

Frederic M. Douglas (Calif. State Bar # 212778)
Attorney At Law
15333 Culver Drive, Suite 340
Irvine, California 92604-3051
Tel: (949) 293-0442
Fax: (949) 203-8768
fdouglas@cox.net

Attorney for Plaintiffs
MESIKA MAGIC & YIGAL MESIKA

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION**

MESIKA MAGIC, a California
corporation, YIGAL MESIKA, an
individual

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PENGUIN MAGIC, INC., a Nevada
corporation, CRAIG PETTY, a resident
of the United Kingdom, DOES 1-10,
inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:25-cv-07943-MWF-(MBKx)

**Opposition to Defendant Craig Petty's
Motion to Dismiss Second Amended
Complaint**

Date: June 10, 2026

Time: 10:00 A.M.

Judge: Hon. Michael W. Fitzgerald

Courtroom: 5A, 5th Floor

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	6
II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	7
A.	Yigal Mesika’s Reputation.....	7
B.	The Videos at Issue.....	7
a.	“The Desolation of Yigal Mesika” – July 14, 2025.....	7
b.	“Craig Petty Discusses Controversy With Yigal Mesika” – July 25, 2025...	8
c.	“Sued for Speaking Out” – February 13, 2026.....	9
d.	“Crowdsourcing information for the Mesika v. Craig Petty SLAPP suit” – March 1, 2026	10
C.	The Parties and Penguin’s Commercial Marketplace.....	11
III.	LEGAL STANDARDS.....	11
A.	Rule 12(b) (6).....	12
B.	Anti-SLAPP Under Federal Procedure.....	12
IV.	THE ANTI-SLAPP MOTION MUST BE DENIED.....	12
A.	Section 425.17(c) Commercial-Speech Exemption Applies.....	12
B.	The Motion Conflicts with Federal Procedure (Metabolife).....	13
C.	Even if Anti-SLAPP Applied, Petty Fails Prong One.....	14
D.	Petty Fails Prong Two: Plaintiffs Easily Show a Probability of Prevailing	14
V.	THE SAC STATES ALL CLAIMS UNDER RULE 12(b) (6).....	16
A.	Defamation, Trade Libel, and False Light.....	16
a.	Public Figure Issue.....	16
a.	Public Interest Issue.....	19
b.	The Statements are Provably False.....	20

1	c. Statements of and Concerning Mesika Magic.....	26
2	a. Opinion can be Actionable.....	27
3	a. Malice is Adequately Alleged.....	27
4	B. Misappropriation of Likeness (§ 3344 and Common Law).....	29
5	C. Unfair Competition (§ 17200) and False Advertising (§ 17500).....	29
6	D. CONCLUSION.....	29

Cases

<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	12
<i>Celle v. Filipino Reporter Enterprises Inc.</i> , 209 F.3d 163 (2d Cir. 2000)	29
<i>Coastal Abstract Serv., Inc. v. First Am. Title</i> , 173 F.3d 725 (9th Cir. 1999)	14
<i>Communications, Inc v. Connaughton</i> , 491 U.S. 657, 689 fn. 36, 109 S.Ct. 2678, 105 L.Ed.2d 562 (1989)	29
<i>Downing v. Abercrombie & Fitch</i> , 265 F.3d 994 (9th Cir. 2001)	29
<i>Dyer v. Childress</i> , 147 Cal.App.4 th 1273, 55 Cal.Rptr.3d 544 (Cal. App. 2007)	20
<i>Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.</i> , 418 U.S. 323, 345 (1974), 94 S.Ct. at p. 3009, 41 L.Ed.2d at p. 808.	17, 18
<i>Hecimovich v. Encinal Sch. Parent Teacher Org.</i> , 203 Cal. App. 4 th 450 (2012)	14
<i>Manzarek v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.</i> , 519 F.3d 1025 (9th Cir. 2008)	12
<i>Melaleuca, Inc. v. Clark</i> 66 Cal.App.4 th 1344, 1365 (Cal. App. 1998)	27
<i>Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.</i> , 497 U.S. 1, 110 S.Ct. 2695 (1990)	27
<i>Mosesian v. McClatchy Newspapers</i> , 233 Cal.App.3d 1685, 1694 (1991)	17
<i>Newsom v. Fox News Network, LLC</i> , N25C-06-251 SPL, slip opinion, p. 22, lines 8-11 (Del. Super. Apr 30, 2026)	17, 28
<i>Palin v. New York Times Co.</i> , 940 F.3d 804, 813 (2d Cir. 2019)	29
<i>Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc v. Hepps</i> , 475 U.S. 767, 768-769, 106 S.Ct. 1558, 89 L.Ed.2d 783 (1986)	17
<i>Reader's Digest Assn. v. Superior Court</i> , 208 Cal.Rptr. 137, 142, 37 Cal.3d 244, 253-254, 690 P.2d 610 (Cal. 1984)	18
<i>Roberts v. McAfee, Inc.</i> , 660 F.3d 1156 (9 th Cir. 2011)	15
<i>St Amant v. Thompson</i> , 390 U.S. 727, 731, 88 S.Ct. 1323, 20 L.Ed.2d 262 (1968)	28
<i>Tilkey v. Allstate Insurance Company</i> , 56 Cal.App.5 th 521, 554-5 (2020)	27
<i>US Dominion, Inc. v. Fox News Network, LLC</i> , 293 A.3d 1002, 1043 (Del. Super. 2023)	29
<i>Varian Medical Systems, Inc. v. Delfino</i> , 6 Cal.Rptr.3d 325, 344, 113 Cal.App.4 th 273 (Cal. App. 2003)	7, 18
<i>Wolston v. Reader's Digest Ass'n, Inc.</i> , 443 U.S. 157, 167 (1979)	18

Statutes

1 Cal. Civ. Code § 3344(d)..... 29

2 California Code of Civil Procedure Section 425.17(c)..... 12

3 **Rules**

4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)..... 6

5 L.R. 11-6.1 6

6 L.R. 11-6.2 6

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Petty has unloaded a large pile of irrelevant exhibits upon Plaintiffs and this Court. The Motion comprises 35 filed pages, with large exhibits. On top of this, Petty submits separately a Request for Judicial Notice (Dkt. No. 51) with 42 individual exhibits, most without proper authentication, amounting to 334 pages, in support of a motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). The memorandum, Dkt. No. 50, expanded the 7,000-word briefing limit from L.R. 11-6.1 to unfairly give an advantage in briefing his Motion. It is noted that Petty's motion brief, Dkt. No. 50 lacked the certificate of compliance required by L.R. 11-6.2, while Petty's brief seems to have a word count of 7,246. Despite the expansive volume wielded against the Second Amended Complaint, as his co-defendant states, "But volume is not sufficiency." Dkt. No 49, Defendant Penguin Magic, Inc.'s Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss; Memorandum of Points and Authorities, page 11 of 35 (internal page 1), lines 7-8.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Yigal Mesika's Reputation

A California court found that plaintiffs who make equipment for a niche market, but do not advertise or sell to the general public, were found not to be all-purpose public figures as they lacked pervasive involvement in the affairs of society.¹ Mesika's reputation is tied to the commercial sale of his inventions within a niche community, which does not amount to the general fame or notoriety required to strip Plaintiffs of private figure protections.

B. The Videos at Issue

a. "The Desolation of Yigal Mesika" – July 14, 2025

He attempts to reference a text message exchange between Craig Petty and Yigal Mesika, but studiously avoids providing the full contents of the text message chain. Filed concurrently is the Declaration of Yigal Mesika, producing that text message conversation. Below, the details of that conversation, wherein Petty acknowledged that Yigal Mesika's patent application did indeed cite prior art that he claims in the later video Mesika intentionally hid and thus Mesika's invention was "stolen." Petty knew the falsity of his statements as of June 27, 2025, but contemplated the video for two weeks, then published knowingly false statements on July 14, 2025.

Petty could have produced the text message conversation in full, but strategically did not. This is not the first time that Petty strategically burdened this Court while withholding evidence contrary to his assertions.

On February 18, 2026 Petty filed a Motion for Extension, seeking to avoid

¹ See, *Varian Medical Systems, Inc. v. Delfino*, 6 Cal.Rptr.3d 325, 344, 113 Cal.App.4th 273 (Cal. App. 2003).

