  
 12 FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE 802 *et seq.* ..... 22  
 13 FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE 1002 ..... 22  
 14 FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ..... 16  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
 150 Post Street, Suite 520  
 San Francisco, CA 94108  
 www.KBIInternetLaw.com

1 Plaintiff Art of Living Foundation (“Plaintiff”), by and through its counsel of record,  
2 respectfully submits the following memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to  
3 the Second Special Motion to Strike of Defendants Doe/Klim and Doe/Skywalker  
4 (collectively, “Defendants”).

### 5 INTRODUCTION

6 In denying Defendants’ first motion to strike, the Court already found that Plaintiff  
7 has submitted competent evidence supporting its trade secret claims. Plaintiff has  
8 submitted evidence that it is a non-profit organization that offers courses on breathing,  
9 meditation, and yoga, focusing on the teachings of Sri Sri Ravi Shankar and Sudarshan  
10 Kriya. Plaintiff has submitted evidence that it keeps its teaching principles confidential.  
11 Plaintiff has submitted evidence that it derives economic value from the secrecy of its  
12 teaching principles, namely by differentiating its courses on breathing, meditation, and  
13 yoga from the courses of other organizations. Finally, Plaintiff has submitted evidence  
14 that Defendant Skywalker posted Plaintiff’s trade secrets on an Internet blog that he  
15 created for the purpose of criticizing Plaintiff. Based on this evidence, the Court denied  
16 Defendants’ first special motion to strike Plaintiff’s trade secret claim.

17 Defendants have filed a second motion to strike under Code of Civil Procedure  
18 section 425.16, again challenging Plaintiff’s claim for misappropriation of trade secrets.  
19 Despite labeling their motion as a special motion to strike, it is more akin to a motion for  
20 reconsideration. Thus, the Court should disregard most of Defendants’ arguments,  
21 where the Court has already found that Plaintiff has submitted competent evidence and  
22 authority that:

- 23 • Plaintiff owns the documents containing the trade secrets;
- 24 • Plaintiff takes reasonable measures to protect its trade secrets;
- 25 • Plaintiff’s trade secrets have independent economic value;
- 26 • Skywalker has admitted to posting materials designated by Plaintiff as trade  
27 secrets; and
- 28 • That religious or spiritual works can enjoy trade secret protection.

1 The few issues in Defendants' motion that the Court has not already addressed  
2 are also easily dismissed for the following reasons:

- 3 • Plaintiff's students are required to sign confidentiality agreements before taking  
4 Plaintiff's courses—**Plaintiff's counsel's prior representation to the Court**  
5 **that Plaintiff's students are not required to sign such agreements was**  
6 **incorrect**;
- 7 • Even if students were not required to sign confidentiality agreements, Courts have  
8 found that teaching methods—like those contained in the Plaintiff's manuals—are  
9 entitled to trade secret protection; and
- 10 • Plaintiff does not need to quantify its damages to establish its trade secret claim,  
11 but is prepared to do so through discovery of information in the exclusive control  
12 of Defendants and third parties.

13 For all of these reasons, and as set forth more fully below, the Court should deny  
14 Defendants' special motion to strike.

### 15 **BACKGROUND**

#### 16 **A. Plaintiff & Plaintiff's Teachings**

17 Plaintiff, the Art of Living Foundation, is a California non-profit corporation based in  
18 Goleta, California. (Declaration of Ashwani Dhall [D.E. No. 40] ("Dhall Decl.") ¶11.)  
19 Plaintiff is not a religious organization or a cult. (*Id.* ¶12.) Rather, Plaintiff is a non-  
20 denominational educational and humanitarian organization dedicated to the teachings of  
21 Sri Sri Ravi Shankar ("Shankar"). (*Id.* ¶13.) Plaintiff offers courses on breathing,  
22 meditation, and yoga. (*Id.* ¶14.) At the core of Plaintiff's teachings is Sudarshan Kriya,  
23 which is a rhythmic breathing exercise. (*Id.* ¶15.)

24 Generally, individuals who wish to take a course offered by Plaintiff must register  
25 and pay the course fee. (Dhall Decl. ¶18.) Plaintiff uses the money it raises through its  
26 courses to maintain its facilities, to train new teachers for its courses, and to provide  
27 humanitarian aid and community service. (*Id.* ¶19.)

28 //

1 **B. Plaintiff’s Training of its Teachers & Plaintiff’s Trade Secrets**

2 Many organizations in the U.S. offer courses on breathing, yoga, and meditation.  
3 (Dhall Decl. ¶20.) Plaintiff distinguishes its courses from other courses by requiring the  
4 specialized training of its teachers. (*Id.* ¶21.) The training of Plaintiff’s teachers results  
5 in a direct financial benefit to Plaintiff in the form of course fees (both from new and  
6 continuing students). (*Id.* ¶22.)

7 Given the importance Plaintiff places on teacher training, Plaintiff—in  
8 consultation with Shankar—has developed detailed processes by which its courses are  
9 to be taught. (Dhall Decl. ¶23.) These processes are contained in several written  
10 manuals developed by Plaintiff in consultation with Shankar. (*Id.* ¶24.) These manuals  
11 include, but are not limited to: a) the Training Guide Phase One Manual, b) the Phase  
12 One Supplement Manual (the Continuation Manual), and c) the Yes! Teacher Notes  
13 (collectively, the “Manuals”). (*Id.* ¶¶25-28 & Exs. A-C.) Plaintiff has intentionally not  
14 memorialized the teaching processes for Sudarshan Kriya in a formal manual to prevent  
15 the unlawful distribution of its Sudarshan Kriya teaching principles. (*Id.* ¶29.) However,  
16 Plaintiff has developed a set of Sudarshan Kriya teaching notes (the “Teaching Notes”),  
17 which are read to student-teachers in a secure and untainted environment. (Declaration  
18 of Michael Fischman in Opposition to Defendants’ Second Special Motion to Strike  
19 (“Fischman Decl.”) ¶5; Dhall Decl. ¶¶29-30.) Plaintiff created the Manuals and  
20 Teaching Notes, and Plaintiff owns the Manuals and Teaching Notes as well as the  
21 intellectual property rights to the Manuals and Teaching Notes (Fischman Decl. ¶5.)

