

1 ANNETTE L. HURST (State Bar No. 148738)
ahurst@orrick.com
2 WARRINGTON S. PARKER III (State Bar No. 148003)
wparker@orrick.com
3 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
The Orrick Building
4 405 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
5 Telephone: 415-773-5700
Facsimile: 415-773-5759
6

7 WILLIAM A. MOLINSKI (State Bar No. 145186)
wmolinski@orrick.com
8 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
777 South Figueroa Street, Suite 3200
Los Angeles, CA 90017
9 Telephone: 213-629-2020
Facsimile: 213-612-2499
10

11 THOMAS S. McCONVILLE (State Bar No. 155905)
tmconville@orrick.com
12 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2258
13 Tel: (949) 567-6700/Fax: (949) 567-6710

14 Attorneys for MGA Parties and IGWT 826

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 SOUTHERN DIVISION

17 CARTER BRYANT, an individual
18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 MATTEL, INC., a Delaware
corporation,
21 Defendant.

22
23 AND CONSOLIDATED ACTIONS
24
25

Case No. CV 04-9049 DOC (RNBx)
Consolidated with Case No. CV 04-9059
and Case No. CV 05-2727

Hon. David O. Carter

**MGA PARTIES' MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF THE
COURT'S SUMMARY JUDGMENT
RULING REGARDING COPYRIGHT
PREEMPTION OF THE BRATZ
DRAWINGS AND SCULPTS TRADE
SECRETS OR, IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, FOR
CERTIFICATION OF THE
PREEMPTION RULING FOR
INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL**

26 Date: TBD
27 Time: TBD
Place: 9D

28 Trial Date: January 11, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Page(s)

INTRODUCTION 1

NEW FACTS AND LAW WARRANTING RECONSIDERATION..... 2

 A. The Summary Judgment Order 2

 B. The Damages Reports And Analysis..... 3

ARGUMENT..... 3

I. SECTION 301 EXPRESS PREEMPTION APPLIES TO THE
BRATZ TRADE SECRET CLAIM..... 5

 A. Mattel’s Bratz Trade Secret Claim Covers Material That Comes
 Within The Subject Matter Of Copyright 5

 B. The Rights Asserted By Mattel In Its Trade Secret Claim Are
 “Equivalent” To The Rights It Asserts Under Copyright. 6

 C. “Secrecy” Is Not An Extra Element..... 7

 1. The Copyright Act Specifically Governs Secret Works By
 Controlling The Right Of First Publication 8

 2. The Alleged Implied Duty Upon MGA Regarding
 “Secret” Information Is Not An Extra Element 9

 3. Alleged Knowledge Or Intent Of MGA Regarding
 “Secret” Information Is Not An Extra Element 11

 D. Under Mattel’s Theory Regarding MGA, There Is No Legally
 Sufficient Extra Element Alleged And The Authority Relied
 Upon By The Court Is Not To The Contrary. 13

 E. Congress Intended That Section 301 Avoid The Creation Of
 “Borderline” Rights Of The Type Created Under Mattel’s
 Theory And Adopted In The Court’s Summary
 Judgment Order 14

II. ALLOWING MATTEL’S CLAIM TO PROCEED MERELY BASED
ON “SECRECY” OF THE ASSERTED MATERIALS CONFLICTS
WITH THE STATUTORY OBJECTIVE AND IS THUS SUBJECT
TO CONFLICT PREEMPTION..... 15

 A. The Reasoning Of The Court’s Order Conflicts With Congress’
 Objective Of Harmonizing State Law Regarding Unpublished
 Works In A Single Federal Copyright Act..... 17

 B. The Order Conflicts With Congress’ Objective Of Section
 102(b) Which Denies Protection To “Concepts” Or “Ideas” For
 Copyrighted Works.. 18

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

III ALTERNATIVELY, THE COURT SHOULD CERTIFY ITS RULING REGARDING COPYRIGHT PREEMPTION FOR IMMEDIATE INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §1292(b)..... 19

A. The Preemption Ruling Presents Controlling Issues Of Law..... 19

B. The Preemption Ruling Involves Questions Reasonably In Dispute..... 21

C. Certification Of An Interlocutory Appeal And A Stay Of Trial Pending Resolution Of That Appeal Will Expedite The Ultimate Resolution Of This Case. 21