1 responding to the First Amended Complaint, claiming that Petty did not know that he
2 was properly served.² In fact, five days earlier, on February 13, 2026, Craig Petty
3 published a YouTube video, “Sued For Speaking Out,” and a GiveSendGo campaign,
4 displaying the first image of him holding the First Amended Complaint, as stating at
5 around 1:17 through 1:25, “I was served with a 105-page complaint . . . [it] was hand-
6 delivered to my office. 105 pages.”³ If Petty had complied with L.R. 7-3, I could have
7 informed counsel of Petty’s public display of himself holding the served complaint.⁴
8 Petty’s penchant for not being truthful is established.

9 **b. “Craig Petty Discusses Controversy With Yigal Mesika” – July 25, 2025**

10 The description of this video publishes a defamatory statement against Plaintiffs,
11 “Erik Tait, for the first time, shares a story of when he wrote ad copy for Yigal and
12 how it didn’t end the way he had hoped.” The Penguin Magic video, and the channel
13 overall, is branded with Penguin Magic’s branded marks, is monetized through
14 YouTube and embedded links, linked directly to Penguin Magic’s product pages,
15 including products competing with Plaintiffs and used to drive traffic to Penguin
16 Magic’s platform and sales funnels.⁵ This video also republishes Craig Petty’s
17 defamatory “The Desolation of Yigal Mesika” video via the displayed active link, and
18 excerpts from Petty’s video.

19 The Penguin Magic video was published on their official Penguin Magic
20 YouTube channel that prominently displays Penguin Magic’s name and logo, and that
21 links viewers directly to Penguin Magic’s retail website and product pages. Beneath or
22 near the videos, viewers are encouraged to visit Penguin’s site, and links to products,

23 ² See, Petty Motion for Extension, Dkt. No. 33, p. 3, lines 12-13.

24 ³ See, Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Petty Motion for Extension, Dkt. No. 36, p. 2, lines 19-
25 23, Exhibit 2 to Douglas Declaration, Dkt. No. 36-1. See, also, SAC, Dkt. No. 43,
paragraph 20, Exhibit F, Dkt. No. 43-6.

⁴ See, Douglas Declaration, Dkt. No. 36-1, paragraph 13.

⁵ See. *Id.*, paragraph 45, Exhibit M to SAC.

1 including Craig Petty’s releases and competing products, appear in the description or
2 on the same page.⁶

3 False statements made in the Penguin Magic video are provided in Exhibit C to
4 the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-3, and discussed below.

5 **c. “Sued for Speaking Out” – February 13, 2026**

6 In this February 13, 2026 video Petty doubles down on the same defamatory
7 statements from his “Desolation of Yigal Mesika” video, after having been served with
8 the First Amended Complaint, and demonstrated actual malice.⁷

9 Petty’s “Sued For Speaking Out” video demonstrated actual malice when he
10 publicly stated “I stand by that opinion” immediately after confirming that he was
11 “served with a 105-page complaint,” which explicitly detailed the falsity of his claims.
12 He published these February 2026 statements with actual knowledge of the falsity of
13 his defamatory statements. Petty further demonstrated actual malice in that he
14 possessed the June 25-27, 2025 text message exchange wherein he admitted that
15 Mesika’s patent application properly cited prior art that Petty said was hidden, and that
16 Mesika in fact filed his application before public disclosure.

17 Petty compounded actual malice while inciting others to attack Mesika, including
18 when Petty explicitly instructed his viewers to amplify the attack on Mesika, at about
19 7:56 through about 8:22, “Let’s all talk about it as a community. Let’s have a
20 discussion. Share this video. Yes, but talk about it. If you’re on Facebook, make a
21 Facebook post. If you're in a community somewhere, make a post. If you have a blog,
22 write a blog about this. If you if you're a vlogger, make a vlog about this. Make a
23
24
25

⁶ See, *Id.*, paragraph 93.

⁷ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 20-23.

1 podcast about this. Discuss this with your friends. Discuss this with fellow
2 magicians.”⁸

3 Defendants continue an ongoing malicious campaign to destroy Plaintiffs’
4 reputation, exhorting others to spread the false statements across the Internet and
5 elsewhere.⁹

6 The comments on the February 13, 2026 video demonstrate that the Defendants
7 are inflicting direct, continued commercial damage with all of these videos.
8 Commenters have stated, “I threw out my Yeigal Mesika stuff.”; “I will personally not
9 buy any of his products anymore. . . .Imagine if the entire community stopped buying
10 his stuff.”; “The entire community needs to boycott Meseka. I’ll never buy his
11 products.”; “No more items for me!”; and other calls for boycott and commercial
12 harm.¹⁰

13 **d. “Crowdsourcing information for the Mesika v. Craig Petty SLAPP suit” –**
14 **March 1, 2026**

15 This video demonstrates ongoing malice by Craig Petty. After being
16 served with a 105-page complaint detailing the falsity of his statements and the
17 economic damage his statements caused, Pety continues to produce videos
18 mocking the legal process, disparaging Plaintiffs’ motives as a “game” to “burn
19 money” and actively recruiting the magic community to participate in his
20 harassment campaign.¹¹ Despite having the published patent application in his hand,
21 which he claimed in his video to have already reviewed, which he admitted cited the
22 relevant prior art in his June 25-27 text messages, despite having the falsity of his
23 statements demonstrated in the First Amended Complaint, Petty continued to defame

24 ⁸ See, *Id.*, paragraph 24.

25 ⁹ See, *Id.*, paragraph 25.

¹⁰ See, *Id.*, paragraph 33, Exhibit I, Dkt. No. 43-9.

¹¹ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 135-140.

1 Plaintiffs' character, portraying Mesika as a bully abusing the legal system, seeking to
2 bankrupt his critics, rather than the truth that Plaintiffs are legitimately protecting their
3 intellectual property and business interests over the years.¹² Petty did not merely
4 wrongfully claim that Mesika was threatening litigation over his pending patent
5 application, but falsely claimed that Mesika had been falsely terrorizing others with
6 lawsuits for three decades, with knowledge that Mesika's patents were not valid.

7 **C. The Parties and Penguin's Commercial Marketplace**

8
9 Plaintiff Mesika Magic is a California magic-product company founded by
10 Plaintiff Yigal Mesika, an inventor internationally known for innovations such as
11 LOOPS®, the Tarantula device, and other proprietary magic apparatus.

12 Petty is a magician, entertaining and teaching, while selling products in the
13 magic industry. Petty announces commercial activities in the magic industry in
14 cooperation with Penguin Magic, Inc.¹³ Penguin Magic, Inc. is a commercial online
15 retailer that sells magic products, operates retail channels, produces monetized social-
16 media content, produces online videos promoting magic products, and has introduced
17 house-brand products, including "TIES" that directly compete with Plaintiffs'
18 products.¹⁴

19 **III. LEGAL STANDARDS**

20
21
22
23

¹² See, *Id.*

24 ¹³ See, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, paragraph 4.

25 ¹⁴ See, e.g., Penguin Magic's website, listing "TIES" at
<https://www.penguinmagic.com/p/17608>. See, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, paragraphs 14, 37,
116, 117, and 124.

1 **A. Rule 12(b)(6)**

2 A claim survives dismissal when it alleges sufficient factual matter, accepted as
3 true, to state a plausible claim for relief. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).
4 All reasonable inferences are drawn in the Plaintiffs’ favor. *Manzarek v. St. Paul Fire*
5 *& Marine Ins. Co.*, 519 F.3d 1025, 1031 (9th Cir. 2008).

6 **B. Anti-SLAPP Under Federal Procedure**

7 California’s Anti-SLAPP statute applies in federal court only to the extent it
8 does not conflict with FRCP 8, 12, or 56. *Metabolife*, 264 F.3d at 845–46; *Planned*
9 *Parenthood*, 890 F.3d at 833. Courts may not require plaintiffs to provide “summary-
10 judgment-type evidence” without discovery. *Metabolife*, 264 F.3d at 846. Determining
11 the internal scope of Erik Tait’s employment with Penguin Magic, the exact
12 contractual relationship with Craig Petty, and Penguin Magic’s internal monetization
13 and algorithmic online marketplace suppression metrics requires discovery that
14 Plaintiffs cannot obtain yet, but would be in the hands of Defendants.