22 Plaintiff keeps the Manuals and Teaching Notes strictly confidential. (Dhall Decl.  
23 ¶32.) Plaintiff stores the Manuals and Teaching Notes on password protected  
24 computers, using password protected files. (*Id.* ¶34.) Plaintiff only allows access to  
25 these electronic files to those people for whom access is necessary. (*Id.*) Before the  
26 Manuals or Teaching Notes are disclosed to student-teachers, they must agree not to  
27 disclose the Manuals or Teaching Notes. (*Id.* ¶¶34-36.) Student-teachers must also  
28 agree not to use the Manuals or Teaching Notes for any purpose other than teaching



1 Plaintiff's courses. (*Id.*) Out of an abundance of concern, Plaintiff does not provide  
 2 student-teachers with written manuals containing Plaintiff's confidential information on  
 3 Sudarshan Kriya. (*Id.* ¶¶29-30.) Rather, Plaintiff provides the confidential information  
 4 through oral presentations, and again, requires student-teachers to agree not to  
 5 disclose or misuse any notes they take regarding the Teaching Notes. (*Id.* ¶¶29-31 &  
 6 Ex. D.)

### 7 **C. Plaintiff's Students Must Sign Confidentiality Agreements**

8 At the hearing on Defendants' first motion to strike, Plaintiff's counsel incorrectly  
 9 stated that Plaintiff's students are not required to sign a confidentiality agreement. This  
 10 statement was wrong. Counsel has since conferred with Plaintiff about this specific  
 11 issue and determined that there was a misunderstanding.

12 **Plaintiff has now confirmed that since before the Manuals and Teaching**  
 13 **Notes were created, all students of its courses have been required to agree not to**  
 14 **disclose any course content.** (Fischman Decl. ¶7 & Ex. A.) The agreement states:

15 I also agree that I will not disclose the content of this course to anyone.  
 16 I further agree that I will not attempt to instruct others in any of the  
 17 techniques used in the course until such time as I receive personal  
 18 training from Sri Sri Ravi Shankar and the Art of Living Foundation. (*Id.*  
 19 Ex. A.)

20 All students must sign this agreement before participating in one of Plaintiff's courses.  
 21 (*Id.*¶7.)

22 Counsel for Plaintiff apologizes to the Court and Defendants for any confusion  
 23 the prior misunderstanding caused. Plaintiff intends to re-designate its trade secrets to  
 24 account for this error, and requests that the Court adopt a schedule for this re-  
 25 designation.

### 26 **D. The Wordpress Blog**

27 In or before May 2010, Defendant Skywalker (in coordination with other  
 28 anonymous Defendants) started the blog entitled Beyond the Art of Living and located at  
 <aolfree.wordpress.com> (the "Wordpress Blog"). (Dhall Decl. ¶44; Declaration of

1 Doe/Skywalker [D.E. No. 15] (“First Skywalker Decl.”) ¶3.) The ostensible purpose of the  
 2 Wordpress Blog is to provide former students of Plaintiff and those doubting Plaintiff’s  
 3 teachings a space to heal, find answers, and understand the experiences they went  
 4 through as students of Plaintiff. (Declaration of Jeffrey M. Rosenfeld in Opp. to  
 5 Defendants’ Motions [D.E. No. 39] ¶¶3-5 & Exs. A-C.) In fact, the Wordpress Blog is used  
 6 as a forum to disparage Plaintiff and its teachings. (Dhall Decl. ¶46.)

7 In addition to publishing disparaging statements on the Wordpress Blog,  
 8 Defendant Skywalker (possibly with other Defendants) posted Plaintiff’s trade-secret  
 9 materials on the blog. (First Skywalker Decl. ¶9 & Exs. B-D.) Specifically, during June  
 10 and July of 2010, Skywalker posted versions of Plaintiff’s Manuals, Plaintiff’s Teaching  
 11 Notes, and a link to a version of Plaintiff’s Teaching Notes, all on the Wordpress Blog.  
 12 (*Id.*) The Wordpress Blog is viewed by thousands of people each month. (Declaration of  
 13 Dr. Frederick B. Cohen in Opp. to Defendants’ Motions [D.E. No. 54] ¶2-7 & Exs. A-B.)

#### 14 **E. Procedural History**

15 On November 5, 2010, Plaintiff filed its initial complaint against several Doe  
 16 Defendants who operate and contribute to the Wordpress Blog [D.E. No. 1.] The initial  
 17 complaint asserted claims for copyright infringement, misappropriation of trade secrets,  
 18 defamation, and trade libel. [D.E. No. 1.] On January 31, 2011, pseudonymous  
 19 Defendants Klim and Skywalker filed a motion to dismiss, a motion to strike under Code  
 20 of Civil Procedure 425.16, and a motion to quash the subpoenas that Plaintiff had  
 21 issued to Google and Automattic. [D.E. Nos. 11-13.]

22 On June 15, 2011, Judge Koh entered an order granting in part and denying in  
 23 part Defendants’ motion to dismiss and denying Defendants’ motion to strike (the “Prior  
 24 Order”). [D.E. No. 83.] The Court dismissed Plaintiff’s defamation and trade libel  
 25 claims, but denied the motion to strike as to Plaintiff’s misappropriation of trade secrets  
 26 claim. Because Defendants had not attacked Plaintiff’s copyright infringement claim in  
 27 either their motion to dismiss or motion to strike, that claim remained alive as well. In  
 28 denying the motion to strike, the Court made several findings, including that:

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
150 Post Street, Suite 520  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
www.KBInternetLaw.com

- 1 • Skywalker posted the Manuals and Teaching Notes on the Wordpress Blog.  
2 (Prior Order at 17:12-13.)
- 3 • Plaintiff has submitted credible evidence that it derives independent economic  
4 value from the Manuals and Teaching Notes. (Prior Order at 17:23-24.)
- 5 • Plaintiff has submitted credible evidence that it uses reasonable efforts to  
6 keep the Manuals and Teaching Notes confidential. (Prior Order at 17:24-  
7 25.)
- 8 • Plaintiff generates revenue from its courses, which are based on the Manuals  
9 and Teaching Notes. (Prior Order at 17:26-27.)
- 10 • Plaintiff distinguishes itself from other organizations that teach breathing,  
11 yoga, and meditation by offering courses based on its Manuals and Teaching  
12 Notes. (Prior Order at 17:28-18:1.)

13 In the Prior Order, the Court also made several relevant legal findings:

- 14 • The spiritual nature of the Manuals and Teaching Notes does not remove  
15 them from trade secret protection. (17:14-15.)
- 16 • The secrecy requirement in a trade secret misappropriation claim is a fact-  
17 intensive analysis and a relative concept. (Prior Order at 18:14-15.)
- 18 • The Court has found no authority finding that a motion to strike a trade secret  
19 claim is an appropriate remedy for a failure to designate the trade secrets with  
20 sufficient particularity under Code of Civil Procedure section 2019.210. (Prior  
21 Order at 19:5-7.)

