O

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 04-9484 AHM (SHx)	Date	July 28, 2010
Title	PERFECT 10, INC. v. GOOGLE, INC., *et al.*		

Present: The Honorable	A. HOWARD MATZ, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE	
Stephen Montes	Not Reported	
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.

Attorneys **NOT** Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys **NOT** Present for Defendants:

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS (No Proceedings Held)

NOTICE OF ERRATA REGARDING ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.'S MOTIONS FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS TO SAFE HARBOR UNDER 17 U.S.C. § 512 (DOCUMENT 937)

The Court issues this order to correct the paragraph that begins at the bottom of page 27 of the Order with "As discussed above in the section of this Order . . . ." The reference in that paragraph to Exh. 45 was incorrect. It was Exhibit 16. So, with the corrections reflected in bold, that paragraph is modified to read:

> As discussed above in the section of this Order concerning § 512(d), some Group B notices could be considered adequate for imparting notice under the DMCA. However, in its opposition papers and in oral argument at the hearing P10 did not contend that Google failed to expeditiously process even a single Blogger URL within that group of notices, although it did include **an exhibit supporting this position** (**Exh. 16, pp. 1, 2, 4, 6**) in the binder it handed up in court. *See* Zada Decl. ¶¶ 8, 41-51, 60-61, Exhs. 1, 9, 16, 28-35; Chou Decl. ¶¶ 8-11 (citing only examples of a delay in removing Blogger infringing material identified in P10's Group C notices). Thus, Google clearly is entitled to safe harbor under § 512(c) for its Blogger service for the links identified only in the Group B notices, with the possible exception of the **six** supposedly infringing URLs that were included in **Exhibit 16**.

Initials of Preparer SMO