15
16 **IV. THE ANTI-SLAPP MOTION MUST BE DENIED**

17 **A. Section 425.17(c) Commercial-Speech Exemption Applies**

18
19 California Code of Civil Procedure Section 425.17(c) exempts any claim arising from:

- 20 1. A statement by a person **primarily engaged in selling goods or services**,
21 2. About a **business competitor’s goods or services**,
22 3. Made for the purpose of **promoting or securing sales**, or
23 4. Made in the course of delivering the person’s goods or services.

24 (*Simpson Strong-Tie Co. v. Gore*, 49 Cal. 4th 12, 30 (2010).)

25 Penguin Magic and Petty satisfies every element:

PLAINTIFFS’ OPPOSITION TO CRAIG PETTY’S MOTION TO DISMISS

1. Penguin operates an online retail marketplace.¹⁵
2. Plaintiffs sell competing magic products.¹⁶
3. The challenged videos and posts disparage Plaintiffs' inventions and professional reputation.¹⁷
4. The videos promoted Penguin's competing products, including TIES,¹⁸ with embedded product links and monetized content.¹⁹

Penguin Magic is a direct commercial competitor²⁰ and Petty is aligned in business with Penguin Magic.²¹ The videos were not "public interest journalism," they were monetized commercial content, wrapped in Penguin Magic's branding, designed to disparage Plaintiffs' competing LOOPS products and drive sales to Penguin Magic's house-brand TIES products via embedded commercial links.²²

This statutory exemption alone mandates denial of the Anti-SLAPP motion.

B. The Motion Conflicts with Federal Procedure (Metabolife)

Under *Metabolife* and *Planned Parenthood*, the Court **may not** impose a summary-judgment evidentiary burden where discovery has not occurred. This independently requires denial.

¹⁵ See, *Id.*, Dkt. No. 43, paragraphs 14, 37, 63, 94, 101, 103, 104, 108, 109, 116-125, 134.

¹⁶ See, *Id.*, Dkt. No. 43, paragraphs 9, 60, 93, 94, 100, 101, 123,

¹⁷ See, *Id.*, Exhibits B (Dkt. No. 43-2, C (Dkt. No. 43-3), and N (Dkt. No. 43-14).

¹⁸ See, e.g., Penguin Magic's website, listing "TIES" at <https://www.penguinmagic.com/p/17608>; See, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, paragraphs 57, 60, 62, 101-103, 106, 107, 204.

¹⁹ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 23, 43, 45, 52, 54, 141.

²⁰ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 42, 43, 45, 60, 61, 63, 205.

²¹ See, *Id.*, paragraph 41 (discussing Defendants' conspiracy).

²² See, *Id.*, paragraphs 14, 40, 57, 60, 62, 100, 101-103, 106, 107, 113-115, 126-128, 204, and Exhibit Q, Dkt. No. 43-17 and Exhibit R, Dkt. No. 43-18.

1 **C. Even if Anti-SLAPP Applied, Petty Fails Prong One**

2 Prong one requires Petty to show that the claims “arise from” protected activity.
3 A California Court of Appeal instructed courts to examine the principal thrust or
4 gravamen of the claim. *Hecimovich v. Encinal Sch. Parent Teacher Org.*, 203 Cal.
5 App. 4th 450, 466 (2012).

6 Here, the gravamen is commercial conduct, including marketplace manipulation;
7 product copying; suppression of searches; algorithmic steering; misappropriation of
8 data; and commercial exploitation of Plaintiffs’ likeness. These acts are not protected
9 activities under § 425.16.

10 Moreover, the challenged statements constitute commercial advertising and
11 promotion, not political or public discourse, failing prong one under *Coastal Abstract*
12 *Serv., Inc. v. First Am. Title*, 173 F.3d 725, 735 (9th Cir. 1999) (“While the
13 representations need not be made in a “classic advertising campaign,” but may consist
14 instead of more informal types of “promotion,” the representations (4) must be
15 disseminated sufficiently to the relevant purchasing public to
16 constitute “advertising” or “promotion” within that industry.”).

17 **D. Petty Fails Prong Two: Plaintiffs Easily Show a Probability of Prevailing**

18 Plaintiffs’ SAC includes exhibits demonstrating Petty’s direct role in publishing
19 and monetizing the content;²³ the falsity of statements (e.g., that Plaintiffs filed “fake
20 patents,” made fraudulent threats);²⁴ evidence of malice (profit motive, disregard of
21 contrary facts);²⁵ commercial harm (lost sales, lost distributors, suppressed listings);²⁶

22
23 ²³ See, *Id.*, paragraph 23, 144, exhibit 2, thereto.

24 ²⁴ See, *Id.*, Exhibits B (Dkt. No. 43-2), C (Dkt. No. 43-3), and N (Dkt. No. 43-14),
25 thereto. See, Mesika Declaration, Exhibit 1, filed concurrently.

²⁵ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 21, 23, 24, 40 and 135. See, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, Exhibit N. See,
malicious statements reproduced in SAC, Exhibits B-E thereto. See, e.g., Exhibit B,
timestamp 1:54, where the false claim that Mesika’s patent application is a copy of the

1 copying of Plaintiffs' products;²⁷ and consumer confusion²⁸ and boycotts²⁹ fomented
2 by Petty.

3 Petty's video features Craig Petty falsely claiming that Mesika does not credit
4 "Rinky Dinky" as part of a history of not crediting other creators, while Mesika
5 publicly credited the "Rinky Dinky" as prior art in his published patent application.³⁰

6 Under *Roberts v. McAfee, Inc.*, 660 F.3d 1156, 1163 (9th Cir. 2011), this
7 showing of false statements above exceeds the "potential merit" standard and defeats
8 prong two. Further details regarding false statements are provided below.

9 Craig Petty is not an independent actor in the scheme to disparage Mesika and
10 divert sales to Penguin Magic's TIES product. As shown in Exhibit G, Dkt. No. 43-7, a
11 transcript of Craig Petty's own video, "Penguin Magic At Blackpool 2026," from
12 February 14, 2026, he told the public, "come over to the Penguin booth, see me and
13 Eric" (about 43:22) and Tait stated, "Yep. You and I are on the booth." About 39:27.³¹

14 Petty also publicly stated in his own video, "FISM Roundup, Video Takedowns
15 & LTS of Convention News," Petty established his role as a company insider/agent by

16 "rinky dinky." Compare with paragraphs 46-49, 67-70 of SAC, and Exhibit A thereto,
17 demonstrating that Mesika disclosed the "rinky dinky" in the patent application openly.

18 ²⁶ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 31, 57, 96, 97, 99, 105, 108, 129, 134, 160, 168, 176, 209. See,
Exhibit P, Dkt. No. 43-16.

19 ²⁷ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 39, 57, 60, 102-104, 108, 109, 113-115, 118, 120, 121, 125-127,
20 190, 200, 210, 213, 215.

²⁸ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 88 and 215.

21 ²⁹ See, *Id.*, paragraph 33, Exhibit I, Dkt. No. 43-9. See also, paragraphs 31, 33, 62, 100,
22 151, 160, 168, 176, 182.

23 ³⁰ See, Exhibit C to SAC, Dkt. No. 43-3, page 2, lines 16-19. See, also, Exhibit B, Dkt.
24 No. 43-2, time stamp 1:54, where the false claim that Mesika's patent application is a
25 copy of the "rinky dinky." Compare with paragraphs 46, 67-70 of SAC, Dkt. No. 43,
and Exhibit A (Dkt. No. 43-1) thereto, demonstrating that Mesika disclosed the "rinky
dinky" in the patent application openly. See, Exhibit 1 to the Mesika Declaration, filed
concurrently.

³¹ See also, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, paragraph 26.

PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO CRAIG PETTY'S MOTION TO DISMISS

1 using the corporate “we” when stating, “there was no Penguin booth on Monday at all
2 because we had nothing to sell uh Tuesday we’re going into it with nothing either.”³²
3 Petty stated in this July 22, 2025 video that he was representing Penguin Magic.
4 Specifically, from about 19:45 through 20:17, he stated, “Um I’ll be on the Penguin
5 booth. So, I’m actually going to be there on behalf of Penguin Magic on the Penguin
6 booth.”³³ Petty himself proves that he and Penguin Magic have a deeply integrated
7 commercial partnership, not a mere vendor relationship.
8

9 **V. THE SAC STATES ALL CLAIMS UNDER RULE 12(b)(6)**

10 ***A. Defamation, Trade Libel, and False Light***

11 **a. Public Figure Issue**

12
13 Petty argues that because Plaintiffs pleaded having “developed a fine
14 reputation”³⁴ and thrust themselves into industry disputes (such as sending cease and
15 desist letters),³⁵ Mesika is at least a limited-purpose public figure.³⁶ Petty states “[t]hat
16 should be enough.”³⁷

17 However, that is not enough, especially as Petty does not commit to what type of
18 public figure is Yigal Mesika. Public figures in the context of those needing to prove
19 actual malice defamation may be public officials, general-purpose public figure, or a
20
21
22

23 ³² See, *Id.*, paragraph 16.

24 ³³ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 15-17, and Exhibits G, Dkt. No. 43-7, and S, Dkt. No. 43-19.

25 ³⁴ See, Petty Motion, Dkt. No. 50, page 10 of 35 (internal page 2), lines 3-7.

³⁵ See, *Id.*, page 28 of 35 (internal page 20), lines 18-20.

³⁶ See, *Id.*, lines 3-4.

³⁷ *Id.*, page 10 of 34 (internal page 2), line 7.

1 limited-purpose public figure.³⁸ A public official, for example, California Governor
2 Gavin Newsom, may still validly allege actual malice.³⁹

3 Yigal Mesika is a private individual, well-known in the niche magic industry,
4 but not a general-purpose public figure, nor even a limited-purpose public figure in
5 relation to the allegations by Defendants that Mr. Mesika must show actual malice in
6 relation to a matter of public interest.

7 Some individuals “occupy positions of such persuasive power and influence
8 that they are deemed public figures for all purposes.” *Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418
9 U.S. 323, 345 (1974), 94 S.Ct. at p. 3009, 41 L.Ed.2d at p. 808. This category is
10 designated as an “all purpose” public figure. (418 U.S. at p. 351, 94 S.Ct. at p. 3013, 41
11 L.Ed.2d at p. 812.) An all-purpose public figure is not lightly assumed; for a plaintiff to
12 be deemed an all-purpose public figure, there must be “clear evidence of general fame
13 or notoriety in the community, and pervasive involvement in the affairs of
14 society....” (418 U.S. at p. 352, 94 S.Ct. at p. 3013, 41 L.Ed.2d at p. 812.).

15 The Supreme Court distinguished the Gertz opinion, stating: “Here, we hold that,
16 at least where a newspaper publishes speech of public concern, a private-figure
17 plaintiff cannot recover damages without also showing that the statements at issue are
18 false.”⁴⁰ Defendants here are not newspapers, and not “media” as contemplated in
19 1986, the year of the *Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc. v. Hepps* opinion.

20 “Unlike the ‘all purpose’ public figure, the ‘limited purpose’ public figure loses
21 certain protection for his reputation only to the extent that the allegedly defamatory
22 communication relates to his role in a public controversy.” *Reader's Digest Assn. v.*

23 ³⁸ *Mosesian v. McClatchy Newspapers*, 233 Cal.App.3d 1685, 1694 (1991).

24 ³⁹ *Newsom v. Fox News Network, LLC*, N25C-06-251 SPL, slip opinion, p. 34, lines 6-
25 7 (Del. Super., Apr 30, 2026)(“Thus, under the standard applicable here, the facts are
reasonably susceptible to a finding of actual malice”).

⁴⁰ *Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc v. Hepps*, 475 U.S. 767, 768-769, 106 S.Ct. 1558, 89
L.Ed.2d 783 (1986).

1 *Superior Court*, 208 Cal.Rptr. 137, 142, 37 Cal.3d 244, 253-254, 690 P.2d 610 (Cal.
2 1984).

3 Plaintiffs who make equipment for a niche market, but do not advertise or sell to
4 the general public, were found not to be all-purpose public figures as they lacked
5 pervasive involvement in the affairs of society.⁴¹ Mesika's reputation is tied to the
6 commercial sale of his inventions within a niche community which does not amount to
7 the general fame or notoriety required to strip Plaintiffs of private figure protections.

8 The Supreme Court established the legal standard to define limited-purpose
9 public figures as those who "have thrust themselves to the forefront of particular public
10 controversies in order to influence the resolution of the issues involved."⁴² Plaintiffs
11 did not interject themselves into any public controversy, Petty dragged them into
12 public controversy he decided to manufacture.⁴³ Even if one considers Petty's issue to
13 be a public issue, "[a] private individual is not automatically transformed into a public
14 figure just by becoming involved in or associated with a matter that attracts public
15 attention." *Wolston v. Reader's Digest Ass'n, Inc.*, 443 U.S. 157, 167 (1979). Thus, the
16 Defendants "must show more than mere newsworthiness to justify application of the
17 demanding burden of [pleading the heightened actual malice standard]." *Id.* at 167-68.

18 Enforcing intellectual property rights through private legal channels does not
19 mean that Plaintiffs voluntarily injected themselves into a public controversy.⁴⁴ Petty
20 publishing his defamatory video in July 14, 2025, generating public attention, was not
21 participating in a public controversy, he created a public controversy, grounded on his
22 intentionally false statements, such as saying that the Mesika did not cite prior art,

23 ⁴¹ See, *Varian Medical Systems, Inc. v. Delfino*, 6 Cal.Rptr.3d 325, 344, 113
24 Cal.App.4th 273 (Cal. App. 2003).

25 ⁴² *Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323, 345 (1974).

⁴³ See, Declaration of Yigal Mesika (the "Mesika Declaration"), filed concurrently,
paragraphs 29, 36, and Exhibit 1 to the Mesika Declaration, June 25-27, 2025 text
message conversation.

⁴⁴ See, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, paragraph 91

1 despite his admission in June 25-27, 2025 text messages that he knew Mesika's
2 published application referenced the specific prior art that he claimed in his video
3 Mesika intentionally did not disclose.⁴⁵

4 Petty knew that his statements in the Penguin Magic video, and in the prior
5 Craig Petty video, were false or acted in reckless disregard to the truth. *Jackson v.*
6 *Paramount Pictures Corp.*, 68 Cal.App.4th at 35 (“We agree with the court's
7 assessment. The New York Times Co. v. Sullivan standard does not require that the
8 reporter hold a devout belief in the truth of the story being reported, only
9 that he or she refrain from either reporting a story he or she knows to be false or acting
10 in reckless disregard of the truth.”).

11 **a. Public Interest Issue**

12 Defendants' defamation was not a matter of journalistic reporting, as neither
13 Erik Tait of Penguin Magic, nor Petty have any journalism credentials, nor was the
14 content of the videos part of any pre-existing genuine public interest debate. Instead,
15 Defendants conspired to make a coordinated, bad-faith commercial attack to destroy
16 Plaintiffs' reputation so that Penguin Magic and Petty could step into the void when
17 Mesika's sales are depleted and Penguin Magic can sell house-brand knockoffs at the
18 conventions and other events Erik Tait and Petty jointly operate.⁴⁶ Petty holds himself
19 out as a Penguin Magic insider/agent.⁴⁷

20 Defendant Petty does not identify a valid matter of widespread public interest,

21 ⁴⁵ See, also, *Id.*, paragraph 46 (“Petty further republishes and ratifies
22 Sean Bobunia's false claim that Mesika's ‘patent’ was ‘bogus’ because ‘he didn't list
any prior art of any kind.’”).

23 ⁴⁶ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 41, 58. See, *Id.*, paragraph 54 (“the joint effort by
24 Craig Petty and Penguin Magic to disparage and harm Plaintiff and Plaintiffs' business
activities to gain an unfair advantage over Penguin Magic's competitors, the
25 Plaintiffs.”).

⁴⁷ See, *Id.*, paragraphs 16-19 (referencing a Petty video where he views himself as part
of the Penguin Magic corporate team). See, *Id.*, paragraphs 27-29, 54

1 but a matter of a dispute between Plaintiffs and Defendants and maybe, Mark Bennett.⁴⁸
2 See, *Dyer v. Childress*, 147 Cal.App.4th 1273, 1280, 55 Cal.Rptr.3d 544 (Cal. App.
3 2007) (“The fact that ‘a broad and amorphous public interest’ can be connected to a
4 specific dispute” is not enough.). The “Defendants cannot merely offer a ‘synecdoche
5 theory’ of public interest, defining their narrow dispute by its slight reference to the
6 broader public issue.” *Filmon.com, Inc.*, at 152. In other words, Defendants cannot
7 expand the tree of their specific dispute with Plaintiffs as a matter of public interest
8 about the entire forest.

