

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

CSI LITIGATION PSYCHOLOGY, LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
VS.)	
)	3:16-CV-3255-G
DECISIONQUEST, INC., ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the court is the motion for partial summary judgment filed by the plaintiff CSI Litigation Psychology, LLC (“CSI”) (docket entry 27). For the reasons stated below, the motion is denied.

I. BACKGROUND

CSI and the defendant DecisionQuest, Inc. (“DecisionQuest”) are competing jury consulting companies. Plaintiff’s Brief in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (“Motion”) at 2 (docket entry 28). The defendant Ann T. Greeley (“Greeley”) serves as DecisionQuest vice president and as a jury consultant

for the company. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint ("Complaint") ¶¶ 2, 20 (docket entry 21).

Dr. Bill Kanasky, Jr. ("Kanasky"), a jury consultant at CSI, published two articles entitled *Derailing the Reptile Safety Rule Attack: A Neurocognitive Analysis and Solution* ("Derailing") and *Debunking and Redefining the Plaintiff Reptile Theory* ("Debunking"). *Id.* ¶¶ 15, 17; *see* Appendix in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment ("CSI Appendix") at APP004-019, 022-031 (docket entry 29). CSI obtained federal copyrights to both works.¹ CSI placed the works on its website, and distributed them to current and potential clients. Complaint ¶ 18. Additionally, Kanasky presented the papers to various seminars. *Id.* ¶ 19.

Greeley subsequently authored an article entitled *A Brief Primer on the Reptile Theory of Trial Strategy: Plaintiff Psychology and the Defense Response* ("Primer") and distributed the paper at the American Bar Association annual conference in 2015. *Id.* ¶ 21; *see* CSI Appendix at 034-051. Greeley listed *Derailing* and *Debunking* in the reference section of *Primer*. *See* CSI Appendix at APP051. CSI asserts that Greeley plagiarized Dr. Kanasky's work by copying portions of two sections of

¹ The United States Copyright Office issued CSI Litigation Psychology, LLC, a Certificate of Registration (Number TX 8-256-027) for *Derailing* with an effective date of October 17, 2016 and first publication date of April 1, 2014 and a Certificate of Registration (Number TX 8-256-024) for *Debunking* with an effective date of October 17, 2016 and first publication date of April 30, 2014. *See* CSI Appendix at APP020, 032.

Debunking and one section of *Derailing* into *Primer* and subsequently presenting *Primer* to the same type of clients hired by CSI. Complaint ¶ 22; Motion at 5-7.

On November 21, 2016, CSI commenced this action against DecisionQuest. On April 25, 2017, CSI amended its complaint and added Greeley as a party. CSI asserts claims of federal copyright infringement and unfair competition and also seeks a permanent injunction. *See generally* Complaint.

CSI moves for summary judgment only on its copyright infringement claim against DecisionQuest. Motion at 1. CSI asserts that “[a] partial summary judgment as to liability at this juncture will narrow and streamline discovery and other issues and conserve this Court’s and the Parties’ resources.” *Id.* at 2. Specifically, CSI moves the court for a ruling that there are no fact issues regarding (1) “CSI’s ownership of a valid copyright which DecisionQuest copied in its article: *A Brief Primer on the Reptile Theory of Trial Strategy: Plaintiff Psychology and the Defense Response (“Primer”)*” and (2) “DecisionQuest, without authorization and in an especially flagrant and obvious way, exactly copied word-for-word extensive portions of Plaintiff’s works.” *Id.* (emphasis in the original).

II. ANALYSIS

A. Evidentiary Burdens on Motion for Summary Judgment

Summary judgment is proper when the pleadings and evidence on file show that no genuine issue exists as to any material fact, and that the moving party is

entitled to judgment as a matter of law. FED. R. CIV. P. 56.² “[T]he substantive law will identify which facts are material.” *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). The movant makes such a showing by informing the court of the basis of its motion and by identifying the portions of the record which reveal there are no genuine material fact issues. See *Celotex Corporation v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986). Once the movant makes this showing, the nonmovant must then direct the court’s attention to evidence in the record sufficient to establish that there is a genuine issue of material fact for trial. *Id.* at 323-24. To carry this burden, the opponent must do more than simply show some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts. *Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corporation*, 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986). Instead, it must show that the evidence is sufficient to support a resolution of the factual issue in its favor. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 249. All of the evidence must be viewed, however, in a light most favorable to the motion’s opponent. *Id.* at 255 (citing *Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144, 158-59 (1970)).

² The disposition of a case through summary judgment “reinforces the purpose of the Rules, to achieve the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of actions, and, when appropriate, affords a merciful end to litigation that would otherwise be lengthy and expensive.” *Fontenot v. Upjohn Company*, 780 F.2d 1190, 1197 (5th Cir. 1986).

B. Copyright Infringement

To prevail on a claim for copyright infringement, a plaintiff must demonstrate “(1) ownership of a valid copyright, and (2) copying of constituent elements of the work that are original.” *Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Company*, 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991)). “In any judicial proceedings the certificate of a registration made before or within five years after first publication of the work shall constitute prima facie evidence of the validity of the copyright and of the facts stated in the certificate. . . .” 17 U.S.C. § 410(c); see also *General Universal Systems, Inc. v. Lee*, 379 F.3d 131, 141 (5th Cir. 2004) (“A certificate of registration, if timely obtained, is prima facie evidence both that a copyright is valid and that the registrant owns the copyright.”). CSI has established valid ownership in *Derailing* and *Debunking*.

To establish copying, a plaintiff must prove factual copying and substantial similarity. *General Universal Systems*, 379 F.3d at 141. CSI may show factual copying “either with proof of direct evidence of copying or through circumstantial evidence demonstrating both (1) that the defendant had access to the copyrighted work and (2) that the two works are ‘probatively’ similar.” *Id.* (citation omitted).

DecisionQuest has conceded access “[s]ince Greeley gave attribution to Dr. Kasansky in Primer. . . .” See Defendants’ Brief in Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (“Response”) at 8 (docket entry 31); Motion at 4. Probative similarity requires a plaintiff to demonstrate that the works “when compared as a

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.