22 In its Prior Order, the Court also instructed Plaintiff to identify the scope of its trade  
23 secrets with greater particularity. Thus, on July 7, Plaintiff served its amended trade  
24 secret designations on Defendants' counsel, and on July 14, Plaintiff filed its First  
25 Amended Complaint, which asserted claims for copyright infringement and  
26 misappropriation of trade secrets against Defendant Skywalker and unknown  
27 Defendants that materially assisted Skywalker in his misconduct. [D.E. No. 85.] On  
28

1 September 12, Defendants filed the instant special motion to strike Plaintiff's trade  
2 secret claim.

### 3 ARGUMENT

4 Adjudication of an anti-SLAPP motion involves a two-part process. First, the  
5 moving party must establish that the plaintiff's cause of action arises from the defendant's  
6 free speech or petition activity. See *Marijanovic v. Gray, York & Duffy*, 137 Cal. App. 4th  
7 1262, 1270 (2006). Second, if the moving defendant meets that burden then the burden  
8 shifts to the plaintiff to establish a probability of prevailing. See *id.* In order to establish  
9 such a probability, the plaintiff must make a prima facie showing of facts, which would, if  
10 proven at trial, support a judgment in the plaintiff's favor. See *id.*

11 In considering an anti-SLAPP motion, the plaintiff's burden of establishing a  
12 probability of prevailing is not high. See *Overstock.com, Inc. v. Gradient Analytics, Inc.*,  
13 151 Cal. App. 4th 688, 699–700 (2007). The Court must not weigh credibility, evaluate  
14 the weight of the plaintiff's evidence, or consider conflicting evidence presented by the  
15 defendant. See *id.*; *Moore v. Shaw*, 116 Cal. App. 4th 182, 196–98 (2004). Instead, the  
16 Court must accept as true all evidence favorable to the plaintiff and determine if that  
17 evidence is sufficient to establish Plaintiff's claim at trial. See *id.*; *Paiva v. Nichols*, 168  
18 Cal. App. 4th 1007, 1017 (2008). The Court looks to and assesses the defendant's  
19 evidence only to determine if it defeats the plaintiff's submission as a matter of law. See  
20 *Grewal v. Jammu*, 191 Cal. App. 4th 977, 989 (2011). Thus, only a cause of action that  
21 lacks minimal merit will be stricken by an anti-SLAPP motion. See *Smith v. Adventist*  
22 *Health Sys./West*, 190 Cal. App. 4th 40, 50 (2010); *Overstock.com, Inc.* 151 Cal. App.  
23 4th at 699-700.

24 Here, the Court has already found that Plaintiff has presented sufficient evidence to  
25 establish its claim at trial with respect to most of the issues raised in Defendants' current  
26 motion to strike. Defendants fare no better with the few issues not already decided by  
27  
28

1 the Court. For these reasons and as set forth in more detail below, the Court should deny  
2 Defendants' special motion to strike.<sup>1</sup>

3 **A. The Court has already found that the Manuals and Teaching Notes constitute**  
4 **trade secrets, and that Skywalker published them.**

5 To establish a claim for misappropriation of trade secrets under California law, a  
6 plaintiff must show: 1) the existence of a trade secret, and 2) misappropriation of the  
7 trade secret. See *DocMagic, Inc. v. Ellie Mae, Inc.*, 745 F. Supp. 2d 1119, 1145 (N.D.  
8 Cal. 2010). California law defines a trade secret as:

9 information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device,  
10 method, technique, or process, that: (1) Derives independent economic  
11 value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to the public or  
12 to other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or  
13 use; and (2) Is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the  
14 circumstances to maintain its secrecy. Civ. Code §3426.1(d).

15 In its Prior Order, the Court found that Plaintiff had submitted competent evidence  
16 that it possesses trade secrets in the Manuals and Teaching Notes, and that Defendant  
17 Skywalker misappropriated those trade secrets. Specifically, the Court found that Plaintiff  
18 had submitted sufficient evidence that it derives economic value from the Manuals and  
19 Teaching Notes, that Plaintiff uses reasonable measures to keep the Manuals and Teaching  
20 Notes confidential, and that Defendant Skywalker posted the Manuals and Teaching Notes  
21 on the Wordpress Blog. (Prior Order at 17:8-18:23.) Considering these findings of the  
22 Court, most of Defendants' motion makes no sense.

23 <sup>1</sup> Defendants seek fees under Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16 based on  
24 Plaintiff's decision not to include defamation and trade libel claims in its First Amended  
25 Complaint, arguing that Defendants are prevailing parties. This request makes no sense  
26 and is contradicted by Ninth Circuit authority.

27 In *Verizon Delaware, Inc. v. Covad Communications Co.*, 377 F.3d 1081, 1091  
28 (9th Cir. 2004), the court found that "the purpose of the anti-SLAPP statute, the early  
dismissal of meritless claims, would still be served if plaintiffs eliminated the offending  
claims from their original complaint." Thus, the court went on to find that "if the offending  
claims remain in the first amended complaint, the anti-SLAPP remedies remain available  
to defendants." *Id.* at 1091.

Here, the offending claims—*i.e.* Plaintiff's defamation and trade libel claims—did  
not remain in the First Amended Complaint. Thus, under *Verizon Delaware*, the anti-  
SLAPP remedies do not remain available to Defendants as to these claims, particularly  
where the Court never granted Defendants' original anti-SLAPP motion as to these  
claims.

1           Moreover, to the extent that Defendants seek to introduce new evidence that Plaintiff  
 2 does not use reasonable efforts to keep the Manuals or Teaching Notes confidential or that  
 3 Plaintiff does not derive economic value from its trade secrets, Defendants are asking the  
 4 Court to weigh their evidence against Plaintiff's evidence. As discussed above, such a  
 5 weighing of evidence is inappropriate in analyzing a special motion to strike. Because the  
 6 Court has already determined that Plaintiff has established the elements of its trade  
 7 secret claim with competent evidence, Defendants' motion must fail.

8           **B. Contrary to Defendants' argument, Plaintiff owns the Manuals and the**  
 9           **Teaching Notes.**

10           In its Prior Order, the Court recognized that Plaintiff had submitted evidence that it  
 11 owns the Manuals and Teaching Notes. (Prior Order at 3:2-9, 17:23-18:11.) Specifically,  
 12 Plaintiff developed the Manuals and Teaching Notes in consultation with Shankar, and  
 13 Plaintiff retains the rights to these documents. (Dhall Decl. ¶¶24-25, 29-31; Fischman Decl.  
 14 ¶4.)

