

No. 18-956

In the Supreme Court of the United States

GOOGLE LLC, PETITIONER

v.

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

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

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE

NOEL J. FRANCISCO

Solicitor General

Counsel of Record

JOSEPH H. HUNT

Assistant Attorney General

MALCOLM L. STEWART

Deputy Solicitor General

MATTHEW GUARNIERI

Assistant to the Solicitor

General

MARK R. FREEMAN

DANIEL TENNY

SONIA M. CARSON

Attorneys

Department of Justice

Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov

(202) 514-2217

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. 101 *et seq.*, protects “original works of authorship,” 17 U.S.C. 102(a), including “computer program[s],” 17 U.S.C. 101. The Act specifies, however, that copyright protection does not “extend to any idea, procedure, process, system, method of operation, concept, principle, or discovery, regardless of the form in which it is described, explained, illustrated, or embodied in such work.” 17 U.S.C. 102(b). Under the “merger” doctrine, copyright protection also does not apply when an idea can be expressed in only a limited number of ways, such that the expression and idea “merge.” Finally, the Copyright Act provides that “the fair use of a copyrighted work * * * is not an infringement of copyright.” 17 U.S.C. 107.

The questions presented are as follows:

1. Whether Section 102(b) or the merger doctrine precludes copyright protection for respondent’s original computer code, which defines and organizes a set of functions that are useful in writing computer programs.
2. Whether the court of appeals correctly held that no reasonable jury could find that petitioner’s verbatim copying of respondent’s original computer code into a competing commercial product was fair use.

(I)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement..... 1
Discussion..... 10
I. The copyrightability question does not warrant review..... 11
A. The court of appeals correctly held that neither Section 102(b) nor the merger doctrine forecloses copyright protection 11
B. Further review is not warranted..... 15
II. The fair-use question does not warrant review 17
A. The court of appeals correctly held that no reasonable jury could find fair use on this record 17
B. The court of appeals' fact-bound decision on fair use does not warrant further review..... 21
Conclusion..... 23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

American Broad. Cos. v. Aereo, Inc., 573 U.S. 431 (2014)..... 21
Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of Am. Inc., 975 F.2d 832 (Fed. Cir. 1992)..... 19
Baker v. Selden, 101 U.S. 99 (1880) 14
Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc., 510 U.S. 569 (1994)..... passim
Disney Enters., Inc. v. VidAngel, Inc., 869 F.3d 848 (9th Cir. 2017)..... 19
Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., 499 U.S. 340 (1991)..... 1, 8, 11
Golan v. Holder, 565 U.S. 302 (2012)..... 2, 12
Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters., 471 U.S. 539 (1985)..... 18, 22

(III)

IV

Cases—Continued:	Page
<i>Lexmark Int’l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.</i> , 387 F.3d 522 (6th Cir. 2004)	15, 16
<i>Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Borland Int’l, Inc.</i> , 49 F.3d 807 (1st Cir. 1995), aff’d by an equally divided Court, 516 U.S. 233 (1996).....	15, 16
<i>Mitel, Inc. v. Iqtel, Inc.</i> , 124 F.3d 1366 (10th Cir. 1997).....	2
<i>Roth Greeting Cards v. United Card Co.</i> , 429 F.2d 1106 (9th Cir. 1970).....	15
<i>Sega Enters. Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.</i> , 977 F.2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1993).....	19
<i>Situation Mgmt. Sys. v. ASP Consulting LLC</i> , 560 F.3d 53 (1st Cir. 2009)	16
<i>Sony Computer Entm’t, Inc. v. Connectix Corp.</i> , 203 F.3d 596 (9th Cir. 2000).....	19
<i>Sony Corp. of Am. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> , 464 U.S. 417 (1984).....	22
<i>TCA Television Corp. v. McCollum</i> , 839 F.3d 168 (2d Cir. 2016), cert. denied, 137 S. Ct. 2175 (2017)	18
<i>Twin Peaks Prods., Ltd. v. Publications Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 996 F.2d 1366 (2d Cir. 1993)	2
<i>Zalewski v. Cicero Builder Dev., Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 95 (2d Cir. 2014)	2, 13
Statutes, regulation, and rule:	
Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. 101 <i>et seq.</i>	1
17 U.S.C. 101.....	1, 4, 11
17 U.S.C. 102(a)	1, 8, 11, 12
17 U.S.C. 102(a)(1).....	1
17 U.S.C. 102(b).....	2, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16
17 U.S.C. 106(1)	3
17 U.S.C. 106(2)	3, 18

Statutes, regulation, and rule—Continued:	Page
17 U.S.C. 107.....	3, 17, 18
17 U.S.C. 107(1).....	9
17 U.S.C. 107(1)-(4).....	3, 17
17 U.S.C. 107(2).....	9, 21
17 U.S.C. 107(3).....	10
17 U.S.C. 107(4).....	9
17 U.S.C. 109(b)(1)(A).....	4
17 U.S.C. 117.....	4, 11
17 U.S.C. 302.....	15
17 U.S.C. 506(a)(3)(A).....	4
17 U.S.C. 1201(f).....	20
17 U.S.C. 1201(f)(4).....	20
28 U.S.C. 1295(a)(1).....	8
37 C.F.R. 202.1(a).....	15
Sup. Ct. R. 10(a).....	21
Miscellaneous:	
H.R. Rep. No. 1476, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. (1976).....	2, 11
1 Melville B. Nimmer & David Nimmer, <i>Nimmer on Copyright</i> (2019).....	4
U.S. Copyright Office, <i>Software-Enabled Consumer Products</i> (2016), https://go.usa.gov/xVNyD	19

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.