

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 HUDSON INSTITUTE AS *AMICUS*  
*CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

---

ERIK S. JAFFE  
(Counsel of Record)  
GENE C. SCHAEER  
SCHAEER | JAFFE LLP  
1717 K Street, NW, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 787-1060  
ejaffe@schaerr-jaffe.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

---

## 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. Does the Copyright Act protect the code and organization of an original and creative reference system, popular with computer programmers who use the Java programming language, that could have been written in countless ways to perform the same function?
2. Does the fair-use limitation on copyright protection apply where the protected computer code was copied for commercial purposes, the copied code serves the same purpose and has the same meaning in the derivative work that it had in the original, and the derivative work containing the copied material competes directly with the original work, harming its actual and potential markets?

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
Table of Authorities.....	iii
Interest of <i>Amicus Curiae</i> .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Summary of Argument.....	3
Argument .....	4
I. Reduced and Indeterminate Copyright Protection for Computer Code Will Undermine Efforts To Reign in IP Theft by China, which Has a Long History of Hostility toward IP.....	4
II. Concerns Over Interoperability Do Not Justify Diminished Protection for IP. ....	10
Conclusion.....	13

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Faulkner v. Gibbs</i> , 199 F.2d 635 (9th Cir. 1952) .....	12
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 872 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	11
<i>Twin Laboratories, Inc. v. Weider Health &amp; Fitness</i> , 900 F.2d 566 (2d Cir. 1990) .....	12

### Statutes

17 U.S.C. §101 .....	i
17 U.S.C. §102 .....	i

### Other Authorities

Robin Brant, <i>How a Chinese firm fell victim to intellectual property theft</i> , BBC News, March 25, 2019, available at <a href="http://www.bbc.com/news/business-47689065">www.bbc.com/news/business- 47689065</a> .....	7
Commission on the Theft of American Intellectual Property (IP Commission), 2019 REVIEW: PROGRESS AND UPDATED RECOMMENDATIONS (Feb. 2019), available at <a href="http://ipcommission.org/report/ip_commission_2019_review_of_progress_and_updated_recommendations.pdf">http://ipcommission.org/report/ip_commi ssion_2019_review_of_progress_and_up dated_recommendations.pdf</a> .....	6, 7

Commission on the Theft of American Intellectual Property (IP Commission), UPDATE TO THE IP COMMISSION REPORT, THE THEFT OF AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: REASSESSMENTS OF THE CHALLENGE AND UNITED STATES POLICY (Feb. 2017), available at <a href="http://www.ipcommission.org/report/IP_Commission_Report_Update_2017.pdf">http://www.ipcommission.org/report/IP_Commission_Report_Update_2017.pdf</a> .....	5
Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR), Executive Office of the President, FINDINGS OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO CHINA’S ACTS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES RELATED TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, AND INNOVATION UNDER SECTION 301 OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 (Mar. 22, 2018), available at <a href="https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/Section%20301%20FINAL.PDF">https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/Section%20301%20FINAL.PDF</a> .....	7
Eric Rosenbaum, <i>1 in 5 corporations say China has stolen their IP within the last year: CNBC CFO survey</i> , CNBC (Mar. 1, 2019), available at <a href="http://www.cnbc.com/2019/02/28/1-in-5-companies-say-china-stole-their-ip-within-the-last-year-cnbc.html">www.cnbc.com/2019/02/28/1-in-5-companies-say-china-stole-their-ip-within-the-last-year-cnbc.html</a> .....	6

# 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.