

No. 18-956

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

GOOGLE LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT

Dorian E. Daley	E. Joshua Rosenkranz
Deborah K. Miller	<i>Counsel of Record</i>
Matthew M. Sarboraria	Annette L. Hurst
Andrew C. Temkin	Peter Bicks
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Lisa T. Simpson
500 Oracle Parkway	Andrew D. Silverman
Redwood Shores, CA	Matthew R. Shahabian
94065	Jeremy Peterman
	Hannah Garden-Monheit
Dale M. Cendali	Geoffrey Moss
Joshua L. Simmons	ORRICK, HERRINGTON &
Jordan M. Romanoff	SUTCLIFFE LLP
Ari E. Lipsitz	51 West 52nd Street
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP	New York, NY 10019
601 Lexington Avenue	(212) 506-5000
New York, NY 10022	jrosenkranz@orrick.com

Counsel for Respondent

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The Copyright Act protects “literary works,” 17 U.S.C. §102(a), expansively defined as “works ... expressed in words, numbers, or other verbal or numerical symbols or indicia,” §101. Computer programs are protected as literary works under the Act. Google copied 11,330 lines of Oracle’s original and creative computer code, as well as the intricate organization of its computer program, into a competing software platform, Android. The questions presented are:

1. Under §102(a), computer programs, like all “works of authorship,” have “[c]opyright protection,” as long as they are “original.” The merger doctrine does not make any expression unprotectable except in the rare circumstance where there were very few ways to express the idea. Does the Copyright Act protect the code and organization that Google concedes were original and creative and that Oracle could have written in countless ways to perform the same function?

2. Was the Court of Appeals correct in holding that Google’s copying was not fair, where Google conceded it copied for commercial purposes and that the code it copied serves the same purpose and has the same meaning, and Google did not dispute the evidence that Android competes directly with Oracle’s work, harming its actual and potential markets?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
Sun Develops Java SE To Help Developers Write Their Own Applications.....	3
Sun Licenses Java SE, Including Just Declaring Code And Organization.....	11
Google Copies 11,330 Lines Of Declaring Code And The Organization Of Java SE.....	12
Android Competes Directly With Java SE	14
The Court Of Appeals Finds Google Unfairly Copied Copyrightable Code	15
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	16
ARGUMENT	20
I. Java SE’s Declaring Code And Organization Are Copyrightable.....	20
A. Java SE’s declaring code and organization, which Google conceded are original, are protected under §102(a).	20

- B. Section 102(b) codifies the idea/expression dichotomy, and Oracle seeks protection only for its particular expression, not ideas. 23
- C. Google’s merger argument is meritless..... 28
 - 1. Merger is inapplicable because Java SE’s authors had countless ways to express the ideas embodied in the platform..... 28
 - 2. Copying Java SE’s exact words and organization was not necessary for Google to express the ideas. 30
 - 3. Google’s proposed interoperability exception is misplaced and inconsistent with the Act..... 35
- II. Google’s Superseding Use Of Oracle’s Copyrighted Work Was Not Fair Use..... 36
 - A. The Court of Appeals applied the correct standard of review. 37
 - B. Google’s copying is an unfair superseding use..... 39
 - 1. Factor one: Google’s use was commercial and for the same purpose as Oracle’s. 39
 - 2. Factor two: Google copied creative and expressive portions of Oracle’s work..... 44
 - 3. Factor three: Google’s copying was substantial. 45

4. Factor four: Google’s concededly “competing” product harmed Java SE in actual and potential markets.....	46
C. Google’s additional considerations cannot establish fair use.....	49
III. Google’s Policy Arguments Are Misplaced And Misguided.....	54
CONCLUSION.....	58
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY ADDENDUM.....	1a

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.