

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-13712
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 0:16-cv-61471-KMW

THOMAS S. ROSS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

APPLE, INC.,
a California corporation,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida

(July 12, 2018)

Before MARTIN, JILL PRYOR and FAY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas S. Ross, proceeding pro se, appeals following the district court's dismissal after denying leave to amend his complaint alleging copyright infringement against Apple, Inc. ("Apple"). We affirm.

I. BACKGROUND

In 2016, Ross filed a complaint against Apple alleging misappropriation of intellectual property and copyright infringement. He stated that he had invented an electronic reading device ("the Device") and applied for a patent on it in 1992. He asserted that he had envisioned a range of uses for the Device, including reading books and news, viewing photographs and videos, making phone calls, and keeping notes. He said that he had created three technical drawings of the Device, which he contended became his intellectual property upon creation in 1992. He then stated the patent application was declared abandoned in 1995 for failure to pay the application fee. He said that he had registered his copyrights on the drawings of the Device in 2015.

Ross contended that Apple had systematically searched for abandoned and discarded ideas to patent and exploit. He stated that, in 2007, Apple began using images of products, including iPhones, iPods, and iPads, that were substantially similar to his drawings of the Device and embodied its "non-functional aesthetic look and feel." Accordingly, Ross alleged numerous counts of copyright

infringement based on the visual similarities between his drawings and Apple's products.¹

Apple moved to dismiss the complaint, arguing that Ross had failed to state a copyright claim. It stated that, while he might hold a copyright on the expressive elements of his patent application, he could not hold a copyright on the idea for the Device and he had not identified how Apple had copied any expressive, non-utilitarian elements. It also argued that Ross had not identified any specific infringing work but instead referred generally to various models of Apple products. Apple contended that Ross had failed to allege any evidence of direct copying and only speculated that it was possible that Apple had accessed his patent applications. He also had not identified any non-functional elements of his Device that were similar to Apple's products; the only similarities between its products and the drawings of the Device were being rectangular, handheld electronic devices with screens, hardly unique expressive elements.

In December 2016, the district court granted Apple's motion to dismiss. The court found that Ross had not alleged any facts to show when or how Apple copied elements of his original works. It stated that the presence of the patent application in the public record coupled with generalized statements about Apple's culture of stealing others' ideas was insufficient to show that the company copied or had

¹ Ross also alleged misappropriation and unjust enrichment; however, he did not include those claims in his proposed amended complaint and has not challenged their dismissal on appeal.

access to the patent application. The court also found that Ross had not sufficiently alleged substantial or striking similarity because he merely asserted that the “overall look and feel” of Apple’s products was the same as the Device.

In January 2017, Ross moved for leave to file an amended complaint. With his motion he submitted a proposed amended complaint and asserted that nothing like the Device existed when he designed it in 1992 and that Apple and other tech companies began releasing handheld digital notepads and tablets in 1993, but their designs were bulky and none matched the “elegant look and feel” of the Device. Ross asserted one claim for copyright infringement, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 106, and stated that he had exclusive rights to the drawing of the Device and that Apple had violated those rights by making copies and derivatives of the drawing without his consent.

The district court denied Ross’s motion for leave to amend in July 2017 and dismissed the case without prejudice. First, the court stated that the idea for the Device depicted in Ross’s drawing could not be the basis for a claim that Apple infringed on his rights to the drawing. The court found that the proposed amended complaint, like the original complaint, failed to distinguish between the drawing and the Device that it depicted. Second, the court found that, even if the proposed amended complaint alleged infringement of expressive elements, Ross had failed

to allege facts showing Apple copied or had a reasonable opportunity to access the drawing.

Ross appealed and designated the court's July 2017 Order for review. On appeal, he argues that his 1992 drawing of the Device depicted artistic, ornamental elements and he showed that Apple's line of electronics infringed on his copyright to those elements because they were strikingly similar.

II. DISCUSSION

A district court's denial of leave to amend the complaint is reviewed for abuse of discretion. *Covenant Christian Ministries, Inc. v. City of Marietta*, 654 F.3d 1231, 1239 (11th Cir. 2011). A legal determination that a proposed amendment to the complaint would be futile is reviewed de novo. *SFM Holdings, Ltd. v. Banc of Am. Sec., LLC*, 600 F.3d 1334, 1336 (11th Cir. 2010).

Pro se filings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys and are liberally construed. *Tannenbaum v. United States*, 148 F.3d 1262, 1263 (11th Cir. 1998). However, where a pro se litigant fails to raise a legal claim on appeal, he abandons that claim, and we will not review it. *Timson v. Sampson*, 518 F.3d 870, 874 (11th Cir. 2008). Where an appellant makes only passing reference to an issue or raises it in a perfunctory manner, without providing supporting arguments or authority, that claim is considered abandoned

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.