15           Notwithstanding this finding, Defendants argue that Plaintiff does not own the trade  
 16 secrets at issue, because Plaintiff's Manuals and Teaching Notes appear to have been  
 17 published abroad. (Mot. at 6:3-12.) Defendants cite to no evidence to support this  
 18 argument, nor could they. As the Court has already found, Plaintiff has submitted competent  
 19 evidence that it owns the Manuals and Teaching Notes. To the extent there is any doubt,  
 20 Plaintiff has submitted additional testimony by the co-author of the Manuals and Teaching  
 21 Notes, establishing that Plaintiff owns the specific documents attached to its trade secret  
 22 designation, which Plaintiff created in consultation with Shankar. (Fischman Decl. ¶4.)  
 23 Thus, Defendants' argument fails and their motion should be denied.

24           **C. The designated portions of the Manuals and Teaching Notes constitute trade**  
 25           **secrets where they are not generally known to the public.**

26           While Defendants argue that the designated portions of the Manuals and Teaching  
 27 Notes are generally known, and thus cannot be trade secrets, Defendants' argument fails for  
 28 several reasons, discussed in detail in the following sections. First, Plaintiffs' counsel  
 misspoke at the prior hearing when he said that Plaintiff's students do not sign a

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
 150 Post Street, Suite 520  
 San Francisco, CA 94108  
 www.KBIInternetLaw.com

1 confidentiality agreement. This was incorrect. Plaintiff's students must agree not to disclose  
 2 the contents of Plaintiff's courses before they can take a course. Second, even if students  
 3 did not sign a confidentiality agreement, the fact that a teaching method is observed by  
 4 students does not make the method unprotectable as a trade secret. Rather, where a  
 5 teaching method is sufficiently nuanced or complex, such that a student would not  
 6 remember it outside of the class, trade secret protection remains. Third, the audio recording  
 7 of the Panchakosha Guided Meditation that Defendants' counsel downloaded differs from  
 8 Plaintiff's trade secret version, and these differences include novel components entitling  
 9 Plaintiff's method to trade secret protection. Finally, while the Manuals and Teaching Notes  
 10 refer to traditional Hindu concepts, they use those concepts in novel ways with additional  
 11 proprietary components. Trade secret protection exists for the use of traditional concepts in  
 12 novel ways, particularly when coupled with novel components. Thus, as explained in more  
 13 detail below, Defendants' argument that the Manuals and Teaching Notes do not contain  
 14 trade secrets fails.

15 However, if there is any question about whether the Manuals and Teaching Notes  
 16 contain trade secrets, that is a question of fact, which must be resolved by a jury. See *San*  
 17 *Jose Const., Inc. v. S.B.C.C., Inc.*, 155 Cal. App. 4th 1528, 1537 (2007); *Thompson v.*  
 18 *Impaxx, Inc.*, 113 Cal. App. 4th 1425, 1430 (2003).

19 **1. Plaintiff's students must agree not to disclose the contents of Plaintiff's**  
 20 **courses.**

21 Since before the creation of the Manuals and Teaching Notes, Plaintiff has required  
 22 students to agree not to disclose the contents of Plaintiff's courses. (Fischman Decl. ¶7.)  
 23 Plaintiff's counsel previously misinformed the Court about the use of such agreements, and  
 24 apologizes for this error. Plaintiff has now confirmed that students must sign a confidentiality  
 25 agreement before taking one of Plaintiff's courses. (*Id.* ¶7.) This agreement requires  
 26 students not to "disclose the content of this course to anyone [and] further agree that  
 27 [he/she] will not attempt to instruct others in any of the techniques used in the course until  
 28 such time as [he/she] receive[s] personal training from Sri Sri Ravi Shankar and the Art of

1 Living Foundation.” (*Id.* Ex. A.) This agreement—or a similar version of it—has been used  
 2 by Plaintiff since before the Manuals and Teaching Notes were created. (*Id.* ¶7.)

3 Plaintiff’s confidentiality requirement makes this case analogous to *Religious Tech.*  
 4 *Ctr. v. Netcom On-Line Communication Serv.*, 923 F. Supp. 1231, 1253 (N.D. Cal. 1995),  
 5 where in analyzing the confidentiality of trade secrets, the court found that “adherents of the  
 6 church . . . are under a duty of confidentiality as to the materials.” See also *Bridge Publ’ns,*  
 7 *Inc. v. Vien*, 827 F. Supp. 629, 633 (S.D. Cal. 1993) (finding that plaintiff used reasonable  
 8 steps to keep religious materials secret when they required church adherents to sign an  
 9 agreement to maintain secrecy). Because Plaintiff takes reasonable efforts to keep its  
 10 Manuals and Teaching Notes confidential—including by requiring both student-teachers and  
 11 end-students not to disclose the materials outside of Plaintiff’s courses—Plaintiff’s trade  
 12 secrets are not generally known to the public. Thus, the Court should deny Defendants’  
 13 motion to the extent it is based on a lack of secrecy of the Manuals and Teaching Notes.

14 **2. Even if students did not sign confidentiality agreements, courts have**  
 15 **found that teaching procedures can constitute trade secrets.**

16 The Court and Defendants have questioned whether the portions of the Manuals and  
 17 Teaching Notes that are observed by students can constitute trade secrets. This question is  
 18 now moot where Plaintiff has clarified that all of its students are required to sign  
 19 confidentiality agreements. But even if Plaintiff did not require its students to sign  
 20 confidentiality agreements, the Manuals and Teaching Notes would still warrant trade secret  
 21 protection. The few courts that have addressed the issue have found that teacher training  
 22 processes and classroom techniques can constitute trade secrets—even when the students  
 23 are not subject to a confidentiality agreement—when the techniques are sufficiently complex  
 24 or nuanced such that a student would not be expected to remember the techniques.

- 25 • *Harvey Barnett, Inc. v. Shidler*, 338 F.3d 1125 (10th Cir. 2003): The plaintiff,  
 26 which offered a swimming instruction program, asserted a trade secret claim  
 27 against three former employees. In a five-week course, the plaintiff trained its  
 28 instructors to teach the plaintiff’s swimming courses, and the instructors received a



1 videotape showing the techniques. The Tenth Circuit found that the district court  
2 had improperly looked at the individual components of the swimming program  
3 rather than the whole in finding that the plaintiff did not have a trade secret. Thus,  
4 the Tenth Circuit found that the plaintiff had raised genuine issues of fact as to  
5 whether their instruction techniques were trade secrets.

