

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 OF AMICUS CURIAE DIGITAL JUSTICE
FOUNDATION IN SUPPORT OF AFFIRMANCE**

Andrew Grimm
DIGITAL JUSTICE
FOUNDATION
15287 Pepperwood
Drive
Omaha, NE 68154
(531) 210-2381

Gregory Keenan
DIGITAL JUSTICE
FOUNDATION
81 Stewart Street
Floral Park, NY 11001
(516) 633-2633

Edward F. Cunningham
Counsel of Record
LAW OFFICES OF EDWARD F.
CUNNINGHAM
62 Cambridge Avenue
Garden City, NY 11530
(516) 328-3705
ed@edcunninghamlaw.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

February 19, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... iii

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE..... 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 1

ARGUMENT..... 3

I. GOOGLE CONFLATES SUBSTANTIAL SIMILARITY WITH COPYRIGHTABILITY AND CONFLATES NECESSITY WITH CONVENIENCE. 3

 A. The first question presented pertains to eligibility for copyright protection—not the scope of that protection. 3

 B. Google could have enabled Java programmers to transition to Android by making a code-conversion tool. 13

II. GOOGLE’S ALL-OR-NOTHING APPROACH TO FAIR USE DESTROYS MARKETS AND CONCENTRATES WEALTH. 21

 A. Even if it is seen as transformative, Google’s use was not fair. 21

 B. There are major, and growing, costs to an all-or-nothing approach on fair use. 23

 C. A more nuanced approach to fair use shows greater fidelity to the Copyright Act and its animating purposes. 31

CONCLUSION 38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|--|------------|
| <u>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</u> , 804 F.3d 202 (2nd Cir. 2015)..... | 21, 24, 29 |
| <u>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</u> , 510 U.S. 569 (1994)..... | 21, 35, 36 |
| <u>Camreta v. Greene</u> , 563 U.S. 692 (2011)..... | 33 |
| <u>Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.</u> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991)..... | 5, 9, 16 |
| <u>Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enter's</u> , 471 U.S. 539 (1985)..... | 22 |
| <u>Kingdomware Techs., Inc. v. United States</u> , 136 S. Ct. 1969 (2016)..... | 32 |
| <u>Obduskey v. McCarthy & Holthus LLP</u> , 139 S. Ct. 1029 (2019)..... | 4 |
| <u>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</u> , 750 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 12 |
| <u>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</u> , 872 F. Supp. 2d 974 (2012)..... | 7, 13 |
| <u>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</u> , 508 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2007)..... | 24 |
| <u>Star Athletica, L.L.C. v. Varsity Brands, Inc.</u> , 137 S. Ct. 1002 (2017)..... | 20 |
| <u>Sun Microsystems, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</u> , 188 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 1999)..... | 18 |

Statutes

| | |
|-----------------------|----------|
| 17 U.S.C. § 101. | 4, 5, 14 |
|-----------------------|----------|

| | |
|-------------------------|------|
| 17 U.S.C. § 102(a)..... | 4, 5 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 102(b)..... | 4, 6 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 106. | 6 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 107. | 32 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 121. | 11 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 121A..... | 11 |
| 17 U.S.C. §108. | 35 |

Other Authorities

| | |
|--|--------|
| 4 <u>Nimmer on Copyright</u> § 13.03[A]..... | 11 |
| Amanda Levendowski <u>How Copyright Law Can Fix Artificial Intelligence’s Implicit Bias Problem</u> 93 Wash. L. Rev. 579 (2018)..... | 37 |
| Andrew Gilden & Timothy Greene, <u>Fair Use for the Rich and Fabulous?</u> , 80 U. Chicago L. Rev. Dialogue 88 (2013). | 29 |
| Andrew Gilden, <u>Raw Materials and the Creative Process</u> , 104 Geo. L.J. 355 (2016)..... | 29 |
| Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, <u>Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts</u> (2012)..... | 34 |
| Benjamin Sobel, <u>Artificial Intelligence’s Fair Use Crisis</u> , 41 Colum. J.L. & Arts 45 (2017)..... | passim |
| Eman J. Coco et al., <u>JPT: A Simple Java- Python Translator</u> , 5 Computer Applications 1 (2018). | 17 |
| <u>Goldstein on Copyright</u> § 12.2..... | 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.