

Before the
Copyright Royalty Judges
Washington, D.C.

_____)	
In the Matter of)	
)	
Distribution of)	Docket No. 2008-2 CRB CD
2000-2003)	2000-2003 (Phase 2)
Cable Royalty Funds)	
_____)	

**INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS GROUP’S REPLY IN SUPPORT
OF MOTION FOR FINAL DISTRIBUTION OF 2000-2003
CABLE ROYALTIES OR, ALTERNATIVELY,
SECOND RENEWED MOTION FOR PARTIAL
DISTRIBUTION OF 2000-2003 CABLE ROYALTIES**

Worldwide Subsidy Group LLC dba Independent Producers Group ("IPG") has moved that the Judges promptly address the final issue applicable to the 2000-2003 cable royalty pools in order that such matter be finally resolved, and issue an order for final distribution to IPG of the percentage to which it is entitled of the devotional programming category (31.25%) under the SDC-reported settlement agreement that was adopted as

**INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS GROUP’S REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL DISTRIBUTION
OF 2000-2003 CABLE ROYALTIES OR, ALTERNATIVELY,
SECOND RENEWED MOTION FOR PARTIAL
DISTRIBUTION OF 2000-2003 CABLE ROYALTIES**

an order by the Judges. Alternatively, IPG has moved that IPG be distributed 31.25% of the devotional 2000-2003 cable royalty pools, as applied against the *lowest* figure that could possibly be accorded to the devotional 2000-2003 cable royalty pools following resolution of the final issue before the Judges. In effect, IPG has moved that it immediately receive the lowest dollar figure that IPG could be entitled, by means of any calculation.

No “reasonable objection” to IPG’s motion has been made. The only party filing an opposition, the Settling Devotional Claimants (“SDC”), advocate denying IPG *any* of the royalties to which IPG is entitled, advocating that the Judges disregard the settlement agreement entered into between IPG and the SDC, and disregard the Judges’ order distributing 2000-2003 devotional royalties to IPG. The SDC’s encouragement that the Judges disregard the terms of the SDC’s settlement agreement and the Judges’ distribution order is based on nothing more than the SDC’s fabricated claim of IPG’s “unwillingness or inability to disgorge funds” and the SDC’s fabricated “concerns about IPG’s continued solvency”.

As the SDC's briefing reveals, the SDC's patchwork of accusations, even if accurate, would not support the conclusions the SDC advocate. The accusations do not support a determination that IPG is unwilling or unable to disgorge overdistributed funds,¹ do not raise issue with IPG's solvency, and in any event could not warrant the Judges' refusal to distribute to IPG the royalty percentages to which the SDC previously stipulated and the Judges previously ordered. Adopting the SDC's opposition would be tantamount to implementing the SDC's advocated breach of contract, but with no consequence to the party advocating the breach, only consequence to the CRB.

Finally, the SDC argue that if insufficient funds are available for a full and final distribution of 2000-2003 cable royalty funds, then IPG should receive a distribution no greater than its *pro rata* share of available amounts pending recoupment from any other parties. Because the SDC fail to

¹ Moreover, the question is logically begged how IPG could even possibly be required to disgorge "overdistributed" funds if IPG is only distributed the *minimum* funds that IPG will be entitled by any means of calculation once the final outstanding issue is resolved.

explicate, the statement suggests that IPG would receive only 31.25% of the available amounts, irrespective of the fact that the SDC was advanced significant funds in 2002, and then again in 2007. Common sense would dictate that IPG be advanced 100% of the devotional category funds until it has reached 31.25% of all distributed devotional category funds, then 31.25% thereafter.

IPG and its clients have waited an interminable amount of time to receive royalties that have been held by the Copyright Office for two decades. The royalties that remain yet-to-be-distributed are older than any other matter before the CRB by over a decade. No reasonable basis exists for failing to make final distribution of 2000-2003 cable royalties the issue of first priority for the Judges.

#

The Judges should rule in IPG's favor, without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 13, 2021

_____/s/_____
Brian D. Boydston, Esq.
California State Bar No. 155614

PICK & BOYDSTON, LLP
2288 Westwood Blvd., Ste. 212
Los Angeles, California 90064
Telephone: (424)293-0111
Facsimile: (213)624-9073
Email: brianb@ix.netcom.com

Attorneys for Independent Producers
Group

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on August 13, 2021, I caused a copy of the foregoing pleading to be served on all parties registered to receive notice by eCRB by filing through the eCRB filing system.

_____/s/_____
Brian D. Boydston, Esq.

Proof of Delivery

I hereby certify that on Friday, August 13, 2021, I provided a true and correct copy of the Independent Producers Group's Reply In Support Of Motion For Final Distribution Of 2000-2003 Cable Royalties Or, Alternatively, Second Renewed Motion For Partial Distribution Of 2000-2003 Cable Royalties to the following:

Settling Devotional Claimants (SDC), represented by Jeannette M. Carmadella, served via ESERVICE at jeannette@lutzker.com

Signed: /s/ Brian D Boydston