- 6 • State ex rel. Perrea v. Cincinnati Pub. Sch., 916 N.E.2d 1049 (2009): Cincinnati  
7 Public Schools (“CPS”), a public school district, required teachers to use  
8 prescribed assessment exams. Perrea, a high school teacher within the CPS  
9 district, requested copies of the prior exams. Perrea’s request was denied on the  
10 ground that the exams constituted trade secrets. Perrea filed an action to compel  
11 CPS to produce the exams. While the court acknowledged that the exams were  
12 fully disclosed to students and teachers without a confidentiality requirement, the  
13 court nevertheless found that the exams were trade secrets where students and  
14 teachers were not permitted to make copies of the exams.
- 15 • Smokenders, Inc. v. Smoke No More, Inc., 184 U.S.P.Q. 309, 1974 WL 20234  
16 (S.D. Fla. 1974): The plaintiff, which operated a smoke cessation program,  
17 asserted a trade secret claim against a competitive service. The plaintiff had  
18 reduced its program to a written manual, which contained smoke cessation  
19 concepts and techniques to be communicated to students. Plaintiff’s instructors  
20 were required to sign a written statement not to appropriate or disclose any portion  
21 of the manual; however the attendees of the plaintiff’s program were not required  
22 to sign a confidentiality agreement. See *Religious Tech. Ctr.*, 923 F. Supp. at 1252  
23 (analyzing *Smokenders*). The court found that the plaintiff’s manual constituted a  
24 trade secret, emphasizing that “the length and complexity of the program make it  
25 too much for an attendee to remember or to memorize enough of the program to  
26 appropriate it.”

27 Based on this case law, teacher training processes and classroom techniques can  
28 constitute trade secrets—even when the students are not subject to a confidentiality

1 agreement—when the techniques are sufficiently complex or nuanced. Thus, even if Plaintiff  
 2 did not require its students to sign confidentiality agreements, Plaintiff’s Manuals and  
 3 Teaching Notes would remain protectable as confidential teaching methods.

4 **3. The Panchakosha Guided Meditation downloaded by Defendants differs**  
 5 **from the Panchakosha process in Plaintiff’s Manuals.**

6 In his declaration, Defendants’ counsel states that he purchased and downloaded a  
 7 recording of Shankar conducting a version of the Panchakosha Guided Meditation  
 8 (Declaration of Joshua Koltun in Support of Second Special Motion to Strike (“Koltun Decl.”)  
 9 ¶12.) Thus, Defendants argue that the portion of Plaintiff’s Manuals describing Panchakosha  
 10 is in the public domain. The problem with Defendants’ argument is that there are significant  
 11 and strategic differences between the downloaded version and the version in Plaintiff’s  
 12 Manuals.

13 First, the Panchakosha version in the Manuals contains timing, breathing, and resting  
 14 instructions that are not in the downloaded version, referred to as “gaps.” (Fischman Decl.  
 15 ¶10.) These gaps are an important and intentional aspect of Plaintiff’s unique approach to  
 16 Panchakosha Guided Meditation, which is taught in Plaintiff’s courses, and which differs  
 17 from other versions of Panchakosha. (*Id.*) Second, the Manual contains specific instructions  
 18 on how to teach Panchakosha, which are not in the downloaded version. (*Id.*) Again, these  
 19 instructions are important aspects of Plaintiff’s teaching of Panchakosha, which distinguish  
 20 Plaintiff’s teachings from the teachings of others. (*Id.*) Finally, the actual Panchakosha  
 21 meditation process described in the Manuals differs from the downloaded version. (*Id.* ¶11.)

22 These differences are not minor or unintentional. Plaintiff has expended significant  
 23 resources developing and refining its proprietary Panchakosha Guided Meditation, and  
 24 specifically the timing gaps. (Fischman Decl. ¶10.) Moreover, Plaintiff has diligently  
 25 protected this method as a trade secret. (*Id.* ¶11.) The fact that Defendants downloaded  
 26 another version of Panchakosha, which does not contain Plaintiff’s trade secret information,  
 27 in no way disproves Plaintiff’s possession of a trade secret in Plaintiff’s novel, proprietary  
 28 version of Panchakosha.

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
 150 Post Street, Suite 520  
 San Francisco, CA 94108  
 www.KBIInternetLaw.com

1           **4. While Plaintiff's trade secrets refer to traditional Hindu concepts, they**  
2           **also include specific, novel, and proprietary teaching methods.**

3           Defendants argue that Plaintiff's trade secrets are common assertions of Hindu  
4           mysticism, and are thus not entitled to trade secret protection. (Mot. at 10:10-11.) While it is  
5           true that Plaintiff's Manuals and Teaching Notes refer to traditional Hindu concepts, Plaintiff's  
6           texts include much more than these references. Plaintiff's Manuals and Teaching Notes  
7           include specific approaches to the teaching of breathing, meditation, and yoga, which were  
8           designed by Plaintiff to simplify the exercise processes and to maximize the benefit for  
9           students. (Fischman Decl. ¶9.) While Plaintiff's methods refer to traditional Hindu concepts,  
10          Plaintiff's teaching methods incorporate novel instructional components, which transform the  
11          methods into protectable trade secrets. (*Id.*) Thus, even though Plaintiff's trade secrets refer  
12          to concepts in the public domain, Plaintiff's teaching methods are entitled to protection where  
13          they incorporate novel aspects. See *O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.*, 420  
14          F. Supp. 2d 1070, 1089 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (stating that "combinations of non-secret  
15          information can be trade secrets"); *Harvey Barnett, Inc.*, 338 F.3d at 1130 (finding that  
16          plaintiff's swimming instruction techniques were trade secrets when they included unique  
17          and novel components).

18          Defendants' specific examples fare no better. Defendants argue that Plaintiff's  
19          Manuals and Teaching Notes cannot comprise trade secrets where they refer to the  
20          traditional Hindu concepts of: a) Brahman and Atman, b) the So Ham mantra, and c) the  
21          guru's grace. (Mot. at 11:1-2, 11:20-21, 13:1-6.) However, Plaintiff does not contend that it  
22          has trade secret rights over these traditional Hindu concepts. Rather, Plaintiff has trade  
23          secret rights over its novel teaching methods, which in some cases refer to these traditional  
24          concepts. Defendants fail to explain how public knowledge of So Ham, Brahman, Atman, or  
25          the guru's grace relates to Plaintiff's specific teaching methods. Nor do Defendants argue  
26          that these traditional concepts comprise the entirety of Plaintiff's trade secrets, such that  
27          Plaintiff has not added any novel component. Thus, Plaintiff's novel teaching methods—  
28          including those that refer to traditional Hindu concepts—are fully protectable under California  
trade secret law.

