

| 1 2 | Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261) kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP | Steven Cherny (admitted pro hac vice) steven.cherny@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 601 Lexington Avenue | | |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| | 51 Madison Avenue, 22 nd Floor | New York, New York 10022 | | |
| 3 | New York, NY 10010 | Telephone: (212) 446-4800 | | |
| 4 | Telephone: (212) 849-7000 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100 | Facsimile: (212) 446-4900 | | |
| 5 | Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032) | Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834) adam.alper@kirkland.com | | |
| 6 | seanpak@quinnemanuel.com Amy H. Candido (SBN 237829) | KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 555 California Street | | |
| _ | amycandido@quinnemanuel.com | San Francisco, California 94104 | | |
| 7 | John M. Neukom (SBN 275887) | Telephone: (415) 439-1400 | | |
| 8 | johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com. | Facsimile: (415) 439-1500 | | |
| | QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP | Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001) | | |
| 9 | 50 California Street, 22 nd Floor | michael.devries@kirkland.com | | |
| 10 | San Francisco, CA 94111 | KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP | | |
| 10 | Telephone: (415) 875-6600 | 333 South Hope Street | | |
| 11 | Facsimile: (415) 875-6700 | Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 680-8400 | | |
| | Mark Tung (SBN 245782) | Facsimile: (213) 680-8500 | | |
| 12 | marktung@quinnemanuel.com | | | |
| 13 | QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP | | | |
| | 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5 th Floor | | | |
| 14 | Redwood Shores, CA 94065 | | | |
| 15 | Telephone: (650) 801-5000 | | | |
| 15 | Facsimile: (650) 801-5100 | | | |
| 16 | Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc. | | | |
| 17 | LINITED STATES | DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 18 | UNITED STATES | DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 19 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CA | LIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION | | |
| 1) | | 1 | | |
| 20 | CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., | CASE NO. 5:14-cv-5344-BLF (PSG) | | |
| 21 | Plaintiff, | CISCO'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND | | |
| 22 | VS. | MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT | | |
| 23 | ARISTA NETWORKS, INC., | Date: August 4, 2016 | | |
| | | Time: | | |
| 24 | Defendant. | Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 28 | 02099-00004/8117426.1 | | | |
| | | CO'S MOTION FOR DARTIAL SUMMARY HIDGMENT | | |



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 2 |
|---|
| 3 |

| MEN | 10RAN | NDUM (| OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES | l | |
|------|------------|---------------------------------------|--|----|--|
| I. | INTI | RODUCTION | | | |
| II. | BACKGROUND | | | 2 | |
| | A. | Cisco and its Copyrighted Works | | | |
| | B. | Arista and its Infringing Works | | | |
| | C. | Arista's Public Admissions of Copying | | | |
| | D. | O. Cisco's Copyright Claim | | | |
| III. | ARGUMENT | | | 4 | |
| | A. | Cisco | Is Entitled To Summary Judgment On Copyrightability | 4 | |
| | | 1. | Cisco Is Entitled To A Presumption of Validity and Ownership | 5 | |
| | | 2. | There Can Be No Material Dispute On Ownership | 6 | |
| | | 3. | There Can Be No Material Dispute On Originality | 6 | |
| | В. | Cisco | Is Entitled To Summary Judgment On Copying | 9 | |
| | | 1. | Direct Evidence Indisputably Shows Arista's Copying | 9 | |
| | | 2. | Circumstantial Evidence Indisputably Shows Arista's Copying | 12 | |
| | C. | Cisco | Is Entitled To Summary Judgment Of No Fair Use | 14 | |
| | | 1. | Arista's Purpose Is Commercial And Non-Transformative | 14 | |
| | | 2. | Cisco's CLI Is Creative And Expressive In Nature | 17 | |
| | | 3. | Arista Copied Substantial Amounts Of Cisco's CLI | 22 | |
| | | 4. | Arista's Copying Harms The Value Of Cisco's CLI | 24 | |
| IV. | CON | CLUSI | ON | 25 | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| 1 | Page | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | Cases | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | 4 Benay v. Warner Bros. Entm't, Inc., 607 F.3d 620 (9th Cir. 2010) | | | | |
| 5 | Brighton Collectibles, Inc. v. RK Texas Leather Mfg., | | | | |
| 6 | No. 10 Civ. 419, 2012 WL 6553403 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2012) | | | | |
| 7 | CJ Products LLC v. Snuggly Plushez LLC, 809 F. Supp. 2d 127 (E.D.N.Y. 2011)6 | | | | |
| 8 | Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc., 510 U.S. 569 (1994) | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | Cosmetic Ideas, Inc. v. IAC/Interactivecorp, 606 F.3d 612 (9th Cir. 2010)5 | | | | |
| 11 | Elvis Presley Enters., Inc. v. Passport Video, | | | | |
| 12 | 349 F.3d 622 (9th Cir. 2003) | | | | |
| 13 | Harper& Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters., 471 U.S. 539 (1985)14, 17 | | | | |
| 14 | Johnson Controls, Inc. v. Phoenix Control Sys., Inc., | | | | |
| 15 | 886 F.2d 1173 (9th Cir. 1989)5 | | | | |
| 16 | Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google, Inc., 750 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | | | | |
| 17 | Oracle America, Inc. v. Google Inc., | | | | |
| 18 | No. 3:10-cv-03561-WHĂ (N.D. Cal.)16 | | | | |
| 19 | Practice Mgmt. Info. Corp. v. Am. Med. Ass'n, 133 F.3d 1140 (9th Cir. 1998) | | | | |
| 20 | Sega Enterprises v., Accolade, Inc. , | | | | |
| 21 | 977 F.2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1992) | | | | |
| 22 | Seltzer v. Green Day, Inc., 725 F.3d 1170 (9th Cir. 2013) | | | | |
| 23 | Tetris Holding, LLC v. Xio Interactive, Inc., | | | | |
| 24 | 863 F. Supp. 2d 394 (D.N.J. 2012) | | | | |
| 25 | Three Boys Music Corp. v. Bolton, 212 F.3d 477 (9th Cir. 2000) | | | | |
| 26 | <u>Statutes</u> | | | | |
| 27 | 17 U.S.C. § 101 | | | | |
| <u>, </u> | 02000_00004/81174261 | | | | |



