

EXHIBIT 2

Mueller, Jeff

From: Mueller, Jeff
Sent: Friday, August 04, 2017 12:53 PM
To: 'Eric H. Zagrans'; 'Michael Silverman'; kb@brunolawus.com; 'Matthew Peterson'; 'Bill Clendenen'; 'Maura Mastrony'
Cc: 'McDevitt, Jerry'; 'Krasik, Curtis B.'
Subject: Bagwell v. WWE - Discovery Issues

Counsel:

I write in response to your emails from last evening and to address the status of certain open issues with respect to Plaintiffs' responses to WWE's first and second set of discovery requests. Your recent emails raise concerns that you may be renegeing or backtracking on several of your prior commitments. We take this opportunity to clarify the issues.

1. Based on your representations, we expect that you will identify the formula, identify the attorney who contacted Plaintiff Bagwell in 2015, and provide complete responses to the contention interrogatories on Monday.
2. Based on your representations, we understood that you would be supplementing your responses to the interrogatories seeking information concerning damages (IROG 6). Please provide a date certain by which you propose to supplement those responses and to state the damages that you are claiming with respect to Bagwell and Levy.
3. Based on your representations, we understood that you would be immediately contacting prior attorneys for Plaintiffs to obtain information and documents responsive to our discovery requests. Please advise which attorneys you have contacted, whether they have advised they will provide records to you, and provide a date certain by which you will be producing documents obtained from them.
4. Based on your representations, we understood that you would be identifying and producing documents reflecting royalty income and information for Plaintiffs for each year they performed for WCWI, ECW, WCW, Inc., and/or WWE (IROGS 2-3 and multiple RFPS including 20-22).

Previously, you had indicated that you would provide banking information such that we could subpoena bank records reflecting Plaintiffs' income from wrestling, but that you did not believe that it was your responsibility to obtain such records. Now you seem to be renegeing on that commitment. To be clear, we have no particular interest in wading through bank records to reconstruct their performance income versus royalty income, and are interested in obtaining only records sufficient to show these two components of income during their tenure with WCWI, ECW, WCW, Inc., and/or WWE. Thus, will you produce your clients' income tax returns showing such information and sign IRS forms to release such information to us, or is it your position that either or both components of past income from those four sources are objectionable?

5. We intend to seek a compulsion order with respect to our requests for information regarding Plaintiffs' total income (performance income in addition to royalty income) for each year they performed for WCWI, ECW, WCW, Inc. and/or WWE. Such information is plainly relevant to our defenses for the reasons stated in our email correspondence and telephone conversations. As to your point regarding income earned from wrestling promotions other than WWE, such information is obviously relevant as Plaintiffs have claimed an entitlement to royalties on WCWI and ECW works as well.
6. Without waiver of our position that fee agreements are relevant and discoverable, we will agree not to move to compel production of those agreements at this time if you respond in writing to the questions below. Contrary to your statements, you either have not provided answers to these questions with respect to *all* of the fee agreements because you claimed not to have them during our prior telephone conversations, or you have not answered them at

all. Depending on your answers to these questions, we reserve the right to seek production of the fee agreements themselves.

(a) Who has the authority to settle this case under the terms of the fee agreements?

(b) Are the named plaintiffs eligible to receive incentive payments or additional compensation?

(c) Who is responsible for the payment of fees and expenses related to the litigation?

(d) What fee-sharing arrangements exist between counsel for plaintiffs?

(e) How could Brenden Leydon not have a fee agreement with Plaintiffs consistent with the Connecticut Rules of Professional Conduct? See Rule 1.5(b).

(f) What other attorneys, including but not limited to Konstantine Kyros, have been involved in this case or involved with the Plaintiffs, or have a financial interest in this case?

(g) What attorneys were involved in referring this case to any of the current or former counsel for Plaintiffs?

We would appreciate a prompt response to this email, particularly in view of the substantial delays occasioned by Plaintiffs to date and the deadlines set forth in the Court's scheduling order. Please provide your final position on these matters **by no later than Monday, August 7**, so that we know what we need to include in our submission to the Court on Wednesday. Thank you.

Jeffrey P. (Jeff) Mueller | Attorney at Law | [Attorney Bio](#)



242 Trumbull Street | Hartford CT 06103-1212

t (860) 275 0164 | f (860) 881 2625 | m (203) 444 5207

jmueller@daypitney.com | www.daypitney.com

BOSTON | CONNECTICUT | FLORIDA | NEW JERSEY | NEW YORK | WASHINGTON, DC

