

1 Dennis Watson
2 Pro se Defendant

3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6 (SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION)
7

8 TELUS CORPORATION, a foreign
corporation,
9 Plaintiff,
10 vs.
11 DENNIS WATSON, an individual,
12 Defendant.
13

Case No.: C06-02173 JSW

**DEFENDANT'S AFFIDAVIT IN RESPONSE
TO THE COURT'S DECEMEBR 17 2010
ORDER**

14 On December 17 2010 this court proceeded in my absence and made an illegal order
15 outside of it's jurisdiction. I am notifying the court at this time that I have complied with
16 that illegal order. I have destroyed all copies I have of the 11 video clips in the real
summery order but I will at this time record my dissent.

17 This court is fully aware that the only jurisdiction that was ever agreed to was for videos
18 posted on Youtube. I filed a Motion to Dismiss based on a lack of jurisdiction and a
19 Motion to Strike. I objected to jurisdiction because neither the plaintiff nor the defendant
had anything to do with the District of San Francisco. TELUS is a foreign corporation and
I am a foreign citizen unable to attend a trial in San Francisco.

20 We argued jurisdiction. Judge Walker asked me point blank if I agreed to jurisdiction. I
21 said, before I agreed to jurisdiction I wanted what we are arguing clearly defined first.
22 I quoted Ronald Lopez's opposition brief to my Motion to Strike wherein he stated my
23 Motion to Strike was a nonstarter because TELUS' dispute only involved videos posted
on Youtube.

24 Before I agreed to jurisdiction I wanted it made very clear exactly what we were arguing.
25 TELUS had 23 videos taken off Youtube not 11. We were to argue what videos were to
26 go back on Youtube and what videos were to remain off Youtube. That is all. Judge
Walker very clearly said "TELUS' dispute is only about videos posted on Youtube." My
response was, "On that conditioin, I agree to jurisdiction."
27
28

1 After the Summery Order was made TELUS made a new application extending the
2 jurisdiction far beyond that which was ever agreed to. I objected to that new jurisdiction
3 which was never agreed to and the court proceeded unilaterally in my absence in a
4 matter that it has no jurisdiction over – my home in Canada. Consequently the December
5 17 2010 order is illegal.

6 Notwithstanding the fact that I have complied with that illegal order I will make one
7 important clarification about how natural justice has failed and how the U.S. Constitution
8 has been violated.

9 This dispute was never about copyright. It was about censorship and sexual harassment.
10 This court has placed copyright above sexual harassment and that is very sad.

11 TELUS lied in their initial application stating that TELUS Idol was called TELUIS VOIP
12 and was a protected work about TELUS' voice over internet protocol. That was proven to
13 be a bold faced lie and the court did nothing about that act of perjury.

14 TELUS lied when Matt Wilcox sent the initial letter to Youtube claiming copyright to
15 videos they had no possible copyright claim on. Yet this court did nothing about that act
16 of perjury.

17 This court viewed TELUS Idol and became witness to the sexual harassment contained
18 therein and did nothing about the violation of those laws whatsoever. This court was
19 notified that the employees of TELUS made unsuccessful complaints about the sexual
20 harassment contained in that training video and it did nothing but aid and abet the
21 censorship that enabled that kind of sexual harassment to continue at TELUS.

22 This court accepted tainted evidence about false Canadian copyright registration and
23 said nothing about it. No Canadian court and no American court has the authority to grant
24 TELUS copyright to Avril Lavigne's song Skaterboy. The song which one of the female
25 managers at TELUS sang while lying at Darren Entwistle's feet on stage bragging about
26 her special relationship with him for the whole company to see.

27 One thing we do know now is that even though this court does not have the authority to
28 grant TELUS the copyright to that song, we now know that it is TELUS corporation not
just Darren Entwistle who assumes legal liability for the sexual harassment contained in
that video. Those are the facts.

Signed,

Dated: January 28 2011

DENNIS J. WATSON

/s/ Dennis Watson
DENNIS WATSON
Pro Se Defendant