Case 5:14-cv-05344-BLF Document 348 Filed 07/01/16 Page 4 of 31

| | 17 U.S.C. § 102(a) | |
|-----|---------------------|-----|
| 1 1 | | |
| | 17 U.S.C. § 107 | .14 |
| _ | | |
| 3 | 17 U.S.C. § 107— | .13 |
| | 17 U.S.C. §§ 201(a) | 5 |
| | | |
| 5 | 17 U.S.C. § 410(c) | 5 |
| | 17 U.S.C. § 410(c) | |
| 91 | | |
| 7 | Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 | 1 |
| / | | |
| | | |

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that on August 4, 2016, at 9:00 a.m., or at such other

1 2 time as the Court may direct, before the Honorable Beth Labson Freeman in the United States 3 District Court for the Northern District of California, Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc. ("Cisco"), will, and hereby does, move the Court under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 for entry of partial summary judgment 4 5 on Count I (Copyright Infringement) of its Second Amended Complaint ("Complaint"). Dkt. 64. 6 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the Memorandum of Points and 7 Authorities below, the Declarations of Kevin Almeroth, Judith A. Chevalier and Amy H. Candido 8 filed herewith, and such other papers, evidence and argument as may be submitted to the Court in

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

connection with the hearing on this motion.

This case is about the blatant and comprehensive copying by defendant Arista Networks, Inc. ("Arista") of Cisco's copyrighted works. Cisco holds valid copyrights to a set of original expressions related to its unique command-line interface, including original multi-word commandline expressions; original hierarchies, modes, prompts, command responses, screen displays, and help screens in its user interface; and original technical documentation like user guides and manuals available to those who use its command-line interface (referred to collectively herein as "Cisco CLI"). 1 Cisco's engineers created Cisco's unique CLI from innumerable creative possibilities, as Arista's own witnesses have admitted. And as Arista's own witnesses have also admitted, Arista blatantly copied Cisco CLI. In the words of Arista's own Chief Technology

Officer and Senior Vice President of Software Engineering, Ken Duda:

22

23

24

25 26

27

For convenience, Cisco refers to all the asserted aspects of the copyrighted works as "Cisco CLI" even though some copyrighted Cisco CLI elements (like hierarchies, modes, prompts, command responses, screen displays and help screens) are not themselves command-line expressions and some copyrighted CLI-related elements (like user guides and manuals) are not contained in Cisco's command-line interface.



DOCKET

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.