1 Finally, if any question remains about whether Plaintiff's trade secrets only comprise  
2 publicly known concepts, this is a question of fact that must be resolved by a jury. See *San*  
3 *Jose Const., Inc.*, 155 Cal. App. 4th at 1537 (finding that whether information is a trade  
4 secret is ordinarily a question of fact). Thus, the Court should deny Defendants' motion.

5 **D. Contrary to Defendants' argument, Plaintiff need not disentangle its trade**  
6 **secrets from religious issues to enjoy trade secret protection.**

7 Defendants argue that the Court cannot decide whether the Manuals and Teaching  
8 Notes contain trade secrets because such a decision would impermissibly entangle the  
9 Court in religious matters. (Mot. at 16:27-17:2.) This is incorrect. As the Court has already  
10 found, the spiritual nature of Plaintiff's works does not remove them from trade secret  
11 protection. (Prior Order at 17:14-15.) In so finding, the Court relied on *Religious Tech. Ctr.*  
12 923 F. Supp. at 1252, which found:

13 Thus, there is at least some precedent for granting trade secret status  
14 to works that are techniques for improving oneself (though not  
15 specifically spiritually). Conversely, there is no authority for excluding  
16 religious materials from trade secret protection because of their nature.  
17 Indeed, there is no authority for excluding any type of information  
18 because of its nature. While the trade secret laws did not necessarily  
19 develop to allow a religion to protect a monopoly in its religious  
20 practices, the laws have nonetheless expanded such that the Church's  
21 techniques, which clearly are "used in the operation of the enterprise,"  
22 Restatement § 39, at 425, are deserving of protection if secret and  
23 valuable.

24 Similarly, in *Bridge Publ'ns, Inc.* 827 F. Supp. at 634-35, the court found:

25 [P]laintiffs' claims for copyright and trade secret protection are not barred  
26 by the religious nature of the works. The court expressly held that  
27 enforcing plaintiffs' right in these works violated neither the establishment  
28 clause nor the free exercise clause. See *United Christian Scientists v.*  
*Christian Sci. Bd. of Dir., First Church of Christ Scientist*, 829 F.2d  
1152, 1159 (D.C.Cir.1987) ("normally, a grant of copyright on a religious  
work poses no constitutional difficulty. Religious works are eligible for  
protection under general copyright laws"); *Religious Tech. Ctr., Church*  
*of Scientology Int'l, Inc. v. Scott*, 869 F.2d 1306, 1309-10 (9th Cir.1989)  
(religious material can qualify as a trade secret under California law if it  
confers on its owner an actual economic advantage over competitors.)

Despite the foregoing case law, Defendants argue that the decision in *Maktab Tarighe*  
*Oveyssi Shah Maghsoudi, Inc. v. Kianfar*, 179 F.3d 1244 (9th Cir. 1999) prevents the Court

1 from considering whether a spiritual or religious text contains trade secrets. However, this is  
2 not what *Maktab* says. In fact, *Maktab* undermines Defendants' position, holding:

3 In avoiding the religious thicket, however, we must be careful not to  
4 deprive religious organizations of all recourse to the protections of civil  
5 law that are available to all others. Such a deprivation would raise its  
6 own serious problems under the Free Exercise Clause. It would also  
7 leave religious organizations at the mercy of anyone who appropriated  
8 their property with an assertion of religious right to it.

9 The Supreme Court accordingly has recognized that courts may play a  
10 role in resolving religious property disputes. "[N]ot every civil court  
11 decision as to property claimed by a religious organizations jeopardizes  
12 values protected by the First Amendment."

13 [¶]

14 The Supreme Court has held that, wholly apart from the hierarchical  
15 decision-making apparatus of the religious organization, a court may  
16 resolve property disputes by applying secular principles of property,  
17 trust and corporate law when the instruments upon which those  
18 principles operate are at hand. Thus no First Amendment issue arises  
19 when a court resolves a church property dispute by relying on state  
20 statutes concerning the holding of religious property, the language in  
21 the relevant deeds, and the terms of corporate charters of religious  
22 organizations. *Maktab*, 179 F.3d at 1248-49 (internal quotations and  
23 citations omitted).

24 The *Maktab* court went on to find that the plaintiffs' trademark infringement claims against  
25 a competing religious organization were susceptible to decision by neutral principles. *Id.*  
26 at 449.

27 Defendants' efforts to distinguish this case from *Maktab*, *Religious Technology*  
28 *Center*, and *Bridge Publications* are unavailing. As with the claims in each of those cases,  
Plaintiff's trade secret claim can be decided on neutral principles, where the Court and/or  
jury need only determine whether Plaintiff has used reasonable efforts to keep its trade  
secrets confidential and whether Plaintiff derives economic value from their secrecy.  
Defendants are free to argue—as they have already unsuccessfully done and as was  
argued in *Religious Technology Center* and *Bridge Publications*—that Plaintiff's trade  
secrets are generally known to the public. However, the resolution of this argument does not  
improperly embroil the Court in religious matters, but rather involves a straightforward

1 comparison of Plaintiff's texts to texts in the public domain. Thus, the Court should deny  
2 Defendants' motion to strike on this basis as well.

3 **E. Plaintiff has already established that it takes reasonable measures to protect**  
4 **its trade secrets.**

5 In its Prior Order, the Court found that Plaintiff had submitted credible evidence that it  
6 uses reasonable measures to protect its trade secrets. (Prior Order at 18:4-23.) Despite this  
7 finding, Defendants re-hash their argument that Plaintiff's confidentiality measures are  
8 inadequate. Defendants first argue that Plaintiff's trade secrets originated from outside the  
9 U.S., and that international chapters of the Art of Living do not impose the same  
10 confidentiality obligations as Plaintiff. (Mot. at 20:23-27.) Defendants' argument fails where  
11 the Manuals and Teaching Notes were developed by Plaintiff in consultation with Shankar,  
12 and Plaintiff owns the Manuals, the Teaching Notes, and the intellectual property rights in  
13 these texts. (Fischman Decl. ¶¶4-5.) Moreover, Plaintiff has used diligent efforts to preserve  
14 the confidentiality of the Manuals and Teaching Notes. (*Id.* ¶¶6-7.) Where Plaintiff has  
15 authorized a third party to use the Manuals or Teaching Notes—such as another chapter of  
16 the Art of Living—Plaintiff has required that the third party adhere to the same confidentiality  
17 protocols as Plaintiff. (*Id.* ¶8.)

