From: "Bridy, Annemarie (abridy@uidaho.edu)" <abridy@uidaho.edu>

To: Carl Malamud <carl@media.org>

Subject: records request

Date: April 7, 2014 at 8:20:41 PM PDT

Great to meet you, too. Thanks for sending the documents. They're very illuminating. I wasn't expecting that LexisNexis would be a player in this drama, though I probably shouldn't be surprised. It's predictable that Lexis prefers to stay in the background, shielding its role in the instigation of the dispute. I'm not sure why the folks at the Code Commission don't understand Lexis's motivation. I'm surprised that Brad Frazer conveyed such certainty to his client that the annotations are copyrightable. I think they'd be copyrightable under existing legal decisions if they weren't part of the official code of the state—if they were just Lexis's annotations. I believe their status as part of the official code is what makes them copyright ineligible. Do you agree with me on that front? I do find it curious that the Copyright Office issues registrations for these works. And they do; I checked. That fact would almost certainly come up in litigation as a favorable fact for the Commission.

----Original Message----

From: Carl Malamud [mailto:carl@media.org]

Sent: Monday, April 07, 2014 5:02 PM To: Bridy, Annemarie (abridy@uidaho.edu)

Subject: records request

I thought you might be interested in the results of the records request we made in Idaho.

Great to meet you last week!

Best regards,

Carl

cusions: Assesspelated: 79 (1942-201). Message. ID \$55.507 (rice-bibb) La12-55-00.5550 (fill. 1990-0001-201). Compreh part and search of the comprehensive and search of the