

1 BROWNE GEORGE ROSS LLP
 Keith J. Wesley (State Bar No. 229276)
 2 kwesley@bgrfirm.com
 Jonathan L. Gottfried (State Bar No. 282301)
 3 jgottfried@bgrfirm.com
 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2400
 4 Los Angeles, California 90067
 Telephone: (310) 274-7100
 5 Facsimile: (310) 275-5697
 6 Attorneys for EVOX Productions, LLC

7
 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

10
 11 EVOX Productions, LLC,
 12 Plaintiff,
 13 vs.
 14 California Rent-A-Car, Inc.
 & Steve Vahidi,
 15 Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-08046

**PLAINTIFF EVOX
 PRODUCTIONS, LLC'S
 OPPOSITION TO CALIFORNIA
 RENT-A-CAR, INC.'S MOTION
 FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR
 FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY
 ADJUDICATION**

Judge: Hon. Michael W. Fitzgerald
 Date: June 27, 2016
 Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Crtrm.: 1600

Trial Date: Januarv 10. 2017

20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
1		
2		
3		
4	I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
5	II. ARGUMENT	2
6	A. Title 17 Section 113(c) Does Not Excuse Defendants’ Infringement.....	2
7	1. The Plain Language of the Statute Does Not Favor Defendants’ Interpretation of Section 113(c).....	3
8	2. No Case Backs Defendants’ Interpretation of Section 113(c).....	4
9	3. The Policies Underlying the Copyright Act Do Not Favor Defendants’ Interpretation of Section 113(c).....	6
10	B. EVOX’s Photos Are Not Derivative Works.....	7
11	1. EVOX’s Photos Are Not Derivative Works Because the Photos Are Entirely or Substantially Based Upon Useful Articles.....	7
12	2. EVOX’s Photos Are Not Derivative Works Because They Do Not Recast, Transform or Adapt the Authorship of the Cars or Car Parts.....	9
13	3. EVOX’s Photos Are Not Derivative Works Because There Are No Preexisting Works in the Photos.....	11
14	a. The Steering Wheel and Grilles Are Not Copyrightable Works.	12
15	b. Contrary to defendants’ argument, the shape of the cars are not subject to copyright.....	14
16	c. Contrary to defendants’ argument, the trademark logos are not subject to copyright.	17
17	C. Even If EVOX’s Photos Were Derivative Works, They Were not Unauthorized. Under Section 113(c), EVOX Was Not Required to Obtain a License from the Car Manufacturers to Make and Distribute Photos of Cars.....	19
18	D. EVOX’s Photos Are Not Slavish Copies.....	21
19	E. EVOX Is Not Attempting to Corner the Market on Standard Techniques.	21
20	F. EVOX’s Copyrights Are Not Invalid For Failure to Disclose Mandatory Information to the Copyright Office.	22
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

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 CONTENTS
(cont'd)

Page

G.	Contrary to Defendants’ Argument, EVOX’s DMCA Claim Does Not Fail.	24
H.	Contrary to Defendants’ Argument, EVOX Has a Basis to Recover Direct and Indirect Profits.	24
III.	CONCLUSION	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>FEDERAL CASES</u>	
1 2 3 4 <i>Bryant v. Gordon,</i> 5 483 F. Supp. 2d 605 (N.D. Ill. 2007)	5
6 7 <i>Chestang v. Yahoo Inc.,</i> 8 No. 2:11-CV-00989-MCE, 2012 WL 3915957 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 7, 2012).....	18
9 10 <i>Chosun Int’l, Inc. v. Chrisha Creations, Ltd.,</i> 11 413 F.3d 324 (2d Cir. 2005).....	15
12 13 <i>Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc. v. Miramax Films Corp.,</i> 14 11 F. Supp. 2d 1179 (C.D. Cal. 1998).....	19
15 16 <i>Custom Chrome, Inc. v. Ringer,</i> 17 No. CIV. A. 93-2634 (GK), 1995 WL 405690 (D.D.C. June 30, 1995).....	14
18 19 <i>Design Furnishings, Inc. v. Zen Path, LLC,</i> 20 No. CIV. 2:10-CV-2765-WB, 2010 WL 5418893 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2010).....	15
21 22 <i>Durham Indus., Inc. v. Tomy Corp.,</i> 23 630 F.2d 905 (2d Cir. 1980).....	14
24 25 <i>Eden Toys, Inc. v. Florelee Undergarment Co.,</i> 26 697 F.2d 27 (2d Cir. 1982).....	7
27 28 <i>Entm’t Research Grp., Inc. v. Genesis Creative Grp., Inc.,</i> 122 F.3d 1211 (9th Cir. 1997).....	9
<i>Esquire, Inc. v. Ringer,</i> 591 F.2d 796 (D.C. Cir. 1978)	15, 17
<i>Estate of Magnin v. Commissioner,</i> 184 F.3d 1074 (9th Cir. 1999).....	11
<i>Ets-Hokin v. Skyy Spirits, Inc.,</i> 225 F.3d 1068 (9th Cir. 2000).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Fabrica, Inc. v. El Dorado Corp.,</i> 697 F.2d 890 (9th Cir. 1983).....	8
<i>Fahmy v. Jay-Z,</i> 835 F. Supp. 2d 783 (C.D. Cal. 2011).....	24
<i>Guerrero v. RJM Acquisitions LLC,</i> 499 F.3d 926 (9th Cir. 2007).....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(cont'd)

		<u>Page(s)</u>
1		
2		
3	<i>Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises,</i>	
4	471 U.S. 539 (1985)	5
5	<i>Inhale, Inc. v. Starbuzz Tobacco, Inc.,</i>	
6	755 F.3d 1038 (9th Cir.).....	13, 15
7	<i>Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Seattle Lighting Fixture Co.,</i>	
8	345 F.3d 1140 (9th Cir. 2003).....	22, 23
9	<i>Leicester v. Warner Bros.,</i>	
10	232 F.3d 1212 (9th Cir. 2000).....	13
11	<i>Lenz v. Universal Music Corp.,</i>	
12	815 F.3d 1145 (9th Cir. 2016) (Defs.' Memo.).....	5
13	<i>Major v. Sony Music Entm't, Inc.,</i>	
14	No. 92 CIV. 2826 (PKL), 1992 WL 210115 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 17, 1992)	4, 5, 20
15	<i>Marascalco v. Fantasy, Inc.,</i>	
16	953 F.2d 469 (9th Cir. 1991).....	24
17	<i>Mazer v. Stein,</i>	
18	347 U.S. 201 (1954)	17
19	<i>McDonald v. K-2 Indus., Inc.,</i>	
20	108 F. Supp. 3d 135 (W.D.N.Y. 2015)	22
21	<i>Norris Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Tel. & Tel. Corp.,</i>	
22	696 F.2d 918 (11th Cir. 1983).....	14
23	<i>Omega S.A. v. Costco Wholesale Corp.,</i>	
24	776 F.3d 692 (9th Cir. 2015).....	17
25	<i>Russ Berrie & Co. v. Jerry Elsner Co.,</i>	
26	482 F. Supp. 980 (S.D.N.Y. 1980).....	23
27	<i>Sadhu Singh Hamdad Trust v. Ajit Newspaper Advert., Mktg. & Commc'ns, Inc.,</i>	
28	503 F. Supp. 2d 577 (E.D.N.Y. 2007).....	19
	<i>Satava v. Lowry,</i>	
	323 F.3d 805 (9th Cir. 2003).....	22
	<i>Schrock v. Learning Curve Int'l, Inc.,</i>	
	586 F.3d 513 (7th Cir. 2009).....	21

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.