

No. 21-869

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

ANDY WARHOL FOUNDATION FOR THE VISUAL ARTS,  
INC.,

*Petitioner,*

v.

LYNN GOLDSMITH, ET AL.,

*Respondents.*

---

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of  
Appeals for the Second Circuit

---

---

**BRIEF OF SENATOR MARSHA BLACKBURN AS  
*AMICUS CURIAE* SUPPORTING RESPONDENTS**

---

---

Thomas M. Johnson, Jr.

*Counsel of Record*

William K. Lane III

Krystal B. Swendsboe

Spencer C. Brooks

Corey Hauser

**WILEY REIN LLP**

2050 M Street, NW

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 719-7000

tmjohnson@wiley.law

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT .....	7
I. Through The Copyright Act, Congress Intended To Incentivize And Protect Original Work, In Keeping With The Founders' Design. .....	7
A. Throughout American History, Copyright Law Was Crafted To Protect Original Creative Works. ....	7
B. The Copyright Act's Text And Structure Include Broad Protection Against Use Of Copyrighted Material In Derivative Works. ....	11
C. The Copyright Act's Legislative History Confirms Congress's Intent To Incentivize And Protect Original Work. .....	17
II. The Second Circuit's Application Of The Copyright Act Properly Protects Creators Of Original Work.....	24
CONCLUSION.....	28

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 569 (1994).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cent. Bank, N.A. v. First Interstate Bank, N.A.</i> , 511 U.S. 164 (1994).....	12
<i>Estate of Cowart v. Nicklos Drilling Co.</i> , 505 U.S. 469 (1992).....	12
<i>Dolan v. U.S. Postal Serv.</i> , 546 U.S. 481 (2006).....	14
<i>Emerson v. Davies</i> , 8 F. Cas. 615 (C.C.D. Mass. 1845).....	11
<i>Folsom v. Marsh</i> , 9 F.Cas. 342 (CC Mass. 1841) .....	5, 10, 15
<i>Google LLC v. Oracle Am., Inc.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1183 (2021).....	15
<i>Harper &amp; Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters.</i> , 471 U.S. 539 (1985).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>New Prime Inc. v. Oliveira</i> , 139 S. Ct. 532 (2019).....	23
<i>Sony Corp. of Am. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> , 464 U.S. 417 (1984).....	3, 13

<i>Star Athletica, L.L.C. v. Varsity Brands, Inc.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1002 (2017).....	12
<i>State Farm Fire &amp; Cas. Co. v. U. S. ex rel. Rigsby</i> , 580 U.S. 26 (2016).....	17
<i>Story v. Holcombe</i> , 23 F. Cas. 171 (C.C.D. Ohio 1847) .....	10
<i>Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken</i> , 422 U.S. 151 (1975).....	3
<i>Washington State Dep't of Soc. &amp; Health Servs. v. Guardianship Est. of Keffeler</i> , 537 U.S. 371 (2003).....	14
<b>Constitutional Provisions and Statutes</b>	
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 8.....	1, 3, 7
17 U.S.C. § 101 .....	3, 13
17 U.S.C. § 106.....	3, 13
17 U.S.C. § 107 .....	4, 13, 15, 16
Copyright Act of 1790, Pub. L. No. 1-15, 1 Stat. 124 .....	9
Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101- 1332 .....	3
Statute of Anne, 8 Anne, c. 19 (1710) .....	7

**Other Authorities**

H.R. REP. NO. 94-1476 (1975) .....	<i>passim</i>
S. REP. NO. 94-473 (1975).....	5, 12, 18, 19
Comments from Bart Herbison, Exec. Dir. Nashville Songwriters Ass'n Int'l on " <i>Review of ASCAP and BMI Consent Decrees</i> ," U.S. Dep't of Justice (Aug. 5, 2014), <a href="https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/atr/legacy/2014/08/13/307686.pdf">https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/ files/atr/legacy/2014/08/13/307686.pd f</a> .....	27
Copyright Law Revision: Report of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (H.R. Judiciary Comm. Print 1961) .....	20, 21
<i>Copyright Timeline: A History of Copyright in the United States</i> , ASS'N OF RSCH. LIBRS., <a href="https://www.arl.org/copyright-timeline/">https://www.arl.org/copyright- timeline/</a> .....	8
THE FEDERALIST NO. 43 (James Madison).....	3, 8
James Madison, <i>Madison Debates</i> AVALON PROJECT (Aug. 18, 1787) .....	8

# 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.