18 Defendants Skywalker and Klim have submitted declarations claiming that other  
19 chapters of the Art of Living do not impose the same confidentiality obligations as Plaintiff.  
20 (Second Declaration of Doe/Skywalker ¶¶14-16; Second Declaration of Doe/Klim ¶3.)  
21 However, Defendants' anonymous, self-serving declarations lack any semblance of  
22 foundation. Neither Plaintiff nor the Court knows anything about Defendants, nor can we  
23 verify any of their contentions. We don't know whether Skywalker and Klim were actually  
24 teachers for a chapter of Art of Living, as they claim. We don't know whether Skywalker and  
25 Klim actually live outside the U.S, as they claim. We don't know the basis of Skywalker's  
26 testimony about how confidentiality is enforced by Plaintiff. As discussed in the evidentiary  
27 objections below, the Court should exclude these declarations in their entirety. Regardless  
28

1 of whether the Court excludes these declarations, Plaintiff has submitted sufficient evidence  
2 that Plaintiff keeps its trade secrets confidential.

3 Defendants also argue that Plaintiff's instructors do not know what portions of the  
4 Manuals and Teaching Notes are confidential, and thus cannot have understood what  
5 content was to be taught to students. (Mot. at 21:15-20.) Defendants' argument fails where  
6 Plaintiff's instructors are expressly told to keep the entirety of the Manuals and Teaching  
7 Notes confidential. (Fischman Decl. ¶6.) As clarified above, both Plaintiff's teachers and  
8 Plaintiff's students are under an obligation of confidentiality concerning Plaintiff's courses.  
9 Teachers are required not to disclose the Manuals and Teaching Notes except when  
10 teaching Plaintiff's courses. Students are required not to disclose any content from Plaintiff's  
11 courses. Given Plaintiff's confidentiality requirements for both teachers and students,  
12 Plaintiff need not distinguish between portions of its Manuals and Teaching Notes to  
13 maintain trade secret protection.

14 Because the Court has already found that Plaintiff submitted evidence that it uses  
15 reasonable efforts to maintain the confidentiality of its trade secrets, the Court should deny  
16 Defendants' motion on this basis. If any question remains about whether Plaintiff uses  
17 reasonable efforts to maintain confidentiality, this is a question of fact that must be resolved  
18 by a jury. *See In re Providian Credit Card Cases*, 96 Cal. App. 4th 292, 306 (2002).

19 **F. Plaintiff has already established that the Manuals and Teaching Notes have**  
20 **independent economic value.**

21 As with their first motion to strike, Defendants argue that Plaintiff's trade secrets do  
22 not have independent economic value. (Mot. at 16:3-6.) However, the Court has already  
23 found that Plaintiff has submitted credible evidence that it derives independent economic  
24 value from the Manuals and Teaching Notes. (Prior Order at 17:23-24.) The core  
25 inquiry when determining whether information has independent economic value is the  
26 value to the owner in keeping the information secret from persons who could exploit it to  
27 the relative disadvantage of the owner. *See Yield Dynamics, Inc. v. TEA Sys. Corp.*,  
28 154 Cal. App. 4th 547, 568 (2007). As the Court already found, Plaintiff generates

1 revenue from its courses, based on the Manuals and Teaching Notes, and distinguishes  
 2 itself from other organizations that teach breathing, yoga, and meditation by offering  
 3 courses based on its Manuals and Teaching Notes. (Prior Order at 17:26-18:1.)  
 4 Defendants have presented no evidence to support their re-hashed argument that such  
 5 value does not exist. Thus, Defendants' motion should be denied on this basis as well.

6 **G. Skywalker has admitted to posting materials designated by Plaintiff as trade  
 7 secrets.**

8 Defendants argue that most of the materials that Plaintiff has designated as a trade  
 9 secret were never posted by Skywalker. Defendants' argument fails where: a) Skywalker  
 10 has admitted to posting portions of Plaintiff's trade secrets, and b) based on the realization  
 11 that all of Plaintiff's students must sign a confidentiality agreement, Plaintiff intends to re-  
 12 designate its trade secrets to cover additional materials unlawfully published by Skywalker.

13 First, Skywalker admits that he posted text that significantly overlaps with Plaintiff's  
 14 Sudarshan Kriya Teaching Notes, one of Plaintiff's most sacred and economically valuable  
 15 documents. (First Skywalker Decl. [D.E. No. 15] ¶9 & Exs. B-D.) The fact that that  
 16 Skywalker only misappropriated some but not all of Plaintiff's trade secrets does not excuse  
 17 his misconduct. This evidence is sufficient to state a claim for misappropriation of trade  
 18 secrets.

19 Second, Plaintiff's counsel has now corrected its misunderstanding regarding the  
 20 confidentiality obligations for Plaintiff's students. Specifically, Plaintiff has confirmed that  
 21 both teachers and students are required to keep the Manuals, Teaching Notes, and course  
 22 content confidential. In light of this realization, Plaintiff seeks to re-designate its trade  
 23 secrets, and asks that the Court set a schedule for Plaintiff to do so. Once re-designated,  
 24 the overlap between Plaintiff's trade secrets and Skywalker's publications will become more  
 25 pervasive. For both of these reasons, the Court should deny Defendants' motion.

26 **H. Plaintiff does not need to quantify its damages, but is prepared to do so after  
 27 discovery.**

28 Defendants argue that Plaintiff cannot succeed on its trade secrets claim if Plaintiff  
 does not establish a precise loss. Defendants are incorrect. Quantifiable damages are



1 not an element of a claim for misappropriation of trade secrets. See *DocMagic*, 745 F.  
2 Supp. 2d at 1145. Rather, California law permits judicial relief even when damages are  
3 not readily quantifiable. See Civil C. §3426.3; *Ajaxo Inc. v. E\*Trade Fin. Corp.*, 187 Cal.  
4 App. 4th 1295, 1308 (2010). Specifically, Civil Code section 3426.3 provides several  
5 measures of damages upon proof of misappropriation of trade secrets: a) damages for  
6 the actual loss caused by misappropriation, b) the unjust enrichment caused by  
7 misappropriation, and c) if neither damages nor unjust enrichment caused by  
8 misappropriation are provable, the court may order payment of a reasonable royalty.  
9 See *Unilogic, Inc. v. Burroughs Corp.*, 10 Cal. App. 4th 612, 626 (1992). A reasonable  
10 royalty will be calculated by the court based on what the parties would have agreed to as  
11 a fair licensing price at the time the misappropriation occurred. See *Ajaxo Inc. v.*  
12 *E\*Trade Fin. Corp.*, 187 Cal. App. 4th at 1308.