CONCLUSION 3

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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

FEDERAL CASES

Aargard v. Palomar Builders, Inc.,
344 F. Supp. 2d 1211 (E.D. Cal. 2004)..... 12

Ass'n of Irrigated Residents v. Fred Schakel Dairy,
634 F. Supp. 2d 1081 (E.D. Cal. 2008)..... 22

Atrium Group de Ediciones y Publicaciones, S.L. v. Harry N. Abrams, Inc.,
565 F. Supp. 2d 505 (S.D.N.Y. 2008)..... 11

In re Cement Antitrust Litig.,
673 F.2d 1020 (9th Cir. 1982) *aff'd* 459 U.S. 1190 (1983)..... 19

Compcorp v. Day-Brite Lighting, Inc.,
376 U.S. 225 (1964) 11

Dastar Corp. v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp.,
539 U.S. 23 (U.S. 2003) 16, 17

Del Madera v. Rhodes and Gardner, Inc.,
820 F.2d 973 (9th Cir. 1987)..... 10, 14

Eagan v. CSX Transportation Inc.,
294 F. Supp. 2d 911 (E.D. Mich. 2003)..... 21

Ehat v. Tanner,
780 F.2d 876 (10th Cir. 1986)..... 11, 14

Entous v. Viacom Int'l Inc.,
52 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1628 (C.D. Cal. 2001)..... 5, 6, 18

Entous
58 U.S.P.Q. 2d at 1634-35..... 10, 14

Firoozye v. Earthlink Network,
153 F. Supp. 2d 1115 (N.D. Cal. 2001) 13

Fischer v. Viacom Int'l, Inc. et al.,
115 F. Supp. 2d 535 (D. Md. 2000) 11, 14

Goldstein v. California,
412 U.S. 546 (1973) 16

Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises,
471 U.S. 539 (1985) 9

Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters.,
723 F.2d 195 (2d Cir. 1983), *rev'd on other grounds*, 471 U.S. 539 (1985) . 7, 12

Idema v. Dreamworks, Inc. et al.,

1	162 F. Supp. 2d 1129 (C. D. Cal. 2001).....	10
2	<i>Jones v. Rath Packing Co.</i> ,	
3	430 U.S. 519 (1977)	4, 16
4	<i>Kiwanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.</i> ,	
5	416 U.S. 470 (1974)	16
6	<i>Klinghoffer v. S.N.C. Achille Lauro</i> ,	
7	921 F.2d 21 (2d Cir. 1990)	20, 21
8	<i>Laws v. Sony Music Entm't, Inc.</i> ,	
9	448 F.3d 1134 (9th Cir. 2006).....	4, 6
10	<i>Mediterranean Enters. v. Ssangyoung Corp.</i> ,	
11	708 F.2d 1458 (9th Cir. 1983).....	22
12	<i>Montz v. Pilgrim Films & Television et al.</i>	
13	(9th Cir. Docket No. 08-56954)	20, 21
14	<i>Motown Record Corp. v. George A. Hormel & Co.</i> ,	
15	657 F. Supp. 1236 (C.D. Cal. 1987).....	12
16	<i>Orson, Inc. v. Miramax Film Corp.</i>	
17	189 F.3d 377 (3rd Cir. 1999).....	4, 16
18	<i>S.O.S., Inc. v. Payday, Inc.</i> ,	
19	886 F.2d 1081 (9th Cir. 1989).....	13
20	<i>Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co.</i> ,	
21	376 U.S. 225, 229 (1964)	16
22	<i>Selby v. New Line Cinema Corp.</i> ,	
23	96 F. Supp. 2d 1053 (C.D. Cal. 2000).....	5, 10, 14, 18
24	<i>Trandes Corp. v. Guy F. Atkinson Co.</i> ,	
25	996 F.2d 655, 660 (4th Cir. 1993).....	14
26	<i>Worth v. Universal Pictures, Inc.</i> ,	
27	5 F. Supp. 2d 816 (C.D. Cal. 1997).....	12
28	FEDERAL STATUTES	
	17 U.S.C. §104(a)-(b).....	9
	28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).....	1, 19, 21, 22
	H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476 at pg 129-130 (1976).....	9, 15, 18
	STATE STATUTES	
	Civ. Code § 3426.1	11

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.