### No. 21-711

## In the Supreme Court of the United States

MARKHAM CONCEPTS, INC., ET AL., PETITIONERS,

v.

HASBRO, INC., ET AL.

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

## BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT REUBEN KLAMER IN OPPOSITION

ERICA J. VAN LOON JOSHUA J. POLLACK NIXON PEABODY LLP 300 S. Grand Avenue Suite 4100 Los Angeles, CA 90071

PATRICIA L. GLASER
THOMAS P. BURKE JR.
GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD
AVCHEN & SHAPIRO LLP
10250 Constellation Blvd.
19th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

PETER K. STRIS
Counsel of Record
DOUGLAS D. GEYSER
JOHN STOKES
STRIS & MAHER LLP
777 S. Figueroa Street
Suite 3850
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 995-6800
pstris@stris.com

Counsel for Respondent Reuben Klamer



### **QUESTION PRESENTED**

The Copyright Act of 1909 provided that "the word 'author' shall include an employer in the case of works made for hire." Pub. L. No. 60-349, § 62, 35 Stat. 1075, 1088. It did not further define "employer" or "works made for hire." That provision still governs works created before 1978.

This case addresses how to apply the provision where one party commissioned an independent contractor to create a work. Here the First Circuit held that a work for hire includes a commissioned work if the work was created at the commissioning party's "instance and expense," in which case the commissioning party is the "author." That interpretation of the 1909 Act followed holdings of courts around the country, including every circuit to apply the 1909 Act over the last five decades.

Petitioners contend that all those courts erred. They say that by using the word "employer" in 1909, Congress meant to cover only works created within the scope of an employer-employee relationship.

The question presented is:

Whether the First, Second, Fifth, Seventh, and Ninth Circuits have all erroneously held, consistently over the past 50-plus years, that the term "author" in the Copyright Act of 1909 is not limited to a party whose employee created the work within the scope of his or her employment.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questio	on p	resented	I
Introdu	actio	on	1
Statem	ent		5
	A.	Statutory background	5
	В.	Facts and procedural history	.10
Reasons for denying the petition1			
I.	hel gov	te every other circuit, the decision below d that the instance-and-expense test verns whether a commissioned work is rork for hire under the 1909 Act	.14
II.		at settled interpretation of the 1909 Act correct and does not conflict with $Reid$	.16
III.		e question presented is of limited and ninishing importance	.27
IV.		nificant reliance interests militate against turbing settled law	.30
Conclu	sion		.31



## III

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Aldon Accessories Ltd. v. Spiegel, Inc., 738 F.2d 548 (2d Cir. 1984)	15
Altman v. New Haven Union Co., 254 F. 113 (D. Conn. 1918)	7
Brattleboro Publ'g Co. v. Winmill Publ'g Corp.,	0.01
369 F.2d 565 (2d Cir. 1966)	8, 21
Brevet Press, Inc. v. Fenn, No. CIV. 06-4056-KES, 2007 WL 9773251 (D.S.D. Sept. 17, 2007)	15
Brumley v. Albert E. Brumley & Sons, Inc., 822 F.3d 926 (6th Cir. 2016)	29
Brumley v. Albert E. Brumley & Sons, Inc., No. 3:08-CV-1193, 2010 WL 1439972 (M.D. Tenn. Apr. 9, 2010)	14
Clingman v. Beaver, 544 U.S. 581 (2005)	
Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid, 490 U.S. 730 (1989)	$\dots nassim$



Dastar Corp. v. Random House, Inc., 548 U.S. 919 (2006)	3
Dielman v. White, 102 F. 892 (D. Mass. 1900)5	, 8, 20, 21
Estate of Hogarth v. Edgar Rice Burroughs, Inc., No. 00-Civ 9569 (DLC), 2002 WL 398696 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 15, 2002)	22
Estate of Hogarth v. Edgar Rice Burroughs, Inc., 342 F.3d 149 (2d Cir. 2003)	. 7, 10, 14
Estate of Hogarth v. Edgar Rice Burroughs, Inc., 541 U.S. 937 (2004)	3
Forward v. Thorogood, 985 F.2d 604 (1st Cir. 1993)	13, 14, 29
Grant v. Kellogg Co., 58 F. Supp. 48 (S.D.N.Y. 1944)	8, 21
The Indrani, 101 F. 596 (4th Cir. 1900)	18
Larsen v. Home Tel. Co. of Detroit, 129 N.W. 894 (Mich. 1911)	19
Lawrence v. Dana, 15 F. Cas. 26 (D. Mass. 1869)	5, 20
Lin-Brook Builders Hardware v. Gertler, 352 F 2d 298 (9th Cir. 1965)	8 21



# DOCKET

## 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.