13 As Plaintiff has disclosed to Defendants, Plaintiff intends to rely on a reasonable  
14 royalty to establish its recoverable damages. Specifically, Plaintiff's trade secret  
15 damages (not including the requested punitive damages and attorneys' fees) will be  
16 calculated by multiplying the reasonable royalty by the number of viewers of the  
17 unlawfully published trade secrets.

18 As Plaintiff has also disclosed to Defendants, the number of viewers of Plaintiff's  
19 trade secrets—including all of the different media outlets in which Defendants unlawfully  
20 posted Plaintiff's trade secrets—is information in the exclusive control of Skywalker and  
21 third party Automattic (and possibly other anonymous defendants or third parties).  
22 Skywalker has described some of this data in his declaration (but has not actually  
23 produced it), and Automattic has produced a summary of this data. Plaintiff has not had  
24 an opportunity to question either Automattic or Skywalker about this data or to serve  
25 follow up discovery. However, based on Plaintiff's review of the data produced to date,  
26 Plaintiff will be seeking damages equal to the reasonable royalty multiplied by in excess  
27 of 4,000 viewers.

28

1 Thus, Defendants are simply incorrect that Plaintiff cannot—and has not—  
 2 established its right to recover damages. Defendants' motion should be denied for this  
 3 reason as well.

#### 4 **EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS**

5 As discussed above, the Court should deny Defendants' special motion to strike  
 6 because the Court has already found that Plaintiff has submitted competent evidence  
 7 supporting its trade secrets claim. Moreover, to the extent that Defendants have  
 8 submitted competing evidence, the Court must not consider that evidence; instead, the  
 9 Court must accept as true all evidence favorable to Plaintiff, and on that basis alone,  
 10 determine if Plaintiff has presented sufficient evidence to establish its claim at trial. See  
 11 *Moore*, 116 Cal. App. 4th at 196–198.

12 If, despite the foregoing procedure, the Court decides to review Defendants'  
 13 evidence, it should exclude large portions that lack any foundation, constitute  
 14 inadmissible hearsay, or violate the best evidence rule. Evidence presented in  
 15 connection with a special motion to strike must be admissible. See *Vergos v. McNeal*,  
 16 146 Cal. App. 4th 1387, 1400–1401 (2007). Here, the Court should exclude the following  
 17 evidence of Defendants as inadmissible:<sup>2</sup>

18 • Skywalker and Klim's Second Declarations Generally: Plaintiff objects to the  
 19 second declarations of Klim and Skywalker [D.E. Nos. 101-102] in their entirety, as their  
 20 anonymous testimony lacks the foundational requirements of the Federal Rules of  
 21 Evidence, and deprives Plaintiff of the opportunity to assess the accuracy of the  
 22 declarations. Specifically, neither Klim nor Skywalker has established that their  
 23 declarations are based on their personal knowledge. Fed. R. Evid. 602. Moreover,  
 24 Skywalker and Klim ask the Court and Plaintiff to believe their testimony without  
 25 providing Plaintiff any opportunity to contest it. Such a presumption is antithetical to the  
 26

27 <sup>2</sup> To the extent that Defendants rely on the first declaration of Skywalker and Klim [D.E.  
 28 Nos. 15-16] filed in support of Defendants' original motion to strike and motion to quash,  
 Plaintiff incorporates its original evidentiary objections contained in its opposition to  
 Defendants' motion to quash [D.E. No. 64.]

1 American judicial system. Thus, the Court should exclude the entire declarations of  
2 Skywalker and Klim.

3 • Lacking Foundation: Federal Rule of Evidence 602 provides that a witness may  
4 not testify to a matter unless sufficient evidence is introduced to support a finding that the  
5 witness has personal knowledge of the matter. Skywalker has failed to provide sufficient  
6 foundation for several portions of his second declaration [D.E. No. 101], where he  
7 provides no explanation about the source of his knowledge regarding his testimony.  
8 Thus, the Court should exclude the following portions of Skywalker's second declaration  
9 as lacking the required foundation and/or offering speculation: pp. 3:9-11, 4:9-13, 5:4-7,  
10 5:14-17, 5:18-22, 5:25-28, 6:3-6, 6:28-7:1, 7:2-9, 7:10-13, 7:17-22, 7:23-25.

11 • Containing Hearsay: Under Federal Rule of Evidence 802, hearsay is not  
12 admissible unless it falls within one of the specific exceptions in Rules 804 and 805. The  
13 Court should exclude the following portions of Skywalker's second declaration, which  
14 constitute inadmissible hearsay not subject to any exception: 4:17-22, 5:8-12, 5:15-17,  
15 5:18-22, 5:26-28, 6:28-7:1, 7:2-4, 7:10-13.

16 • Violating the Best Evidence Rule: The best evidence rule, Fed. R. Evid. 1002,  
17 excludes secondary evidence offered to prove the contents of a writing, recording, or  
18 photograph. Paragraph 24 of the Skywalker's second declaration describes analytics  
19 data from the Wordpress Blog, but Skywalker has failed to produce the data (for a  
20 second time). Skywalker cannot rely on testimony about this data without violating the  
21 best evidence rule or the hearsay rule. Thus, the Court should exclude Paragraph 24 of  
22 the Skywalker declaration. Similarly, in the declaration of Defendants' counsel (Joshua  
23 Koltun), Mr. Koltun sets forth the purported text of a digital audio file he downloaded.  
24 However, Mr. Koltun has not submitted the actual audio file in violation of Rule 1002.  
25 Thus, the Court should exclude Paragraph 24 of the Second Skywalker Declaration and  
26 Paragraph 2 of the Koltun Declaration.

27 //

28 //

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

**CONCLUSION**

For all of the reasons set forth above, the Court should deny Defendants' second special motion to strike.

DATED: September 29, 2011

**KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP**

By: s/Karl S. Kronenberger  
Karl S. Kronenberger

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Art of Living Foundation

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, LLP  
150 Post Street, Suite 520  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
www.KBInternetLaw.com