

Response to FCC Form 312 Question 39

In the ordinary course of business, we are a defendant or party to various claims and lawsuits, including those discussed below.

Pre-1972 Sound Recording Litigation. On October 2, 2014, Flo & Eddie Inc. filed a class action suit against Pandora in the federal district court for the Central District of California. The complaint alleges a violation of California Civil Code Section 980, unfair competition, misappropriation and conversion in connection with the public performance of sound recordings recorded prior to February 15, 1972 (which we refer to as, “pre-1972 recordings”). On December 19, 2014, Pandora filed a motion to strike the complaint pursuant to California’s Anti-Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation (“Anti-SLAPP”) statute, which following denial of Pandora’s motion was appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. In March 2017, the Ninth Circuit requested certification to the California Supreme Court on the substantive legal questions. The California Supreme Court accepted certification. In May 2019, the California Supreme Court issued an order dismissing consideration of the certified questions on the basis that, following the enactment of the Orrin G. Hatch-Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act, Pub. L. No. 115-264, 132 Stat. 3676 (2018) (the “MMA”), resolution of the questions posed by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was no longer “necessary to . . . settle an important question of law.”

The MMA grants a potential federal preemption defense to the claims asserted in the aforementioned lawsuits. In July 2019, Pandora took steps to avail itself of this preemption defense, including making the required payments under the MMA for certain of its uses of pre-1972 recordings. Based on the federal preemption contained in the MMA (along with other considerations), Pandora asked the Ninth Circuit to order the dismissal of the *Flo & Eddie, Inc. v. Pandora Media, Inc.* case. On October 17, 2019, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals issued a memorandum disposition concluding that the question of whether the MMA preempts Flo and Eddie’s claims challenging Pandora’s performance of pre-1972 recordings “depends on various unanswered factual questions” and remanded the case to the District Court for further proceedings.

In October 2020, the District Court denied Pandora’s renewed motion to dismiss the case under California’s anti-SLAPP statute, finding the case no longer qualified for anti-SLAPP due to intervening changes in the law, and denied Pandora’s renewed attempt to end the case. Alternatively, the District Court ruled that the preemption defense likely did not apply to Flo & Eddie’s claims, in part because the District Court believed that the MMA did not apply retroactively. Pandora promptly appealed the District Court’s decision to the Ninth Circuit, and moved to stay appellate briefing pending the appeal of a related case against Sirius XM. On January 13, 2021, the Ninth Circuit issued an order granting the stay of appellate proceedings pending the resolution of a related case against Sirius XM.

On August 23, 2021, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued an Opinion in a related case, *Flo & Eddie Inc. v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.* The related case also concerned a class action suit brought by Flo & Eddie Inc. regarding the public performance of pre-1972 recordings under California law. Relying on California’s copyright statute, Flo & Eddie

argued that California law gave it the “exclusive ownership” of its pre-1972 songs, including the right of public performance. The Ninth Circuit reversed the District Court’s grant of partial summary judgment to Flo & Eddie Inc. The Ninth Circuit held that the District Court in this related case erred in concluding that “exclusive ownership” under California’s copyright statute included the right of public performance. The Ninth Circuit remanded the case for entry of judgment consistent with the terms of the parties’ contingent settlement agreement, and on October 6, 2021, the parties to the related case stipulated to its dismissal with prejudice. The *Flo & Eddie Inc. v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.* decision is precedential in the Ninth Circuit, and therefore we believe substantially narrows the claims that Flo & Eddie may continue to assert against Pandora.

Following issuance of the *Flo & Eddie Inc. v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.* opinion, on September 3, 2021, the Ninth Circuit lifted the stay of appellate proceedings in *Flo & Eddie, Inc. v. Pandora Media, LLC*. Pandora promptly filed an appeal of the District Court’s order denying the renewed motion to dismiss the case under California’s anti-SLAAP statute.

On June 2, 2022, the Ninth Circuit upheld the District Court’s order denying dismissal of the case under California’s anti-SLAPP statute, finding that Pandora had failed to demonstrate that Flo & Eddie’s claims arise from Pandora’s protected conduct. As part of the decision, the Ninth Circuit noted that Pandora had forcefully argued that the Court’s decision in *Flo & Eddie Inc. v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.*, and other decisions under New York, Florida and Georgia law, foreclosed Flo & Eddie’s claims as a matter of law. Because the case has been pending for over seven years, the Ninth Circuit remanded the case to the District Court and directed “the district court to consider expedited motions practice on the legal validity of Flo & Eddie’s claims in light of the intervening precedent.”

The District Court has scheduled a hearing to review next steps in this case. We continue to believe we have substantial defenses to the remaining claims asserted in this action, and we intend to defend this action vigorously.

Other Matters. In the ordinary course of business, we are a defendant in various other lawsuits and arbitration proceedings, including derivative actions; actions filed by subscribers, both on behalf of themselves and on a class action basis; former employees; parties to contracts or leases; and owners of patents, trademarks, copyrights or other intellectual property.

None of these other matters, in our opinion, is likely to have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations.