

Complaint for Copyright Infringement

Between:

**TELUS Corporation, a foreign corporation**

**Plaintiff**

And

**DENNIS WATSON, an individual,**

**Defendant**

1. The application to which I am responding states that the plaintiff is a foreign corporation and that they have reason to believe that I live in Surrey, B.C. Canada, both of which are true.
2. They have reason to believe I live in Surrey, B.C. because they have my home address on file. I have objected to any court matter proceeding ex parte and request copies of any applications, affidavits or supporting documents, which they have refused to provide. I received a copy of their claim from You Tube.
3. For the record of the courts my address for service is: #27 9965 154 Street Surrey, B.C. Canada V3R 7V8 Please send me copies of any applications, decisions or documents that involve me to that address.
4. They are correct in that I did file a counterclaim. Since I am unrepresented and live in Canada, I missed one key element in the counterclaim and they objected to that technical flaw. This amendment is a request that the numerous videos not listed in their complaint that they clearly do not have any copyright claim on whatsoever be put back on You Tube. This is a blatant violation of the First Amendment, as is their entire application.
5. In response to the specific part of their application for a restraining order preventing me from posting items on You Tube, I consent to the jurisdiction of Federal District Court for the judicial district of Northern California which is where the service provider for You Tube is found.
6. However, since I am a citizen and resident of Canada and since the plaintiff is a foreign corporation and since the plaintiff concedes that none of the alleged copyright infringements are United States works, I clearly object to any matter of copyright infringement of a Canadian law be heard in a United States court especially any awards relating to costs and damages.
7. Nevertheless, with regards to their application for damages I will say this: TELUS Idol was a sales conference they planned and taped. They assume legal liability for it's content by claiming copyright to it. They are legally responsible for their sexual harassment not me.

8. If the public finds out the truth behind their sales conference which they previously denied existing, any damages to their reputation as a result of that true information being leaked to the general public is their liability not mine.
9. Likewise, Darren Entwistle's taped comments at a sales conference mocking the sexual orientation of the CEO of Cisco is his liability not mine. Darren Entwistle is responsible for what he says, I am not. The First Amendment guarantees the freedom of speech. As long as I have said nothing that is untrue, I cannot be held legally liable for damages.
10. According to U.S. law for defamation, they must establish malice in my motive. Telling the truth does not constitute malice. Their application for damages fails.
11. I hereby request that the other videos not listed in their complaint be put back on You Tube as they clearly do not hold any copyright on them whatsoever and to remove them is a defiant violation of the First Amendment and a dangerous precedent for the nation and the world.
12. With regards to the merit of the root of their application regarding TELUS Idol, I will say this: The name of the Video in question is TELUS Idol. At no time during the entire training video is the name TELUS VOIP Video ever mentioned. The training video has nothing to do with TELUS' voice over Internet protocol ("VoIP") initiative. It was a spoof on the American Idol. News reports of the event are enclosed and marked exhibit "A".
13. TELUS Idol is not an original work and is filled with it's own copyright infringements. It most certainly is not a literary work and does not have literary copyright protection. In fact, at no time during the entire video is it ever claimed that it is copyright protected and no such warning over unauthorized reproduction of the video exists in it. The TELUS Idol video is enclosed and marked exhibit "B". Excerpts or screen clips do not constitute a substantial part of the video even if there was a copyright on it, which there is not.
14. I ask that this application be dismissed with costs. Failing an immediate dismissal, I ask that I may call former TELUS Employee Jeff Morris to testify as a witness by way of affidavit. He was the employee that gave me the copy of the extended version and asked that I do something about it. A synopsis of his testimony can be found in the enclosed sound clip from CKNW, a local radio show where he recently called in to complain when he heard I was going to be on the show. The sound clip on the enclosed CD is marked exhibit "C".

Signed on this 14th day of July in the year 2007,

---

Dennis Watson - Defendant