9 **b. The Statements are Provably False**

10 Exhibits B (Dkt. No. 43-2, C (Dkt. No. 43-3), and N (Dkt. No. 43-14) to the
11 SAC, provide tables referencing a portion of the false statements published by Craig
12 Petty and Penguin Magic, and republished by Penguin Magic.

13 Petty made statements in his July 14, 2025 “The Desolation of Yigal Mesika”
14 video that Mesika’s published patent application, US-2024-0416255-A1 at Exhibit A
15 to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-1, that Mesika stole the idea of the invention without crediting
16 the creator of the “Rinkey Dinky” device.⁴⁹

17 As shown in Paragraphs [0006] and [0007] of the published application in
18 Exhibit A to the SAC, Mesika’s patent application publicly referenced the “Ring Flight
19 Revolution” and the “Rinkey Dinkey” device in the section entitled, “Description of
20 Related Art.” It is without question that these two prior devices were volunteered to the
21 Patent Office, publicly in Mesika’s patent application, filed on June 13, 2024, and
22 published on December 19, 2024.

23
24 ⁴⁸ See, Mesika Declaration, concurrently filed, paragraphs 32 (“we’re working out
25 an amicable path forward. No drama, no lawsuits.”), 34 (“I haven’t threatened
litigation.”), and 35 (“I know you aren’t threatening to sue Mark.”). See Declaration
of Yigal Mesika, Dkt. No. 28-1 (“Mesika Declaration”), paragraphs 19-28, 30-38.

⁴⁹ See, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, paragraphs 89-90.

1 Petty acknowledged as much in his text communications with Yigal Mesika in
2 June 25-27, 2025.⁵⁰ On June 26, 2025, as shown in these text messages, Mesika
3 acknowledged the existence of the Ring Flight device and told Petty that the “version I
4 developed isn’t just another Ring Flight-it’s a complete redesign with specific
5 innovations that were recognized and protected under patent law after a long and
6 detailed review process.”⁵¹

7 Further in this text message chain Craig Petty confirmed on June 26, 2025 that
8 “I’ve looked at your patent application and I see the innovations you are referencing
9 especially in comparison to AirFlight.”⁵² Petty confirmed that he saw in the published
10 application that Mesika’s application mentioned the prior art.

11 Further on June 26, 2025 Mesika told Craig Petty that he had been
12 communicating with Mark Bennett and that “Everyone recognizes the overlap, and
13 we’re working out an amicable path forward. No drama, no lawsuits-just professionals
14 sorting out a similarity.”⁵³

15 Mesika further stated to Petty that “Also air flight is mentioned at my patent
16 even before it’s exists.”⁵⁴

17 Yet further on June 26, 2025 Mesika stated, “I haven’t threatened litigation.”⁵⁵

18 In response, Craig Petty stated “I know that your patent mentions an AirTag
19 towards the end.” He later stated in the same text message, “I know you aren’t
20 threatening to sue Mark.”⁵⁶ Petty confirmed on June 27, 2025 that he understood that

21 ⁵⁰ See, Declaration of Yigal Mesika (the “Mesika Declaration”), filed concurrently,
22 paragraphs 29, 31, and 36, and Exhibit 1 to the Mesika Declaration, June 25-27, 2025
text message conversation.

23 ⁵¹ See, Mesika Declaration, paragraph 30, and Exhibit 1 to the Mesika Declaration.

24 ⁵² See, *Id.*, paragraph 31 and Exhibit 1 thereto.

25 ⁵³ See, *Id.*, paragraph 32, and Exhibit 1 thereto.

⁵⁴ See, *Id.*, paragraph 33, and Exhibit 1 thereto.

⁵⁵ See, *Id.*, paragraph 34, and Exhibit 1 thereto.

⁵⁶ See, *Id.*, paragraph 35, and Exhibit 1 thereto.

1 Mesika was not threatening litigation against Mark Bennett, contradicting his and
2 Penguin Magic's later allegations that Mesika is a litigious bully⁵⁷ and a patent
3 terrorist⁵⁸ or a magic terrorist.⁵⁹

4 Despite this clear acknowledgement that Mesika did not "steal" his invention,
5 did not hide the prior art, such as Airflight and Rinkey Dinky, and that Mesika was not
6 threatening litigation, on July 14, 2025 Petty made knowingly false statements contrary
7 to his knowledge, and he repeated those false statements in Penguin Magic's July 25,
8 2025 video republishing and ratifying those false statements.

9 Petty's video features Craig Petty falsely claiming that Mesika does not credit
10 "Rinky Dinky" as part of a history of not crediting other creators, while Mesika
11 publicly credited the "Rinky Dinky" as prior art in his published patent application.⁶⁰

12 It is without question that Craig Petty made these statements; the statements
13 were false, and Plaintiffs have a high likelihood of prevailing in proving the falsity of
14 these statements.

15 The false statements do not stop there. Petty republished false statements from
16 third parties, as shown in Exhibits B, C, and N to the SAC. Petty himself stated at 1:18
17 of his video that Mesika is a "patent troll" and "takes intellectual property by stealing
18 it. They're claiming it theirs and then they go after any possible entity that might have

19
20 ⁵⁷ See, SAC, paragraphs 22, 34, 64, and 136.

21 ⁵⁸ See, *Id.*, paragraph 50

22 ⁵⁹ See, *Id.*, paragraph 51, 86.

23 ⁶⁰ See, Exhibit B to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-2, timestamp 1:54, where Petty publishes the
24 false claim that Mesika's patent application is a copy of the "rinky dinky. See, Exhibit
25 C to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-3, page 2, lines 16-19 ("Petty states that Mesika has a
history of not crediting other creators, specifically mentioning that he never credited
Dave Bonsil or Rinky Dinky on the tutorial for his ring flight, despite mentioning
"another guy in England that put a a ring flight in a key". Compare with paragraphs 46,
and 68-70 of SAC, and Exhibit A thereto, demonstrating that Mesika disclosed the
"rinky dinky" in the patent application openly.

1 something to do with the knowledge that’s inside that pack.”⁶¹ Petty knew from the
2 July 25-27, 2025 text message conversation, as he conceded, that Mesika was not
3 threatening litigation.

4 At 2:39 Petty states that Mesika was “Magic’s biggest litigious bully that for the
5 last three decades has been financially and legally bullying creators into submission
6 behind closed doors.”⁶²

7 Petty represented to the public that he was bringing facts, not merely opinions.⁶³

8 At 3:55, Petty claimed that Mesika “is now trying to sue anyone who brings out
9 their own ring flights,” and that Mesika never will have a patent approved. He knew
10 for a fact that Mesika was not trying to sue Mark Bennett. At 4:50 Petty states that
11 Mesika’s invention “was stolen in the first place” and that he was bullying people. He
12 knew that Mesika was not bullying Mark Bennett, and that he had no other knowledge
13 of any alleged “bullying” of any other person.

14 At 5:40 Petty maintains that he consulted with a lawyer before recording the
15 video, which, if true, shows that he followed Mesika’s admonition to seek legal
16 counsel before making his claims publicly.⁶⁴ This statement, if true, shows that Petty
17 had doubts, but proceeded recklessly, or with full knowledge that his statements would
18 be defamatory, further showing actual malice. Indeed, he states at 6:53 that he
19 deliberated over two weeks before completing the video.

20 At 16:30 Petty says that Mesika’s Ring Flight came out in 2025, while he was
21 told on June 26, 2025 in their text message conversation that Mesika publicly released

22
23 ⁶¹ *Id.*

24 ⁶² *Id.*

25 ⁶³ See, *Id.*, at 3:32 (“Today, I am bringing facts, upon facts.”).

⁶⁴ See, Mesika Declaration, paragraph 37 (“that’s what qualified legal counsel is for. I highly recommend you consult one before publishing anything that could be defamatory or legally damaging to yourself.”), and Exhibit 1 thereto.

