

Appendix A

Panel Opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Eighth Circuit (Aug. 19, 2021)

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 19-3458

Designworks Homes, Inc., a Missouri corporation; Charles Lawrence James

Plaintiffs - Appellants

v.

Thomson Sailors Homes, L.L.C., a Kansas L.L.C.; Thomson Homes, L.L.C.;
Donald Sailors; Edward B. Thomson, III; Team 3 Architects, Inc.; Bruce H.
Beatty; Bobby Sailors; Eric Bradley Thomson; Elswood Smith Carlson, P.A.

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Western District of Missouri - Kansas City

Submitted: June 15, 2021

Filed: August 19, 2021

Before GRUENDER, ARNOLD, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

STRAS, Circuit Judge.

Designworks Homes, Inc., thinks that a group of architects and other builders copied one of its home designs. It also believes that, even if there was no copyright

violation, it should not have to reimburse the alleged infringers for their attorney fees and costs. The district court¹ disagreed on both points, and so do we.

I.

Charles James built a house on Melrose Drive in Columbia, Missouri. The house, just like two others built in the area, has a two-story “triangular atrium design with stairs as part of the main room.” Many years later, Designworks registered the design as a copyrighted architectural work.

Another firm, Thomson Sailors Homes, L.L.C., also used a triangular-atrium design in what it called the Newbury Model. Designworks believes that everyone involved in the design and promotion of the Newbury Model, including those who displayed it in brochures, infringed on its copyright. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 102(a)(8) (extending copyright protection to “architectural works”).

At summary judgment, the district court did not see things the same way. It concluded that the Newbury Model was not a copy of the original Melrose home. It also decided to award over \$400,000 in attorney fees and costs to Thomson Sailors and the other defendants. *See id.* § 505. The reason: Designworks’ “litigating position was unreasonable and . . . [its] pursuit of the case was, at best, frivolous in nature and, at worst, done in bad faith.”

II.

We review the district court’s decision to grant summary judgment de novo. *See Warner Bros. Ent., Inc. v. X One X Prods.*, 644 F.3d 584, 591 (8th Cir. 2011). Summary judgment was appropriate “if the evidence, viewed in the light most

¹The Honorable Stephen R. Bough, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

favorable to [Designworks], demonstrates that there is no genuine issue of material fact and that [Thomson Sailors was] entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

To prevail on its copyright claims, Designworks had to prove that Thomson Sailors copied its design. *See Taylor Corp. v. Four Seasons Greetings, LLC*, 403 F.3d 958, 964 (8th Cir. 2005). It had no direct evidence, so it attempted to make its case indirectly by showing that Thomson Sailors had access to the Melrose house and then designed and built “substantially similar” homes. *Id.* at 966–67.

Substantial similarity incorporates two concepts. First, there must be similarity of ideas, which must be “evaluated extrinsically, focusing on [the] objective similarities . . . of the works.” *Rottlund Co. v. Pinnacle Corp.*, 452 F.3d 726, 731 (8th Cir. 2006). Second, if the ideas are similar, they must be similarly expressed, meaning that an “ordinary, reasonable person” would think that “the total concept and feel of the [designs] in question are substantially similar.”² *Hartman v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.*, 833 F.2d 117, 120–21 (8th Cir. 1987) (referring to this as “the intrinsic test”). Without similarity in ideas *and* expression, there is no infringement. *See id.* at 120.

After “compar[ing] [the] works,” *id.* (second alteration in original) (quoting *O’Neill v. Dell Publ’g Co.*, 630 F.2d 685, 690 (1st Cir. 1980)), we agree with the district court that substantial similarity in expression is missing here. The Melrose house, which was built first, has a roughly rectangular floorplan, except for a large diamond-shaped great room. *See Appendix*. The corners of the great room intersect the rear wall and, as the floor plan of the home shows, half of the diamond extends

²Even if the district court misstated the standard for evaluating similarity, as Designworks argues, “[we] may [still] affirm.” *Wierman v. Casey’s Gen. Stores*, 638 F.3d 984, 1002 (8th Cir. 2011). The reason, of course, is that our review of a grant of summary judgment is *de novo*.

from the back of the house in the form of an isosceles right triangle with 20-foot legs. *Id.* Along the wall forming the far-left side of the diamond is a stairway leading down to a similarly shaped room on the lower level. *Id.* The stairway, which is open and has large windows above it, is what creates the “triangular atrium.” *Id.*

The Newbury Model also has a two-story “triangular atrium” consisting of large windows and stairs, but the similarities end there. *Id.* The walls forming the legs of the triangle on the Newbury Model, for example, are roughly 10 feet long, not 20. *Id.* It has two flights of stairs, not just one, with a landing at the triangle’s point, rather than having the stairs run along a single wall like they do in the Melrose house. *Id.* The adjoining room is also rectangular and oriented in line with the other rooms, not a diamond with sides at a 45° angle to them. *Id.* So even if one feature of both designs is a triangular atrium, there are plenty of differences, from the size of the atriums themselves to how they are integrated with the rest of the house, with each having rooms and stairways of differing shapes, sizes, and orientations.

To an “ordinary, reasonable person” viewing both designs, “the total concept and feel of the” homes would not appear “substantially similar.” *Hartman*, 833 F.2d at 120–21; *see also Taylor Corp.*, 403 F.3d at 966 (explaining that the focus should be on “the work[] taken as a whole”). In summary-judgment terms, our conclusion is the same as the district court’s: “the works are so *dissimilar* that ‘reasonable minds could not differ as to the absence of substantial similarity in expression.’” *Hartman*, 833 F.2d at 120 (emphasis added) (quoting *Litchfield v. Spielberg*, 736 F.2d 1352, 1355–56 (9th Cir. 1984)).

III.

After granting summary judgment, the district court had the discretion to order Designworks to pay Thomson Sailors’s “full costs,” including “a reasonable attorney’s fee.” 17 U.S.C. § 505. In deciding whether to make an award, the court had to “giv[e] substantial weight to the reasonableness of [Designworks’] litigating

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.