

COHEN MUSIC LAW  
Evan S. Cohen (SBN 119601)  
esc@manifesto.com  
1180 South Beverly Drive. Suite 510  
Los Angeles, CA 90035-1157  
(310) 556-9800

BYRNES HIRSCH P.C.  
Bridget B. Hirsch (SBN 257015)  
bridget@byrneshirsch.com  
2272 Colorado Blvd., #1152  
Los Angeles, CA 90041  
(323) 387-3413

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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

JAMES REID, an individual, and  
WILLIAM REID, an individual, both  
doing business as The Jesus and Mary  
Chain,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WARNER MUSIC GROUP CORP., a  
Delaware corporation; and DOES 1  
through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:21-cv-04806

**COMPLAINT FOR COPYRIGHT  
INFRINGEMENT AND  
DECLARATORY RELIEF**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

1 Plaintiffs JAMES REID and WILLIAM REID allege as follows:

2  
3 **I**

4 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5 1. This is an action brought by James Reid and William Reid, two of the  
6 founding members of the successful and critically acclaimed alternative musical  
7 group The Jesus and Mary Chain (“JAMC”), formed in their native Scotland in 1983,  
8 along with Douglas Hart (“Hart”), against Warner Music Group Corp. (“WMG”), the  
9 third-largest record company conglomerate in the world, for willful copyright  
10 infringement and declaratory relief. This action is brought upon the grounds that  
11 WMG, without any viable or tenable legal grounds for doing so, has stubbornly and  
12 willfully refused to comply with JAMC’s Notice of Termination duly served pursuant  
13 to § 203 of the Copyright Act.

14 2. Since the first Copyright Act was enacted in 1790, that Act and the  
15 several successive copyright statutes have always had a feature which allows a  
16 second chance for authors (or their heirs) to reclaim copyrights from unwise grants  
17 made by authors early on in their careers, close to the creation of the works. While  
18 the particular features of those laws, and the length of the terms and statutory scheme  
19 of the terminations involved, have changed and evolved, the strong “second chance”  
20 concept has remained. In fact, the very first act, the Copyright Act of 1790, borrowed  
21 that concept from the English Statute of Anne, enacted in 1709, the first copyright  
22 law. The theme continued in the Copyright Acts of 1831, 1870, and 1909.

23 3. Likewise, § 203 of the Copyright Act of 1976 modified the Act of 1909  
24 substantially but continued the “second chance” policy with full force. According to  
25 the Congressional Record, the purpose of the statute was to protect authors and their  
26 heirs from “the unequal bargaining position of authors” in dealing with unpublished  
27 works, because of “the impossibility of [an author] determining [his or her] work’s  
28 prior value until it has been exploited.” H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476, at 124 (1976).

1 Section 203 provides that authors (a term that includes both songwriters and  
2 recording artists) may terminate grants of copyright ownership thirty-five (35) years  
3 after the initial grant, generally computed from the date of the publication of those  
4 works subject to the grant.

5 4. But while the Copyright Act confers upon authors the valuable “second  
6 chance” that they so often need, the authors of sound recordings, in particular, who  
7 have attempted to avail themselves of this important protection have encountered not  
8 only resistance from many record labels, they have often been subjected to the  
9 stubborn and unfounded disregard of their rights under the law and, in many  
10 instances, willful copyright infringement.

## 11 II

### 12 JURISDICTION

13 5. This court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action because it  
14 arises under the laws of the United States, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and more particularly,  
15 because it arises under an Act of Congress relating to copyrights, 28 U.S.C. § 1338,  
16 namely, the Copyright Act of 1976, as amended, 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*

17 6. This Court is empowered to issue a declaratory judgment and further  
18 necessary or proper relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.  
19

## 20 III

### 21 VENUE

22 7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a), in that  
23 all of defendants or their agents reside or may be found in this district.

24 8. Venue is also proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) in  
25 that either: (1) one or more defendants reside in this district, and all defendants reside  
26 in this state; (2) a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim  
27 occurred in this district; or (3) at least one defendant resides in this district, if there  
28

1 is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought.

2  
3 **IV**  
4 **PARTIES**

5 9. Plaintiff JAMES REID a/k/a Jim Reid (“James”) is an individual  
6 residing in the United Kingdom.

7 10. Plaintiff WILLIAM REID (“William”) is an individual residing in  
8 Tucson, Arizona.

9 11. Defendant WARNER MUSIC GROUP CORP. (“WMG”) is a  
10 corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with  
11 its principal place of business at 777 South Santa Fe Avenue, Los Angeles,  
12 California.

13 12. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants  
14 sued herein as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sue these defendants by  
15 such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to allege the true names  
16 and capacities of those defendants, when ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and  
17 believe, and on that basis allege, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is  
18 responsible in some manner or capacity for the wrongful conduct alleged herein, and  
19 that plaintiffs’ losses and damages as alleged herein were proximately and/or directly  
20 caused by each such defendant’s acts.

21  
22 **V**  
23 **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS**

24 13. After releasing several singles, James, William, and Hart signed to  
25 WEA Records Limited (“WEA”), a predecessor of WMG, on March 27, 1985. WEA  
26 released the first album by JAMC, entitled *Psychocandy*, on January 21, 1986, to  
27 widespread critical acclaim.

28 ///

1           14. On January 7, 2019, James and William, a majority of the authors of all  
2 of the works of JAMC, served a Notice of Termination (the “Notice”) upon WMG,  
3 and JAMC caused the Notice to be recorded in the United States Copyright Office,  
4 on May 8, 2019, as document V9964 D190 P1 through P3. A true and correct copy  
5 of the Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

6           15. On December 9, 2020, shortly before the first effective date of  
7 termination as set forth in the Notice, Melissa Battino of Rhino Entertainment  
8 Company, another company wholly owned by WMG, wrote to JAMC (the “Battino  
9 Letter”) and stated that it was WMG’s position that: (1) WMG “is the owner of the  
10 copyrights throughout the world in each of the sound recordings comprising the  
11 Noticed Works, and the Notice is not effective to terminate WMG’s U.S. rights;” (2)  
12 according to the copyright law of the United Kingdom, JAMC “never owned any  
13 copyrights in the recordings which [JAMC] could terminate;” and (3) the service of  
14 the Notice “may place [JAMC] in breach of [JAMC’s] contractual obligations under  
15 the 1985 Agreement,” and that the matter would need to be decided under the law of  
16 the United Kingdom, citing the so-called “Duran Duran Case” of 2016 [*Gloucester*  
17 *Place Music Ltd v. Le Bon*, EWHC 3091]. A true and correct copy of the Battino  
18 Letter is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

19           16. In the Battino Letter, Battino stated, in conclusion, that “Accordingly,  
20 your attempt to terminate WMG’s rights in and to the Noticed Works is without effect  
21 and will have no impact on WMG’s continued ownership and exploitation of the  
22 Noticed Works in the U.S. pursuant to its rights as outlined above.”

23           17. As Battino promised, WMG ignored the effective dates of termination  
24 for the first four releases listed in the Notice, all of which had an effective date of  
25 termination of January 8, 2021. These four releases are the singles “Never  
26 Understand,” with b-sides “Suck” and “Ambition,” published February 22, 1985,  
27 “You Trip Me Up,” with b-sides “Just Out of Reach” and “Boyfriend’s Dead,”  
28 published May 24, 1985, “Just Like Honey,” with b-sides “Head,” “Cracked,” and

# 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.