1 his product “around February 2024.”⁶⁵ Mesika’s patent application, filed on June 13,
2 2024, and published on December 19, 2024, claiming priority from a June 13, 203
3 provisional patent application. It is noted that when Petty’s Motion claims that “Mesika
4 apparently released his device several months before filing his patent application,”⁶⁶
5 Petty makes no reference to the filing date of the published application, nor his
6 concession in June 2025 to Mesika’s representation that his application filed before
7 Mesika released his device. Petty could have, and should have, reviewed his text
8 messages, the published application, and the SAC before he made again this false
9 statement. If Petty had reviewed Exhibit B to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-2, he would have
10 understood that his statement repeating this lie at 1:33:39 was false, as explained in the
11 parenthetical statement in that Exhibit regarding the patent application filing date. He
12 certainly should have reviewed the filing date before his July 14, 2025 video, which he
13 pondered for over two weeks. At 1:45:57 Petty again makes this false statement,
14 stating that Yigal Mesika’s product was released “months before the patent was
15 actually filed.”

16 At 21:51 Petty stated regarding Mesika’s patent applications, “most of them
17 aren’t granted most of them are never granted.” Petty’s Exhibit D to his Motion, Dkt.
18 No. 50-4 claims to be a quick patent search shows thirteen issued patents. This
19 evidence alone represents the falsity of Petty’s statement. In fact, Mesika has more
20 than fifteen issued patents.⁶⁷ At 1:18:41 Petty maintains again that “A lot of the patents
21 that Yigal puts through never get granted.” So, the reckless nature of Petty’s tirade

22
23 ⁶⁵ See, Mesika Declaration, filed concurrently, Exhibit 1, text message of June 26,
2025 at 8:12 pm.

24 ⁶⁶ Petty Motion, Dkt. No. 50, page 14 of 35 (internal page 6), lines 10-11.

25 ⁶⁷ See, SAC, paragraph 47, listing issued patents of various types and in various
jurisdictions. See, Exhibit N to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-14, in the last row of the table,
listing numerous issued Mesika patents.

1 shows that he accuses Mesika of using his superior power to get patents to bully others,
2 but he is incompetent at obtaining patents to perform that bullying.

3 At 1:35:45 Petty falsely states that Mesika had “dozens of patent applications,
4 few granted,” when his own Exhibit shows a maximum of 32 patent documents, some
5 being merely the published application before issue of the same invention.

6 At 1:39:29 Petty refers to Mesika’s invention, talking directly toward Mesika as
7 if he was present, “You didn’t even credit the person that most people would consider
8 to be the godfather when it comes to ring flights.”

9 On June 9, 2025 Mesika, through his patent counsel, filed an Information
10 Disclosure Statement (IDS) disclosing to the United States Patent and Trademark
11 Office (USPTO) an Al Koran “Ring Flight” document from 1968, a Sumag “Magic
12 Ring Flight” document from 1967, and an Al Koran “Rinkey Dinky” document
13 from 1967.⁶⁸ This document was publicly available as of June 9, 2025, before
14 Petty’s text message conversation with Mesika June 25-2025, and before Petty’s
15 July 14, 2025 “The Desolation of Yigal Mesika” video.

16 In the June 25, 2025 Penguin Magic video, Craig Petty made additional false,
17 defamatory statements. He stated that regarding Mark Bennett, “legal action was
18 threatened.”⁶⁹ As shown above, in reference to the Mesika Declaration and the text
19 message conversation of June 25-27, 2025, this statement was false, and Petty knew
20 that it was false. Petty continues his reckless disregard by claiming that Mesika gets
21 patents issued to bully others, but “Hardly any of them that get granted. And the ones
22 that do get granted, he just he allows them to expire.”⁷⁰

23
24 ⁶⁸ See, Declaration of Frederic M. Douglas, (the “Douglas Declaration”) paragraphs 4-
25 7, and Exhibit 1 thereto.

⁶⁹ See, Exhibit C to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-3, page 1, lines 17-18.

⁷⁰ See, *Id.*, page 1, lines 26-27.

1 Petty repeats his other false statement claiming that Mesika's invention was
2 "commercially advertised on the Magic Café up to a year and a half before the patent
3 was even filed."⁷¹

4 Petty makes the audience believe that he is speaking from knowledge gained
5 from reviewing documents, when he states that Mesika "has a documented history over
6 the last 20 years of using fake patents and patent applications and legally bullying and
7 intimidating people to try and force his will onto them." Petty has not reviewed twenty
8 years of documents that support his false statement, and he wanted his audience to
9 believe that he gained such "knowledge" from reviewing a "documented history."⁷²

10 Petty states the Mesika is "the most litigious person in magic who's got a habit
11 of habitually suing people."⁷³ As shown in Exhibit N to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-14, in
12 reference to Petty's claim that Mesika is the "biggest litigious bully . . . for the last three
13 decades, the last column of the table provides a lengthy list of lawsuits in the magic
14 industry. Mesika has not achieved the distinction of being the most litigious person in
15 magic, let alone for three decades.

16
17 **c. Statements of and Concerning Mesika Magic**

18 Defendants might have thought that their disparagement actions and anti-
19 competitive conduct only affected Yigal Mesika, but they also damages Mesika Magic,
20 a corporation. Plaintiffs seek damages from the Defendants for all damages attributable
21 to their torts.

22
23
24
25 ⁷¹ See, *Id.*, page 1, lines 28-29. See, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, paragraphs 56-59.

⁷² See, *Id.*, page 2, lines 4-6.

⁷³ See, Exhibit C to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-3, page 2, lines 27-28.

1 **a. Opinion can be Actionable**

2 The *Newsom v. Fox News* opinion, which explicitly applies California law, held
3 that statements of opinion on matters of public concern “are not categorically shielded
4 from actionability.”⁷⁴ Instead, an opinion constitutes actionable defamation if it can
5 “reasonably be interpreted as stating or implying defamatory facts about an individual
6 that are provably false.”⁷⁵ Prefacing a statement with, “in my opinion,” does not
7 provide immunity. See *Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.*, 497 U.S. 1, 18, 110 S.Ct.
8 2695 (1990) (“ ‘In my opinion John Jones is a liar’ ... implies a knowledge of facts
9 which lead to the conclusion that Jones told an untruth.”). When a speaker discloses
10 the facts underlying their opinion, they can still be held liable **“if the disclosed facts
11 themselves are false and defamatory.”** *Dickinson v. Cosby*, 17 Cal.App.5th 655, 686
12 (2017) (Emphasis supplied).⁷⁶

13 **a. Malice is Adequately Alleged**

14 Recklessness or doubt which gives rise to actual or constitutional malice is a
15 subjective test. *Melaleuca, Inc. v. Clark* 66 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1365 (Cal. App. 1998).
16 “This may be demonstrated through circumstantial evidence, including a failure to
17 investigate, anger and hostility toward the plaintiff, or reliance on unreliable sources.”
18 *Tilkey v. Allstate Insurance Company*, 56 Cal.App.5th 521, 554-5 (2020). Here, the
19 minimal merit standard is easily satisfied as to Defendants' malice as Plaintiff has
20 alleged and provided significant evidence of the failure to investigate, reliance on
21 biased and unreliable sources, and hostility toward Plaintiffs and their intellectual
22 property rights. Actual malice “does not require that the reporter hold a devout belief in
23

24 ⁷⁴ *Newsom v. Fox News Network, LLC*, N25C-06-251 SPL, slip opinion, p. 22 (Del.
25 Super. Apr 30, 2026).

⁷⁵ *Id.*

⁷⁶ See, Petty Motion, Dkt. No. 50, page 23 of 35 (internal page 15), lines 19-21.

1 the truth of the story being reported, only that he or she refrain from either reporting a
2 story he or she knows to be false or acting in reckless disregard of the truth.” (*Jackson*,
3 *supra*, 68 Cal.App.4th at p. 35.).

