

Exhibit G

Vandenberg & Feliu, LLP

Attorneys at Law

110 East 42nd Street

New York, New York 10017

Telephone: 212-763-6800

Author's direct dial: 212-763-6838

Fax: 212-763-6810/6814

Morlan Ty Rogers

E-mail: mtrogers@vanfeliu.com

June 20, 2006

BY FEDERAL EXPRESS

The Honorable Robert M. Levy
United States Magistrate Judge
United States District Court for
the Eastern District of New York
225 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Courtesy Copy
Original Filed by ECF
Assigned doc. no.

Re: UMG Recordings, Inc. et al. v. Lindor
EDNY No. 05 Civ. 1095 (DGT) (RML)

Dear Magistrate Judge Levy:

We are the attorneys for defendant. The discovery deadline is presently June 30th.¹ By this letter, we respectfully request an extension of 60 days. Although they did not specify how long, plaintiffs' counsel indicated by voice mail today that they are agreeable to an extension of discovery.

Additionally, there are a number of open issues as to which we request rulings from Your Honor.

To provide the Court with the background on these issues, we are enclosing copies of (a) a tentative stipulation with respect to a hard drive mirror imaging inspection, (b) defendant's document requests and interrogatories to plaintiff, and (c) plaintiff's "responses".

¹ By Stipulation so ordered on January 5, 2006, the Court extended the discovery deadline to March 16th. At the parties' mutual request, the Court on March 20th extended the deadline to June 30th.

Honorable Robert M. Levy
United States Magistrate Judge
June 20, 2006
Page 2

Depositions

There is no issue about depositions. Plaintiffs have requested, and we have agreed to, half day depositions of defendant and of her son, a non-party, Mr. Raymond, to take place on July 7th, assuming that discovery is extended.

We reserve the right to take plaintiffs' depositions after they have provided good faith responses to our written discovery requests, served March 9th, which, as set forth below, they have yet to do.

Hard Drive Mirror Imaging Inspection

We are in agreement on an inspection of the hard drive for mirror imaging, to be governed by a stipulation. However, we have reached a slight impasse on the stipulation. We are in agreement on 6 paragraphs, which set forth the whole procedure. The dispute is over a 7th paragraph designed to ensure that defendant has the right to meaningful pretrial discovery on the 'mirror imaging' and its analysis if the plaintiffs are going to use the results of the imaging at trial. This was in our draft but plaintiffs object to it. We are not wedded to the specific language or mechanism, but plaintiffs refuse even to suggest any alternative language that would ensure the right to pretrial discovery. We request that Your Honor resolve this issue.

Defendant's document requests

Despite numerous requests, and the passage of more than 3 months, plaintiffs still have not provided a good faith response to our document requests, as discussed below.

Document Request No. 1: This request deals with the chain of title of the copyrights. We asked for documents showing that the plaintiff is in fact the owner of the copyright. Plaintiffs refuse to do so, unless the plaintiff is not the copyright registrant. The fact that a plaintiff may have registered a copyright with the Copyright Office does not mean that that plaintiff had the right to do so. We are entitled to establish whether the plaintiffs are in fact the owners of the copyrights in question, and request that the Court compel plaintiffs to respond to this request completely.

Document Request No. 2: We have asked for the documents among RIAA, plaintiffs, and their agents Media Sentry and "Settlement Support Center LLC". These are directly relevant to our fourth and fifth affirmative defenses for misuse of copyright. Plaintiffs have provided no documents *at all* and claim that all documents are privileged, despite

Honorable Robert M. Levy
United States Magistrate Judge
June 20, 2006
Page 3

the fact that the document request does not ask for any communications to or from counsel. As to communications which plaintiffs claim a privilege we can accept a privilege log -- one which must be very detailed if it seeks to shield communications with in-house counsel. We request that the Court compel plaintiffs to respond fully.

Document Request No. 3: This request seeks documents concerning plaintiffs' investigation of their alleged claims against defendant. Plaintiffs have produced only a smattering of documents, and have yet to produce the privilege log that they promised. We request that the Court compel them to do so.

Document Request No. 4: We asked for documents relating to plaintiffs' employees engaging in exactly the same conduct which they complain of in this action. We agreed to limit it to documents concerning instances of such conduct engaged in by employees "in the ordinary course of plaintiffs' business". (We have been advised by numerous sources that the record companies themselves are themselves big promoters and major users of the practice sought to be enjoined here. This would obviously be directly relevant to many of the defenses: laches, waiver, estoppel, fair use, unclean hands, plaintiffs' culpable conduct, plaintiffs' having authorized the conduct.). Plaintiffs have refused to produce a single relevant document. We request that the Court compel them to do so.

Document Request Nos. 5, 6, 7: Plaintiffs believe the documents which relate to their investigation of the facts are privileged, without explaining why. They should at least be compelled to produce a detailed privilege log and an explanation of the legal authority for their claim of privilege. It is fundamental that defendant is entitled to know the basis of the plaintiffs' lawsuit so that she can prepare to defend it.

Defendant's interrogatories

Interrogatory No. 1: This interrogatory asked for information concerning the employees who negotiated or entered into the "chain of title" agreements and oral communications referred to in Document Request No. 1. Plaintiff simply has refused to provide this information without any legitimate reason.

Interrogatory No. 2: This interrogatory asked for information concerning the persons who negotiated or entered into the agreements among the record companies, the RIAA, Media Sentry and/or Settlement Support Center, LLC referred to in Document Request No. 2. Plaintiff gave the same flip response without providing any of the requested information.

Honorable Robert M. Levy
United States Magistrate Judge
June 20, 2006
Page 4

Interrogatory No. 3: This interrogatory asked plaintiffs to set forth the evidentiary basis for plaintiffs' "information and belief" that copyright infringement occurred. The first five paragraphs of plaintiffs' "response" are completely non-responsive, and they do not explain how they came up with the information in the sixth paragraph, nor do they identify the name of the individual at Media Sentry who was plaintiffs' "investigator". It goes without saying that we are entitled to this information.

Interrogatory No. 4: This interrogatory asked plaintiffs to set forth the basis for its claim for damages. Plaintiffs' answer was unresponsive. Incredibly, plaintiffs claim that this interrogatory is burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. If plaintiffs had no damages, then they will have to admit this in their response.

Interrogatory No. 5: This interrogatory asked whether any of plaintiffs' employees engaged in the same conduct which they complain of in this action, and to identify such employees. As with Discovery Request No. 4, we agreed to limit the interrogatory to use of online media distribution systems by employees "in the ordinary course of plaintiffs' business". Although it is clearly relevant to defendant's defenses of waiver, estoppel, fair use, unclean hands, etc., plaintiffs have completely refused to answer this interrogatory.

Interrogatory No. 6: This interrogatory asked for information concerning the persons who worked on the investigation and/or settlement of plaintiff's claim against defendant. I.e., who at Media Sentry, Inc., Settlement Support Center, LLC, the RIAA, plaintiffs and/or others. Plaintiffs responded with the name of one individual at Media Sentry, without providing his address and job title or describing the work that he did, as requested. Plaintiffs also claimed that some responsive information was protected by privilege without setting forth any details that would allow the Court to adjudicate the legitimacy of plaintiffs' assertion of privilege. We respectfully request that the Court compel plaintiffs to furnish a complete answer, together with a detailed privilege log.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Morlan Ty Rogers

Morlan Ty Rogers (MR 3818)

enclosures

cc: J. Christopher Jensen, Esq. (by Federal Express)
Richard Gabriel, Esq. (by Federal Express)