

No. 18-877

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

FREDERICK L. ALLEN AND NAUTILUS
PRODUCTIONS, LLC

Petitioners,

v.

ROY A. COOPER, III, AS GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA,
ET AL.,

Respondents.

On Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

**BRIEF OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN
SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS**

CHARLES W. SHIFLEY, PRESIDENT
THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO
P.O. Box 472
Chicago, IL 60690

OF COUNSEL

ROBERT H. RESIS
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
71 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3600
CHICAGO, IL 60606

DONALD W. RUPERT
Counsel of Record
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
6300 WILLIS TOWER
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606
(312) 474-6300
DRUPERT@MARSHALLIP.COM

August 12, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| I. QUESTION PRESENTED..... | 1 |
| II. INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE | 1 |
| III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT | 2 |
| IV. SUMMARY OF FACTS..... | 5 |
| V. ARGUMENT..... | 8 |
| A. Section 511 of the Copyright Act is a clear and unambiguous abrogation of state sovereign immunity and this Court should honor Congressional intent and reverse the Fourth Circuit..... | 8 |
| B. This Court’s precedent supports a finding that 17 USC § 511 validly abrogated sovereign immunity under Congressional Article I powers..... | 13 |
| C. Congress’s intent to abrogate sovereign immunity is not negated by failure to explicitly refer to Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment. | 21 |
| 1. Copyright is protected under Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment | |

and the CRCA is enforceable under that Amendment.21

2. This Court should defer to Congressional intent to validly abrogate sovereign immunity.27

D. N.C. Gen. Stat. 121-25(b) is preempted by federal law.33

VI. CONCLUSION34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| Federal Cases | |
| <i>Allen v. Cooper</i> , 244 F. Supp. 3d 525 (E.D.N.C. 2017) | 7 |
| <i>Allen v. Cooper</i> , 895 F.3d 337 (4th Cir. 2018)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Ashworth v. Albers Med., Inc.</i> , 395 F. Supp. 2d 395 (S.D. W. Va. 2005) | 12 |
| <i>Atascadero State Hosp. v. Scanlon</i> , 473 U.S. 234 (1985)..... | 30 |
| <i>Belknap v. Schild</i> , 161 U.S. 10 (1896)..... | 17 |
| <i>Cent. Va. Cmty. Coll. v. Katz.</i> , 546 U.S. 356 (2006)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.</i> <i>v. City of Chicago</i> , 116 U.S. 226 (1897)..... | 22 |
| <i>Connecticut Nat. Bank v. Germain</i> , 503 U.S. 249 (1992)..... | 12 |
| <i>Crandon v. United States</i> , 494 U.S. 152 (1990)..... | 11 |
| <i>Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council</i> , 530 U.S. 363 (2000)..... | 33, 34 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Felix the Cat Prods. v. New Line Cinema</i> , No. 99-cv-9339 FMC (RCx), 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21763 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2000) | 34 |
| <i>Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Expense Bd. v. Coll. Sav. Bank</i> , 527 U.S. 627 (1999) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Hans v. Louisiana</i> , 134 U.S. 1 (1890) | 18, 30 |
| <i>Knox v. Lee</i> , 79 U. S. 457 (1870) | 31 |
| <i>Lynch v. Household Fin. Corp.</i> , 405 U.S. 538,552 (1972) | 19 |
| <i>McCarthy v. Bronson</i> , 500 U.S. 136 (1991) | 11 |
| <i>Osborn v. Bank of the United States</i> , 22.U.S. 738 (9 Wheat. 738) (1824) | 17, 18 |
| <i>In re Pattison</i> , 132 B.R. 449 (Bankr. D.N.M. 1991) | 32 |
| <i>Pennsylvania v. Union Gas Co.</i> , 491 U.S. 1 (1989) | 30 |
| <i>Rubin v. United States</i> , 449 U.S. 424 (1981) | 12 |
| <i>Seminole Tribe v. Florida</i> , 517 U.S. 44 (1996) | 7, 13, 14 |

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.