

No. 18-1150

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

—◆—
GEORGIA, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

v.

PUBLIC.RESOURCE.ORG, INC.,

Respondent.

—◆—
**On Writ Of Certiorari To The
United States Court Of Appeals
For The Eleventh Circuit**

—◆—
**BRIEF OF PROFESSORS SHYAMKRISHNA
BALGANESH AND PETER S. MENELL AS
AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

—◆—
PETER S. MENELL
Koret Professor of Law
Counsel of Record
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY SCHOOL OF LAW
225 Bancroft Way
Berkeley, CA 94720-7200
(510) 642-5489
pmenell@law.berkeley.edu

COCKLE LEGAL BRIEFS (800) 225-6964
WWW.COCKLELEGALBRIEFS.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	3
I. THE “EDICTS OF GOVERNMENT” DOCTRINE IS FIRMLY ROOTED IN FUNDAMENTAL COPYRIGHT PRINCIPLES	3
A. The Official Announcement of Law Is Not Copyrightable Authorship	3
B. Legal Texts Are Methods of Operation that Constrain Expressive Choice and Are Ineligible for Copyright	6
C. Authentic Statements of Law Entail the Merger of Idea and Expression	9
II. THE OFFICIAL CODE OF GEORGIA ANNOTATED (O.C.G.A.) IS AN UNCOPY- RIGHTABLE EDICT OF GOVERNMENT....	11
A. An Edict of Government Does Not Need to Have the Force of Law	12
B. Annotations Produced under the Osten- sible Authority of the State Qualify as Edicts of Government	19
CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Baker v. Selden</i> , 101 U.S. 99 (1880).....	6
<i>Banks v. Manchester</i> , 128 U.S. 244 (1888)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bleistein v. Donaldson Lithographing Co.</i> , 188 U.S. 239 (1903)	4
<i>Burrow-Giles Lithographic Co. v. Sarony</i> , 111 U.S. 53 (1884)	3, 4
<i>Callaghan v. Myers</i> , 128 U.S. 617 (1888).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Computer Assocs. Int'l, Inc. v. Altai, Inc.</i> , 982 F. 2d 693 (2d Cir. 1992)	7
<i>Herbert Rosenthal Jewelry Corp. v. Kalpakian</i> , 446 F. 2d 738 (9th Cir. 1971).....	9
<i>Howell v. Miller</i> , 91 F. 129 (6th Cir. 1898).....	22, 23
<i>Little v. Gould</i> , 15 F. Cas. 604 (C.C.N.D.N.Y. 1851).....	17, 18
<i>Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Borland Int'l, Inc.</i> , 49 F. 3d 807 (1st Cir. 1995)	6, 7
<i>Morrissey v. Procter & Gamble Company</i> , 379 F. 2d 675 (1st Cir. 1967)	9
<i>Nash v. Lathrop</i> , 6 N.E. 559 (Mass. 1886).....	15, 16
<i>Sega Enterps. Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.</i> , 977 F. 2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1992).....	7
<i>Urantia Foundation v. Maaherra</i> , 114 F. 3d 955 (9th Cir. 1997).....	4
<i>Wheaton v. Peters</i> , 33 U.S. 591 (1834).....	1, 3, 12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
U.S. CONST., Art. I, § 8, Cl. 8	3
STATUTES	
Copyright Act	4, 7, 10
O.C.G.A. § 1-1-1.....	11, 12, 19
O.C.G.A. § 1-1-7.....	11
17 U.S.C. § 102(a).....	3
17 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	6
17 U.S.C. § 505	8
17 U.S.C. § 507	10
RULES	
Sup. Ct. R. 37.6	1
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
2 HOWELL'S ANNOTATED STATUTES OF MICHIGAN iv (1883).....	23
Hector T. Fenton, <i>Mr. Justice Blatchford. In Me- moriam</i> , 41 Am. L. Reg. 882 (1893)	16

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE¹

The authors of this brief are law professors at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of California who study and teach intellectual property law. Their research explores the interaction between statutory law and judge-made law in the evolution of U.S. copyright law.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The “edicts of government” doctrine was first validated by this Court in a series of nineteenth century cases. *Wheaton v. Peters*, 33 U.S. (8 Pet.) 591 (1834); *Banks v. Manchester*, 128 U.S. 244 (1888); *Callaghan v. Meyers*, 128 U.S. 617 (1888). While the doctrine has never been directly recognized in the express wording of the copyright statute, it is nevertheless firmly rooted in foundational copyright principles that are themselves reflected in the text of the statute.

Three foundational copyright principles buttress the doctrine. *First*, copyrightable authorship does not extend to official announcements of law, the hallmark of edicts of government. Authorship as understood in this Court’s jurisprudence requires personalization, an

¹ Pursuant to Sup. Ct. R. 37.6, *amici* note that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no counsel or party made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. No person other than *amici curiae* made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission. Petitioner and Respondents have consented to the filing of this brief.

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.