

In The
United States Court of Appeals
For The Fourth Circuit

SAS INSTITUTE, INC.,

Plaintiff – Appellee,

v.

WORLD PROGRAMMING LIMITED,

Defendant – Appellant.

**ON APPEALS FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT RALEIGH**

BRIEF OF APPELLEE

**Pressly M. Millen
Raymond M. Bennett
Samuel B. Hartzell
WOMBLE BOND DICKINSON (US) LLP
555 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1100
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601
(919) 755-2158**

Counsel for Appellee

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
DISCLOSURE OF CORPORATE AFFILIATIONS AND OTHER INTERESTS

Disclosures must be filed on behalf of all parties to a civil, agency, bankruptcy or mandamus case, except that a disclosure statement is **not** required from the United States, from an indigent party, or from a state or local government in a pro se case. In mandamus cases arising from a civil or bankruptcy action, all parties to the action in the district court are considered parties to the mandamus case.

Corporate defendants in a criminal or post-conviction case and corporate amici curiae are required to file disclosure statements.

If counsel is not a registered ECF filer and does not intend to file documents other than the required disclosure statement, counsel may file the disclosure statement in paper rather than electronic form. Counsel has a continuing duty to update this information.

No. 19-1290 Caption: SAS Institute Inc. v. World Programming Limited

Pursuant to FRAP 26.1 and Local Rule 26.1,

SAS Institute Inc.
(name of party/amicus)

who is Appellee, makes the following disclosure:
(appellant/appellee/petitioner/respondent/amicus/intervenor)

1. Is party/amicus a publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity? YES NO
2. Does party/amicus have any parent corporations? YES NO
If yes, identify all parent corporations, including all generations of parent corporations:
3. Is 10% or more of the stock of a party/amicus owned by a publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity? YES NO
If yes, identify all such owners:

4. Is there any other publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity that has a direct financial interest in the outcome of the litigation (Local Rule 26.1(a)(2)(B))? YES NO
If yes, identify entity and nature of interest:

5. Is party a trade association? (amici curiae do not complete this question) YES NO
If yes, identify any publicly held member whose stock or equity value could be affected substantially by the outcome of the proceeding or whose claims the trade association is pursuing in a representative capacity, or state that there is no such member:

6. Does this case arise out of a bankruptcy proceeding? YES NO
If yes, identify any trustee and the members of any creditors' committee:

Signature: /s/ Pressly M. Millen

Date: April 2, 2019

Counsel for: SAS Institute Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on April 2, 2019, the foregoing document was served on all parties or their counsel of record through the CM/ECF system if they are registered users or, if they are not, by serving a true and correct copy at the addresses listed below:

/s/ Pressly M. Millen
(signature)

April 2, 2019
(date)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
A. The Underlying Action, Judgment, and Appeal	3
i. SAS’s Litigation in the U.S. and U.K. against WPL.....	3
ii. The Appeal.....	5
1. SAS’s Appeal of the Permanent Injunction Denial.....	5
2. WPL’s Appeal on Preclusion and Evidentiary Grounds.....	6
B. After Appeal, Evidence of WPL’s Financial Position and Intent to Avoid the Judgment in the U.K. Becomes Clear	8
C. SAS Initiates Enforcement Proceedings in California.....	8
D. Proceedings in the U.K. Court	11
i. The U.K. Court Refuses to Enforce Any Portion of SAS’s Judgment	11
ii. The U.K. Court Orders SAS to Return Two-Thirds of All Collections, Including the Bond and Escrow Payments Imposed as Security for WPL’s Appeal	13
iii. The U.K. Court’s <i>Ex Parte</i> Injunction against SAS	13
E. WPL Changes Its License Agreement to Thwart the U.S. Judgment	16

F.	SAS Seeks Relief under the All Writs Act and Rule 60	17
G.	The District Court’s Order and Opinion	18
i.	The Anti-Clawback Injunction	19
ii.	The U.S.-Expansion Injunction.....	19
1.	Under the AWA.....	19
2.	Under Rule 60(b)(6)	21
H.	SAS’s Collections.....	22
	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	24
	ARGUMENT	26
I.	THE ALL WRITS ACT AUTHORIZED THE ANTI- CLAWBACK AND U.S.-EXPANSION INJUNCTIONS	26
A.	The District Court Did Not Abuse Its Discretion When Defending Its Judgment from Being Undermined by the U.K. Clawback.....	27
i.	The District Court Had Authority under the AWA to Issue the Anti-Clawback Injunction	27
ii.	Comity Did Not Require the District Court to Defer to WPL’s Collateral Attack	31
iii.	WPL’s Notice and Vagueness Objections to the Anti-Clawback Injunction Are Inconsistent with the Record and Would Not Justify Reversal in Any Event	33
B.	The District Court Acted within Its AWA Discretion by Enjoining WPL’s Expansion in the U.S. Market while the Judgment Remains Unsatisfied.....	35

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.