27

28

名

DANIEL KORNBLUTH, ESQ. SB# 145467 700 11TH AVENUE, #1 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118 (415) 386-6575

Attorney for Defendants ECLIPSE ENTERPRISES, INC.; JAN MULLANEY; DEAN MULLANEY APR 22 1994

ALAN CARLSON, Clerk

BY:

Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TOREN SMITH, an individual dba STUDIO PROTEUS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ECLIPSE ENTERPRISES, INC., a New York corporation; DEAN MULLANEY, an individual; JAN MULLANEY, an individual; and DOE 1 through DOE 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

No. 957460

DECLARATION OF DEAN
MULLANEY IN OPPOSITION
TO PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE
MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
PROTECTIVE ORDER

DATE: 4-22-94 TIME: 10:30 am PLACE: Rm 469

## I, DEAN MULLANEY, declare the following:

- 1. I am an individually named defendant and president of named defendant ECLIPSE ENTERPRISES, INC. ("ECLIPSE") in the above entitled action, and I have personal knowledge of the following facts and events, and as to those facts stated on belief, I am informed and believe them to be true, and allege them based on such information and belief. If sworn as a witness, I can testify competently to the facts stated herein.
- 2. The individual defendants in this action both reside outside the state of California. The corporate defendant is a New York Corporation, whose principal place of business is

outside California. As president of ECLIPSE, I have personal knowledge of its financial dealings, and business practices and policies.

- 3. ECLIPSE has never blatantly refused to pay a creditor unless there is some dispute as to the amount charged, or the quality of product or service. There are large cash flow fluctuations in the publishing business. In instances where cash flow was insufficient to pay a bill in full when due, either myself or JAN MULLANEY would seek an extension with the creditor or attempt to work out a payment schedule. Any disputes with creditors in the past have been paid or are being paid to the creditor's satisfaction.
- 4. ECLIPSE has a legitimate dispute with the claims made by plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' allegation in the complaint that assignments of rights under contracts made between ECLIPSE and various Japanese companies was never demonstrated to myself or ECLIPSE. I have never seen such assignments and therefore have not been given the opportunity to investigate their validity. In addition, monies paid to plaintiffs is not reflected in plaintiffs claims. We have been negotiating with plaintiffs in good faith to reach a fair settlement amount and terms that won't so severely impede our cash flow as to cause a financial instability.
- 5. Plaintiffs have NO valid claims against the individual defendants since any alleged contracts in the Complaint involved ECLIPSE only, and not individual defendants. It is ECLIPSE'S standard practice that any contracts for publishing activities relating to ECLIPSE are negotiated and signed only in my or JAN

MULLANEY'S capacity as authorized officers of ECLIPSE.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- This Ex Parte Motion was brought in the midst of settlement negotiations which began on or about Thursday, April 14, 1993. During settlement negotiations, opposing counsel gave oral notice of his intent to seek a Temporary Protective Order pending a full hearing on an Application for a Writ of Attachment on the morning of April 20, 1994, if we could not come to a settlement before then. On April 19, 1994, all parties were in agreement on several major points, but some terms needed further negotiation. Defendants requested opposing counsel delay the Ex Parte date for one week so as to give sufficient time to reach settlement. Opposing counsel refused to change the date, and continued to try to make additions to the settlement that were not agreed on, and force settlement by 3:30 pm, Tuesday, April 19, 1994. Defendants fully intended to settle plaintiffs' claims, and were making good faith offers and attempts to resolve the terms. I therefore believe this ex parte motion was brought as a means of pressuring a settlement rather than for the purpose of recovery.
- 7. The buying and selling of various assets of ECLIPSE is a normal action in the course of the publishing business. We are continuing to produce and distribute product. We are NOT closing down operations and "selling the store." Any intended sales would put ECLIPSE in a better position to settle with plaintiffs. No defendants are attempting to conceal or dispose of corporate assets to defraud creditors. In fact, individual defendant officers of the corporation have currently delayed receiving a significant portion of their salary to increase cash flow, and

allow for even greater financial strength of the corporation during recessionary times. ECLIPSE has always and continues to deposit all proceeds from sales into its corporate account, and there have been no drastic changes in the normal running and operation of the business. Additionally, we have had notice of plaintiffs' lawsuit for several months, and notice that plaintiff would seek a temporary protective order for several days. In that time, we have taken no actions to quickly liquidate all assets and transfer funds away from defendants, and have no intention to do so. These are not the actions of individuals who are trying to dispose of corporate assets and siphon off or conceal funds to avoid judgment. The plaintiffs have offered absolutely no proof that such transfers have taken place. There is therefore no danger of irreparable harm to plaintiffs to justify the requested orders.

8. There is no harm done to plaintiffs if the Ex Parte relief is not granted. However, great harm could be done to ECLIPSE if the relief requested is granted. Published products require fast shipment and many time-sensitive deadlines are involved. Interference with ECLIPSE'S ability to meet these deadlines, and pay printers and others would severely cripple the business, and affect the goodwill we have built up with our printers and distributors. Damage to our reputation or our ability to quickly produce and deliver product would have a far reaching effect on future sales. This could easily result in a significant loss of business to ECLIPSE.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: 4-21-94

Dean Mullaney