

No. 19-783

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

NATHAN VAN BUREN,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

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

**BRIEF OF THE R STREET INSTITUTE, PUBLIC
KNOWLEDGE, LINCOLN NETWORK, ENGINE
ADVOCACY, THE INNOVATION DEFENSE
FOUNDATION, AND THE AMERICAN ANTITRUST
INSTITUTE AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF
PETITIONER**

JOHN BERGMAYER
PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE
1818 N St NW Ste 410
Washington, DC 20036

J. SCOTT MCKAIG
LINCOLN NETWORK
44 Tehama St
San Francisco, CA 94105

ABBY RIVES
ENGINE ADVOCACY
700 Pennsylvania Ave SE
Washington, DC 20003

CHARLES DUAN
Counsel of Record
R STREET INSTITUTE
1212 New York Ave NW Ste 900
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 525-5717
cduan@rstreet.org

RANDY M. STUTZ
AMERICAN ANTITRUST INSTITUTE
1025 Connecticut Ave NW Ste 1000
Washington, DC 20036

Counsel for amici curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	4
ARGUMENT	6
I. Broad Construction of the CFAA Enables Anticompetitive Conduct	6
A. Incumbent Companies Can Directly Block Competitors from Entering the Market	7
B. Online Platform Operators Can Copy and Then Foreclose Innovative Startups	10
C. CFAA Assertion Limits Consumer Choice and Facilitates Unfair Pricing	13
II. Conflicts with the Intellectual Property Laws Show That the Broad Construction of the CFAA Enables Anticompetitive Behavior	17
A. Trade Secret Law Requires Secrecy Tradeoffs That the CFAA Disregards	17
B. Copyright Law Incorporates Balances and Exceptions Not Found in the CFAA	20
C. Statutory Text and Legislative History Confirm that the CFAA Was Not Intended to Supersede Intellectual Property Law	22
III. The CFAA Should Be Construed Narrowly to Exclude Terms of Use as Conditions of Authorization	24
A. A Narrow Construction of the CFAA Better Ensures Competition	25
B. Existing Contract Remedies Render the Broad Construction Superfluous and Excessive	26
CONCLUSION	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Bison Advisors LLC v. Kessler</i> , No. 14-cv-3121 (D. Minn. Aug. 12, 2016)	18
<i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 569 (1994)	20
<i>Craigslist Inc. v. 3Taps Inc.</i> , 942 F. Supp. 2d 962 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	14
<i>Defiance Button Machine Co.</i> <i>v. C & C Metal Products Corp.</i> , 759 F.2d 1053 (2d Cir. 1985)	19
<i>EF Cultural Travel BV v. Explorica Inc.</i> , 274 F.3d 577 (1st Cir. 2001)	14, 20–21
<i>Electro-Craft Corp. v. Controlled Motion, Inc.</i> , 332 N.W.2d 890 (Minn. 1983)	18
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Power Ventures, Inc.</i> , 844 F.3d 1058 (9th Cir. 2016)	7–9, 21
<i>Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co.</i> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991)	20
<i>Fire 'Em Up, Inc.</i> , <i>v. Technocarb Equipment (2004) Ltd.</i> , 799 F. Supp. 2d 846 (N.D. Ill. 2011)	18
<i>Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 517 (1994)	21
<i>Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises</i> , 471 U.S. 539 (1985)	20
<i>HiQ Labs, Inc. v. LinkedIn Corp.</i> , 938 F.3d 985 (9th Cir. 2019)	10–13, 27
<i>Impression Products, Inc.</i> <i>v. Lexmark International, Inc.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1523 (2017)	28

(iii)

<i>I.M.S. Inquiry Management Systems, Ltd. v. Berkshire Information Systems, Inc., 307 F. Supp. 2d 521 (S.D.N.Y. 2004)</i>	20
<i>Institute of Veterinary Pathology, Inc. v. California Health Laboratories, Inc., 116 Cal. App. 3d 111 (Ct. App. 1981)</i>	11
<i>Isbrandtsen Co. v. Johnson, 343 U.S. 779 (1952)</i>	28
<i>Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp., 416 U.S. 470 (1974)</i>	18
<i>Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 568 U.S. 519 (2013)</i>	28
<i>Munaf v. Geren, 553 U.S. 674 (2008)</i>	26
<i>nClosures Inc. v. Block & Co., Inc., 770 F.3d 598 (7th Cir. 2014)</i>	18
<i>Ryanair DAC v. Expedia Inc., No. 17-cv-1789 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 6, 2018)</i>	14
<i>Scott v. United States, 79 U.S. (12 Wall.) 443 (1871)</i>	27
<i>Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc., 464 U.S. 417 (1984)</i>	22
<i>Southwest Airlines Co. v. Farechase, Inc., 318 F. Supp. 2d 435 (N.D. Tex. 2004)</i>	13–14, 18, 21, 27
<i>Southwest Stainless, LP v. Sappington, 582 F.3d 1176 (10th Cir. 2009)</i>	19
<i>Specht v. Netscape Communications Corp., 306 F.3d 17 (2002)</i>	27
<i>Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken, 422 U.S. 151 (1975)</i>	21

(iv)

United States v. D'Amato,
39 F.3d 1249 (2d Cir. 1994) 26

United States v. Microsoft Corp.,
253 F.2d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001) 9, 12–13

United States v. Nosal,
676 F.3d 854 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc) 24

Ward v. TheLadders.com, Inc.,
3 F. Supp. 3d 151 (S.D.N.Y. 2014) 26

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION

U.S. Const. art. 1, § 8, cl. 8 21

STATUTES

17 U.S.C. § 102(a) 20

—— § 102(b) 20

—— § 107 20

—— § 201(a) 20

—— § 302 21

—— § 506(a) 23

—— § 902(a)(1) 24

—— § 1301(a)(1) 24

18 U.S.C. § 1832 17

—— § 1836(b)(2) 17

—— § 1836(b)(3) 17

—— § 1839(3)(A) 18

—— § 1839(3)(B) 18

Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (CFAA),
18 U.S.C. § 1030 4–28

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.