

No. 11-697

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

SUPAP KIRTSANG d/b/a BLUECHRISTINE99,
Petitioner,

v.

JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC.,
Respondent.

**On Writ Of Certiorari To The
United States Court Of Appeals
For The Second Circuit**

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE,
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION,
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES,
SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION, AND U.S.
PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

HAROLD FELD
Counsel of Record
JODIE GRIFFIN
SHERWIN SIY
PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE
1818 N Street, NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 861-0020
hfeld@publicknowledge.org

CORYNNE MCSHERRY
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
454 Shotwell Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
(415) 436-9333 x 122

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO. (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT	4
I. The Second Circuit’s erroneous interpretation of section 109(a) will impair trade, innovation, the public interest, and the free market for copies of copyright-protected goods	4
A. Sections 109 and 602 should be interpreted to avoid manifestly absurd results	4
B. The Second Circuit’s decision permits copyright owners to indefinitely control the distribution of all foreign-manufactured copies	7
1. New impediments to the resale of lawfully purchased goods harm U.S. consumers and businesses.....	8
2. Copyright owners may attempt to seize indefinite control over distribution by moving their manufacturing activities abroad.....	13
3. The lower court’s interpretation of “lawfully made under this title” could preclude consumers from displaying their lawfully acquired copies	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
C. The decision below would authorize copyright owners to enjoin parallel imports, contrary to Congress’s intent and consumers’ interest.....	15
II. The Ninth Circuit’s interpretation of section 109(a) does not mitigate the ill effects of interpreting section 602 to trump section 109.....	19
A. The Ninth Circuit’s “authorized sale” exception is not firmly rooted in the text or legislative history of the Copyright Act.....	19
B. The Ninth Circuit recognized that its own reading of section 602 could produce an “untenable” policy result.....	22
III. The Second Circuit’s untenable results and the Ninth Circuit’s need for a novel exception can both be avoided through proper interpretation of section 109.....	26
A. Neither section 602 nor presumptions against extraterritoriality require “under this title” to be read as a geographic restriction.....	27
B. Non-geographic interpretations of “under this title” prevent absurd results, while still giving force to section 602.....	31
CONCLUSION.....	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>BMG Music v. Perez</i> , 952 F.2d 318 (9th Cir. 1991)	22, 23, 24
<i>Cariou v. Prince</i> , 784 F. Supp. 2d 337 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	14
<i>Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States</i> , 143 U.S. 457 (1892).....	5
<i>Conn. Nat’l Bank v. Germain</i> , 503 U.S. 249 (1992).....	32
<i>Denbicare U.S.A. Inc. v. Toys “R” Us, Inc.</i> , 84 F.3d 1143 (9th Cir. 1996).....	10, 24, 25
<i>Fox Film Corp. v. Doyal</i> , 286 U.S. 123 (1932)	17
<i>Hasbro Bradley, Inc. v. Sparkle Toys, Inc.</i> , 780 F.2d 189 (2d Cir. 1985).....	12
<i>Hoepker v. Kruger</i> , 200 F. Supp. 2d 340 (S.D.N.Y. 2002).....	14
<i>John Wiley & Sons, Inc. v. Kirtsaeng</i> , 654 F.3d 210 (2d Cir. 2011)	30, 31, 32
<i>Mass. Museum of Contemporary Art Found., Inc. v. Buchel</i> , 593 F.3d 38 (1st Cir. 2010).....	14
<i>Omega S.A. v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i> , 541 F.3d 982 (9th Cir. 2008), <i>aff’d by an equally divided Court</i> , 131 S. Ct. 565 (2010).....	19, 25, 27
<i>Parfums Givenchy, Inc. v. Drug Emporium, Inc.</i> , 38 F.3d 477 (9th Cir. 1994)	23, 24
<i>Pub. Citizen v. United States Dep’t of Justice</i> , 491 U.S. 440 (1989).....	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Quality King Distributors, Inc. v. L'anza Research International, Inc.</i> , 523 U.S. 135 (1998).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Sebastian Int'l, Inc. v. Consumer Contacts, Ltd.</i> , 847 F.2d 1093 (3d Cir. 1988)	7
<i>Stevens v. Gladding</i> , 57 U.S. 447 (1855).....	5
<i>Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken</i> , 422 U.S. 151 (1975).....	17
<i>United States v. Wilson</i> , 503 U.S. 329 (1992)	4

STATUTES AND LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

17 U.S.C. § 104	28
17 U.S.C. § 106	6, 11, 35
17 U.S.C. § 109	<i>passim</i>
17 U.S.C. § 202	5
17 U.S.C. § 602	<i>passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 2319A.....	34
Copyright Act of 1909, Pub. L. No. 60-349, § 41, 35 Stat. 1075	20
Council Directive 96/9 on the Legal Protection of Databases, 1996 O.J. (L77).....	33
Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (“PRO-IP Act”), Pub. L. No. 110-403, § 105 (2008)	28, 29, 30

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.