Review of legal documents - AAWS Lawsuit Trademarks & Copyrights

(111)	

<u>Exhibit</u>	Document	<u>Page</u>	Content/Comments
001	Plaintiff's First Request For Production of Documents And Things To Defendant Frames Of Mind, Inc.	2	AAWS must have known about the letters, from staff members, "authorizing" the use of the logo in jewelry. Otherwise they would not have needed to include any letters from Waneta New or June Russell (Waneta was AAWS secretary & June GSO staff) in their discovery request. Having known this—one would think caution would be indicated and wide consultation used before taking action.
002	ORDERJudge Conboy - 5/26/92	2	In this "order" AAWS lost its fight to have designs it didn't like ruled as unusable by F.O.M. (Also see item #029-A, Topic: AAWS Request for Conference)
003	Letter to Tom Jasper from AA member on Long Island	3	[newspaper article] "Weber (Cynthia) said that AA has <u>never permitted</u> or licensed anyone to use their trademarks" Based on Item #1 this is an easily identified false statement.
004	Letter from Tom Jasper in response to questions on litigation	4	"By what authority" In the response it is only noted that the actions were taken on the AAWS Boards authority — but does not clearly answer the question of who made the decision? Obviously Tom recognizes that the authority needed here rests with an entire board. However, he seems to fail to recognize which board holds this authority and, it appears, acted as though it had been turned over to him.
005	Letters from Waneta New & June Russell (AAWS Secretary & GSO Staff, respectively)	2/25/76 3/9/76 3/27/96	These three letters give people permission to use the AA logo on jewelry and bumper stickers (decals). Since these are copies transmitted from GSO to F.O.M. (in its discovery request) it is most obvious that the attorney for AAWS & Tom Jasper knew that this had been done in the past. In the 5/27/76 letter it is obvious that this was not an isolated incident ("As usual, please fill out," - ¶ 3). Not only that, but the list of suppliers contained companies who supplied a wide variety of items with our logo on them. I have no doubt that GSO had copies of the catalogs of these suppliers and were aware of the use of the logo.
006	Defendant Frames Of Mind, Inc.'s First Set Of Interrogatories To Plaintiff	5	"ldentify each person who was involved in the promulgation or adoption of the guidelines regarding the use of marks contained in the AA General Service Manuals 1968/89 and 1989/90 editions" Not only are Conference members having their anonymity compromised, this kind of discovery precedes adding names as defendants in future suits having to do with the logo policy in the Service Manual. AAWS foolishly added unnecessary legal risk to the members of the Conferences that approved the noted policy.
007	Notice To Produce	7&9	Requests copies of letters from AA members in which the logos, or use of the logos, is a topic. Not only are Conference members compromised, here we see that individual AA members — writing in what they thought to be complete anonymity — are compromised as well. Should individual names be used in a courtroom argument, or a legal brief, a members affiliation with AA could become a matter of public record.
008	Reply Declaration	2	States that F.O.M. suffered a 42% decline in sales as a direct result of AAWS' actions. Due to our unwillingness to pursue the lawsuit in California (Freedman Jewelry Co), do we now stand to be held pliable for a financial payment should F.O.M. decide to sue us for failure to live up to the Settlement Agreement?