4 Defendants argue that, at most, Plaintiffs have only alleged that Defendants must
5 personally investigate the falsity or reckless disregard of their statements, which
6 Defendants claim does not equate to actual malice under *St. Amant* and *Reader’s*
7 *Digest*. While a mere failure to investigate is not enough, “a speaker cannot
8 purposefully avoid the truth and then claim ignorance.”⁷⁷ If a plaintiff offers direct
9 evidence that the statement was probably false, “the Court may infer that the defendant
10 intended to avoid the truth.”⁷⁸ Defendants’ own cited case, *St. Amant* helps to show
11 how to establish actual malice.⁷⁹

12 Defendants did not merely fail to investigate, but they purposefully avoided the
13 truth by publishing statements that Mesika “hid” prior art, while willfully ignoring the
14 publicly available patent application⁸⁰ that explicitly disclosed the “Ring Flight
15 Revolution,” “Rinkey Dinky,” and “Air Tag” device.⁸¹

16 The Superior Court of Delaware applied substantive California defamation law⁸²

17
18 ⁷⁷ *Newsom v. Fox News Network, LLC*, N25C-06-251 SPL, slip opinion, p. 22, lines 8-
11 (Del. Super. Apr 30, 2026).

19 ⁷⁸ *Id.*, at p. 11-13.

20 ⁷⁹ *St Amant v. Thompson*, 390 U.S. 727, 731, 88 S.Ct. 1323, 20 L.Ed.2d 262 (1968)
21 (“There must be sufficient evidence to permit the conclusion that the defendant in fact
22 entertained serious doubts as to the truth of his publication. Publishing with such
doubts shows reckless disregard for truth or falsity and demonstrates actual malice.”).

23 ⁸⁰ Exhibit A to the SAC, Dkt. No. 43-1.

24 ⁸¹ See, SAC, Dkt. No. 43, paragraphs 68-70, and Exhibit 1, Dkt. No. 43-1, Paragraphs
25 [0006]. [0007], and [0027].

⁸² The Delaware Court evaluated the complaint under Delaware’s highly permissive
“conceivability” standard while in the instant federal litigation, the stricter “plausibility
standard applies under *Twombly* and *Iqbal*. Plaintiffs submit that the detailed exhibits
and factual allegations meet the federal “plausibility” threshold.

1 to recognize that actual malice can be proven through an “accumulation”⁸³ of
2 circumstantial factors, specifically including “financial motive”⁸⁴ and a “preconceived
3 false narrative.”⁸⁵

4 The Delaware Court evaluated the complaint under Delaware’s highly
5 permissive “conceivability” standard while in the instant federal litigation, the stricter
6 “plausibility” standard applies under *Twombly* and *Iqbal*. Plaintiffs submit that the
7 detailed exhibits and factual allegations meet the federal “plausibility” threshold.

8 ***B. Misappropriation of Likeness (§ 3344 and Common Law)***

9 Petty used Plaintiffs’ likenesses in monetized videos and product promotion.
10 This is commercial misappropriation, not news. *Downing v. Abercrombie & Fitch*, 265
11 F.3d 994, 1001 & n. 2 (9th Cir. 2001). The Cal. Civ. Code § 3344(d) “public affairs”
12 exception does not apply to disguised advertisements. *Id.*, at 1002

13 ***C. Unfair Competition (§ 17200) and False Advertising (§ 17500)***

14 The SAC alleges Counts 8-10 against Penguin Magic, but not Craig Petty.

15 ***D. CONCLUSION***

16 For all the foregoing reasons, the Court should:

- 17 1. DENY Petty’s Motion to Dismiss;
18 2. DENY Petty’s Special Motion to Strike;
19 3. Permit discovery to proceed;
20

21 ⁸³ *Celle v. Filipino Reporter Enterprises Inc.*, 209 F.3d 163, 183 (2d Cir. 2000).

22 ⁸⁴ *Communications, Inc v. Connaughton*, 491 U.S. 657, 689 fn. 36, 109 S.Ct. 2678, 105
23 L.Ed.2d 562 (1989)(footnote discussing the circumstantial facts adduced at trial);
24 *US Dominion, Inc. v. Fox News Network, LLC*, 293 A.3d 1002, 1043 (Del. Super.
2023)

25 ⁸⁵ *Newsom v. Fox News Network, LLC*, N25C-06-251 SPL, slip opinion, p. 25, lines
10-18 and p. 26, lines 1-2 (Del. Super. Apr 30, 2026); *Palin v. New York Times
Co.*, 940 F.3d 804, 813 (2d Cir. 2019).

- 1 4. Award attorney fees; and
- 2 5. Grant leave to amend, if necessary.

3 May 20, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

6 /s/ Frederic M. Douglas

7 Frederic M. Douglas
8 Attorney for Plaintiffs
MESIKA MAGIC and YIGAL MESIKA

9
10 The undersigned counsel of record for Plaintiffs certifies that this brief
11 contains 6,996 words, which complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.1.

12 /s/ Frederic M. Douglas

13 Frederic M. Douglas
14 Attorney for Plaintiff
MESIKA MAGIC and YIGAL MESIKA
15 May 19, 2026
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Frederic M. Douglas (Calif. State Bar # 212778)
Attorney At Law
15333 Culver Drive, Suite 340
Irvine, California 92604-3051
Tel: (949) 293-0442
Fax: (949) 203-8768
fdouglas@cox.net

Attorney for Plaintiffs
MESIKA MAGIC & YIGAL MESIKA

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION**

MESIKA MAGIC, a California
corporation, YIGAL MESIKA, an
individual

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PENGUIN MAGIC, INC., a Nevada
corporation, CRAIG PETTY, a resident
of the United Kingdom, DOES 1-10,
inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:25-cv-07943-MWF-(MBKx)

**Declaration of Yigal Mesi a in Support
of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant
Penguin Magic Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss
Second Amended Complaint**

Date: June 10, 2026

Time: 10:00 A.M.

Judge: Hon. Michael W. Fitzgerald

Courtroom: 5A, 5th Floor

DECLARATION OF YIGAL MESIKA

I, Yigal Mesika, declare:

1. I am a United States citizen and a resident of Los Angeles, California. I have been a professional magician, inventor, and manufacturer for twenty-five years. I am a plaintiff in this matter, and I am the principal officer of the corporation Mesika Magic, another plaintiff in this matter. The following facts are of my own personal knowledge, except matters stated on information and belief, which are duly noted. If called upon to do so, I could and would testify to the truth of the matters stated herein.

2. I am the owner of intellectual property including inventions, patent applications, patents, trademarks, trade secrets, know how, and confidential information relating to magic tricks, illusions, devices, and other products for entertainment. My products include, among others, LOOPS, Tarantula, Electric touch, and Spider Pen. My products are sold worldwide through distributors such as Murphy's Magic, online marketplaces including Defendant Penguin Magic, Inc. and Amazon, and directly through my own website.

3. Before the events described in the Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"), my products had a strong reputation in the magic community and generated consistent sales across multiple dealers and online platforms.

4. I reviewed the video entitled "The Desolation of Yigal Mesika" published by Craig Petty on YouTube, and the video/podcast entitled "Craig Petty Discusses Controversy With Yigal Mesika" published on the Penguin Magic YouTube channel and branded as "The Penguin Magic Podcast with Erik Tait."

5. In these videos, my name and image are repeatedly used, and numerous statements are made about me and my products, including accusations that I am a "patent troll," that I file "fake" or "fraudulent" patents, that I am a

1 “magic terrorist,” that I bully and intimidate creators, that I threaten lawsuits with
2 no legal basis, my products are copied from others, and that I copied products such
3 as Rinky Dinky and other creators’ inventions.

4 6. Those statements are false. I have never filed a fraudulent patent, never
5 knowingly misrepresented prior art in any patent application, and never used patents
6 or patent applications to extort money from creators.

7 7. As a direct result of these videos, I received numerous messages from
8 customers, colleagues, and retailers expressing confusion, concern, or hesitation
9 about purchasing my products.

10 8. My U.S. patent application referenced in the videos, U.S. Patent
11 Application No. 2024/0416255 A1, was filed and prosecuted in good faith with the
12 assistance of patent counsel and discloses prior art products such as Ring Flight
13 Revolution and Rinkey Dinky as shown in Exhibit A to the SAC. The application is
14 presently pending before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

15 9. The statements in the videos that my product is “exactly” or “nearly
16 identical” to Rinkey Dinky, or that I stole the idea, are untrue. The design,
17 mechanism, and performance handling of my product differ in material ways from
18 Rinkey Dinky and other prior devices.

