

App. 1

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 18-3711

PETER BROWNSTEIN,
Appellant

v.

TINA LINDSAY; ETHNIC TECHNOLOGIES, LLC

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of New Jersey
(No. 3-10-cv-1581)
District Judge: Hon. Freda L. Wolfson

Argued November 20, 2019

Before: CHAGARES, MATEY, and FUENTES,
Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: May 18, 2020)

Jay R. McDaniel, [ARGUED]
Weiner Law Group
629 Parsippany Road
Parsippany, NJ 07054
Counsel for Appellant

App. 2

Jesse C. Klaproth, [ARGUED]
Klaproth Law
Suite 800
1500 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Counsel for Appellees.

OPINION*

MATEY, *Circuit Judge.*

Innovators have long recognized that “[m]any ideas grow better when transplanted into another mind than in the one where they sprang up.” Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr., *The Breakfast Table Series: The Poet at the Breakfast Table* 146 (1900). So the law encourages collaboration and rewards authors of a joint work with the benefits of joint ownership. Peter Brownstein seeks a declaration of joint ownership in a computer program he developed with Tina Lindsay and an accounting of profits. The District Court granted summary judgment to Lindsay and her company, Ethnic Technologies (“E-Tech”), seeing no proof of Brownstein’s role. We will affirm.

* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and, pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7, does not constitute binding precedent.

I. BACKGROUND

In 1993, Lindsay began compiling a set of rules in order to “predict” a person’s ethnicity. *Brownstein v. Lindsay*, 742 F.3d 55, 59 (3d Cir. 2014). She knew the concept had value given her employment at List Services Direct, Inc., a direct-marketing company that sold customer lists. *Id.* at 58–59. So she enlisted Brownstein, a fellow List Services employee, to transform her rules into a computer program. *Id.* at 59. Lindsay’s rules were known as the Ethnic Determinate System (“EDS”), and Brownstein’s computer code was called “ETHN.” *Id.* Together, EDS and ETHN became the Lindsay Cultural Identification Determinate (“LCID”). *Id.*

In 1996, List Services asserted ownership of the LCID, prompting Lindsay and Brownstein to leave the company in June 1997. *Id.* at 60. List Services, Lindsay, and Brownstein later signed a Settlement Agreement in which Lindsay and Brownstein “agree[d] not to claim ownership or any other rights” to “a certain computer program concerning ethnic selections” that List Services was “presently using,” and List Services “disclaim[ed] any ownership to EDS.” (App. at 317–18.) Years later, things soured between Lindsay and Brownstein, and they parted ways. *Brownstein*, 742 F.3d at 61.

In 2010, Brownstein filed this lawsuit, seeking a declaration that he is co-owner of the LCID and an accounting of any profits Lindsay and E-Tech earned from the program after May 2010. *Id.* at 61–62. The

App. 4

case proceeded to trial and, at the close of Brownstein’s evidence, the District Court granted judgment as a matter of law to the defendants. The District Court held that Brownstein’s claims were barred by the statute of limitations and, in any event, that Brownstein lacked evidence showing his co-authorship of the LCID. *Id.* at 62–63. We reversed on appeal, holding that the accrual date of Brownstein’s claims was a jury question. *Id.* at 69–75. And we relied on an oral argument concession by defendants’ counsel “that Brownstein and Lindsay were co-authors of the LCID up until its 1997 iteration” to remand for further factual development of the co-authorship issue.¹ *Id.* at 65, 77.

On remand, Brownstein filed an amended complaint, which Lindsay and E-Tech then moved to dismiss. After converting that motion into a motion for summary judgment, the District Court held that the Settlement Agreement extinguished Lindsay and Brownstein’s rights to all pre-Settlement-Agreement versions of the LCID. (App. at 26.) The District Court then described the “operative question” as whether post-Settlement-Agreement versions of the LCID “continued to use [Brownstein]’s computer code.” (App. at 26.) Although Brownstein submitted an affidavit describing his work on the LCID, and copies of text purporting to be relevant computer code, the District Court rejected the affidavit as “conclusory” and the code as “not self-evident.” (App. at 29.) For those

¹ We also reversed an order by the District Court that cancelled certain copyright registrations. *Brownstein*, 742 F.3d at 58, 63, 77. That issue is not relevant to this appeal.

reasons, the court found that Brownstein failed to sustain his burden of production, and again granted summary judgment to the defendants. This timely appeal followed.²

II. DISCUSSION

Brownstein raises three issues on appeal. First, he argues that the District Court erroneously interpreted the Settlement Agreement as “sever[ing]” or “deconstruct[ing]” the LCID, (Opening Br. at 28–29), in contravention of established copyright principles, and that defendants’ continued use of Lindsay’s rules, by itself, entitles him to compensation.

It is true that “[t]he authors of a joint work are co-owners of copyright in the work,” 17 U.S.C. § 201(a), and that each joint author acquires “an undivided ownership in the entire work, including all the contributions contained therein.” Nimmer on Copyright § 6.03 (2019); *see* 17 U.S.C. § 101 (“A ‘joint work’ is a work prepared by two or more authors with the intention that their contributions be merged into *inseparable* or *interdependent* parts of a *unitary* whole.” (emphasis added)). But as we previously noted, the EDS was an “independent work,” of which Lindsay was the “sole author.” *Brownstein*, 742 F.3d at 59. And merely using the EDS in the LCID did not affect Lindsay’s ownership of

² The District Court had jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and 1367. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and again exercise plenary review over the District Court’s grant of summary judgment. *Brownstein*, 742 F.3d at 64.

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.