19 10. The videos also state or strongly imply that I “threatened” or “bullied”
20 magician Mark Bennett and others by demanding “ 6 per unit,” insisting that their
21 products be pulled from the market, and using non-existent or “imaginary” patent
22 rights to pressure them. Those characterizations are inaccurate. I did not make
23 baseless legal threats, and any communication regarding my intellectual property
24 rights was on my good-faith belief in those rights. I did not directly talk to Mark
25 Bennett regarding his products or whether his products should be excluded from
sale.

11. At the time these videos were released and promoted, Penguin Magic

1 sold my LOOPS products on its marketplace and also sold competing products,
2 including an item branded as “TIES,” which uses elastic thread and competes
3 directly with LOOPS.

4 12. Several retailers cancelled or refused to carry my products after the
5 videos were released. Two of these retailers cancelled specific, pending orders,
6 directly for the reason of the statements made in Craig Petty’s Desolation video.
7 Based on my conversations with these retailers, their decisions were directly
8 influenced by the defamatory statements. One of these retailers is Fun Incorporated.

9 13. After these videos were posted and promoted, my product sales on
10 major magic marketplaces, including Penguin Magic, decreased abruptly. Revenue
11 reports from my distributors confirm a sharp decline beginning shortly after the
12 Penguin Magic channel published these videos.

13 14. After the videos were published (July 14, 2025, for Craig Petty video;
14 July 25, 2025, for Penguin Magic video), I observed a noticeable and abrupt decline
15 in sales of my products through dealers and online channels. For example, in the
16 six-month period before the July 2025 videos, my total gross revenue from magic
17 products averaged approximately 28,327.08 per month; in the period including
18 July 2025 and to December 2025, those average monthly sales dropped to
19 approximately 11,833.64 per month, a reduction of roughly 60.17 . Attached as
20 Exhibit P to the SAC is a chart of gross revenue data that I prepared from
21 documents and information I keep regularly in the course of business, reflecting the
22 severe loss of revenue from product sales as a consequence of Defendants’
23 wrongful actions. The x-axis represents months in the year 2025 while the y-axis
24 represents gross revenue in dollars.

25 15. I also received communications from at least two retailers, including
Fun Incorporated, who either cancelled future orders or significantly reduced their
orders of my products. One such retailer informed me in substance that, after seeing

1 the “Desolation of Yigal Mesika” video and the reaction in the magic community,
2 they were uncomfortable continuing to promote my products and intended to
3 prioritize other creators’ items.

4 16. As a consequence of the downturn in sales of my magic products, I
5 have lost two of my employees. If sales had kept at the customary level, I would
6 still be employing those two employees.

7 17. I have reviewed some of the public comments left on the two videos,
8 including comments identified in Exhibits D and E to the SAC. Several commenters
9 explicitly state they will “never buy” my products again, will “boycott” my
10 products, or that they now intend to purchase competing products such as Penguin’s
11 TIES instead of LOOPS.

12 18. Shortly after the controversy and the videos, I observed that Penguin’s
13 marketplace prominently featured its TIES product and that, when searching on
14 Penguin’s site for terms associated with my LOOPS products, Penguin’s competing
15 products appeared ahead of mine, or my products were harder to locate than before.
16 I also became aware that positive reviews for my products were not appearing or
17 were fewer than expected, while Penguin’s competing products displayed favorable
18 reviews.

19 19. Through my prior business relationship with Penguin, I know that
20 Penguin has access to detailed sales information, customer purchasing behavior, and
21 performance data relating to merchants’ products, including mine. I believe, based
22 on the timing of the introduction of competing products, their pricing, and the way
23 they were promoted and ranked, that Penguin used its internal marketplace
24 information and knowledge of my product performance to develop, position, and
25 promote competing knockoff products.

20. The statements and conduct described above have harmed my
professional reputation, caused customers and members of the magic community to

1 view me as unethical or abusive of intellectual property, and materially reduced
2 sales and business opportunities for me and Mesika Magic.

3 21. Upon information and belief, Penguin Magic, Inc. advertises, markets,
4 offers for sale, and sells products that compete with me in the United States and in
5 the State of California, including in Los Angeles, California. My “Loops” products
6 are competitive with Penguin Magic, Inc.’s products, such as their “TIES” product.

7 22. Upon information and belief, online commenters have volunteered that
8 Penguin Magic often adds free packages of their “TIES” product to orders shipped
9 to customers. These “TIES” products have nearly identical functionality, form, and
10 marketing presentation as my “LOOP” products, showing that Penguin Magic
11 copied my “LOOP” products.

12 23. Penguin Magic’s marketplace listings for these knockoff products have
13 appeared above my own authorized listings, or to one side of my own authorized
14 listings, and my products were suppressed or shown with negative search rankings.
15 This harmed my sales.

16 24. Penguin Magic has access to sales metrics, customer preferences, and
17 other proprietary information from its own marketplace that was not public. I
18 believe Penguin Magic used this information to develop competing knockoff
19 products.

20 25. Penguin Magic has suppressed negative reviews for its TIES knockoff
21 products and suppressed positive reviews for my LOOPS products. Penguin Magic
22 also suppresses any reviews on its website that mention that LOOPS is a product
23 superior to its TIES knockoff product.

24 26. Penguin Magic floods the market with loss leaders and below market
25 price for its TIES knockoff product to unfairly compete with LOOPS by selling
TIES for less than its own cost, including many free, unsolicited products to
customers not ordering TIES. LOOPS sell for 10 while the knockoff TIES sell for

1 5. Penguin Magic further floods the market with TIES packets with larger number
2 of items per packet at a cost that is not sustainable unless Penguin Magic seeks to
3 force me out of the market as I cannot sell LOOPS at such a low price or at the
4 same price with more items per packet sold.

5 27. So long as Penguin Magic, Inc. sells inferior counterfeit products at
6 below market prices to the detriment of the “LOOPS” product and their “TIES”
7 name associated with those inferior knockoff products, my business is affected
8 negatively. I have sold the same LOOPS product for twenty-five years at the same
9 price and never increased the price at any time.

10 28. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of a text
11 message communication between myself and Craig Petty from June 25-27, 2025.

12 29. As seen in this text message chain, I did not inject myself into any
13 matter that Craig Petty initiated, he reached out to me to make accusations.

14 30. On June 26, 2025, as shown in these text messages, I acknowledged
15 the existence of the Ring Flight device and told him that the “version I developed
16 isn’t just another Ring Flight-it’s a complete redesign with specific innovations that
17 were recognized and protected under patent law after a long and detailed review
18 process.”

19 31. Further in this text message chain Craig Petty confirms on June 26,
20 2025 that “I’ve looked at your patent application and I see the innovations you are
21 referencing especially in comparison to AirFlight.”

22 32. Further on June 26, 2025 I told Craig Petty that I had been
23 communicating with Mark Bennett and that “Everyone recognizes the overlap, and
24 we’re working out an amicable path forward. No drama, no lawsuits-just
25 professionals sorting out a similarity.”

33. I further stated that “Also air flight is mentioned at my patent even
before it’s exists.”

1 34. Further on June 26, 2025 I stated, "I haven't threatened litigation."

2 35. In response, Craig Petty stated "I know that your patent mentions an
3 AirTag towards the end." He later stated in the same text message, "I know you
4 aren't threatening to sue Mark."

5 36. On June 27, 2025, I expressed to Craig Petty that he was "using a
6 fabricated 'dispute' to still attention and drive traffic to your own platform."


7 37. I further reminded him of the falsity of his statements, stating, "You're
8 presenting partial information as if it were fact, misrepresenting the situation, and
9 making claims about patent law that are simply incorrect. I'm not going to educate
10 you on the basics of prior art or how patent filings actually work – that's what
11 qualified legal counsel is for. I highly recommend you consult one before
12 publishing anything that could be defamatory or legally damaging to yourself."

13 38. After viewing Craig Petty's videos from July 2025 and going forward,
14 Penguin Magic's video and Craig Petty's subsequent video, I understand that Craig
15 Petty lied about me, my intellectual property, and my conduct, despite him agreeing
16 to the truth that I explained to him in this text message chain.

17 39. I make this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs' opposition to Penguin
18 Magic's Motion to Dismiss and Special Motion to Strike and Craig Petty's Motion
19 to Dismiss and Special Motion to Strike.

20 40. I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United
21 States that the foregoing is true and correct.

22 Dated May 20, 2026

23
24 By: 

25 Yigal Mesika

DECLARATION OF YIGAL MESIKA- 8

EXHIBIT 1

