

Case Nos. 16-56057 (L), 16-56287

In the
United States Court of Appeals
for the
Ninth Circuit

MICHAEL SKIDMORE, as Trustee for the Randy Craig Wolfe Trust,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LED ZEPPELIN, JAMES PATRICK PAGE, ROBERT ANTHONY PLANT,
JOHN PAUL JONES, SUPER HYPE PUBLISHING, INC.,
WARNER MUSIC GROUP CORPORATION, WARNER CHAPPELL MUSIC, INC.,
ATLANTIC RECORDING CORPORATION,
and RHINO ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY,
Defendants-Appellees.

*Appeal from a Decision of the United States District Court for the Central District of California,
Case No. 2:15-cv-03462-RGK-AGR · Honorable R. Gary Klausner*

**BRIEF *AMICI CURIAE* OF 19 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROFESSORS
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER LED ZEPPELIN**

PROFESSOR MARK A. LEMLEY, *Counsel of Record*
STANFORD LAW SCHOOL
Center for Internet & Society
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, California 94305
(650) 723-4605 Telephone
mlemley@law.stanford.edu

*Counsel for Amici Curiae,
19 Intellectual Property Professors*



COUNSEL PRESS · (213) 680-2300

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST AND IDENTITY OF THE AMICI CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	2
I. The Court Should Clarify the Nature of the Copying-In-Fact Inquiry and Abandon Its Use of the Illogical “Inverse Ratio Rule”	2
II. The Court Should Follow Congress’s Intent and Its Own Precedents to Properly Constrain the Scope of Copyright for Musical Compositions and Claims Based on Original Selection and Arrangement	11
A. Copyright in Musical Works Extends Only to Lyrics and Melody	12
B. A Plaintiff Who Bases His Claim of Infringement on Narrow Features of the Work that Have Been Selected and Arranged from Unprotectable Material Must Demonstrate Virtual Identity between the Defendants’ Work and His Own	19
CONCLUSION.....	25
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	26
APPENDIX A: LIST OF SIGNATORIES.....	27
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 35 F.3d 1435 (9th Cir. 1994)	20, 21, 24
<i>Arc Music Corp. v. Lee</i> , 296 F.2d 186 (2d Cir. 1961)	7, 8
<i>Arnstein v. Porter</i> , 154 F.2d 464 (2d Cir. 1946)	3, 6
<i>Darrell v. Joe Morris Music Co.</i> , 113 F.2d 80 (2d Cir. 1940)	4
<i>Ets-Hokin v. Skyy Spirits, Inc.</i> , 323 F.3d 763 (9th Cir. 2003)	20, 21
<i>Folkens v. Wyland Worldwide, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 768 (9th Cir. 2018)	20, 21
<i>Fred Fisher, Inc. v. Dillingham</i> , 298 F. 145 (S.D.N.Y. 1924) (Hand, J.)	14
<i>Hein v. Harris</i> , 175 F. 875 (C.C.S.D.N.Y.), <i>aff'd</i> , 183 F. 107 (2d Cir. 1910)	14
<i>Jacobsen v. Deseret Book Co.</i> , 287 F.3d 936 (10th Cir. 2002)	24
<i>Knitwaves, Inc. v. Lollytogs Ltd.</i> , 71 F.3d 996 (2d Cir.1995)	23
<i>Kustoff v. Chaplin</i> , 120 F.2d 551 (9th Cir. 1941)	3
<i>LA Printex Indus. v. Aeropostale, Inc.</i> , 676 F.3d 841 (9th Cir. 2012)	23
<i>Mattel, Inc. v. MGA Entertainment, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 904 (9th Cir. 2010)	20, 21
<i>N. Music Corp. v. King Record Distributing Co.</i> , 105 F. Supp. 393 (S.D.N.Y. 1952)	13, 14

..

<i>Oravec v. Sunny Isles Luxury Ventures, L.C.</i> , 527 F.3d 1142 (11th Cir. 2008)	18, 19
<i>Peters v. West</i> , 692 F.3d 629 (7th Cir. 2012)	6
<i>Petrella v. Metro Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. ___; 134 S. Ct. 1962; 188 L. Ed. 2d 979 (2014)	18
<i>Pivot Point International, Inc. v. Charlene Products, Inc.</i> , 372 F.3d 913 (7th Cir. 2004)	5
<i>Rentmeester v. Nike, Inc.</i> , 883 F.3d 1111 (9th Cir. 2018)	3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11
<i>Roth Greeting Cards v. United Card Co.</i> , 429 F.2d 1106 (9th Cir. 1970)	22
<i>Satava v. Lowry</i> , 323 F.3d 805 (9th Cir. 2003)	12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25
<i>Selle v. Gibb</i> , 741 F.2d 896 (7th Cir. 1984)	3, 4
<i>Sheldon v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures, Corp.</i> , 81 F.2d 49 (2d Cir. 1936)	3
<i>Sid & Marty Krofft Television Productions, Inc. v. McDonald's Corp.</i> , 562 F.2d 1157 (9th Cir. 1977)	2, 6, 7
<i>Siskind v. Newton-John</i> , No. 84 Civ. 2634, 1987 WL 11701 (S.D.N.Y. May 22, 1987)	14
<i>Skidmore v. Led Zeppelin</i> , 905 F.3d 1116 (9th Cir. 2018)	19
<i>Swirsky v. Carey</i> , 376 F.3d 841 (9th Cir. 2004)	13, 19, 20, 22
<i>Three Boys Music Corp. v. Bolton</i> , 212 F.3d 477 (9th Cir. 2000)	9, 10
<i>Ty, Inc. v. GMA Accessories, Inc.</i> , 132 F.3d 1167 (7th Cir. 1997)	4, 5, 6
<i>White-Smith Music Publishing Co. v. Apollo Co.</i> , 209 U.S. 1 (1908)	14

...

<i>Williams v. Gaye</i> , 895 F.3d 1106 (2018)	18, 24
---	--------

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

17 U.S.C. § 103(b)	20
17 U.S.C. § 106	2
37 C.F.R. § 202.11	16

OTHER AUTHORITIES

3 William F. Patry, <i>Patry on Copyright</i> (West 2007).....	6, 8
Alan Latman, <i>Probative Similarity As Proof of Copying: Toward Dispelling Some Myths in Copyright Infringement</i> , 90 Colum. L. Rev. 1187 (1990)..	7, 8
Architectural Works Copyright Protection Act, Pub. L. No 101-650, 104 Stat. 5089, 5133 (1990)	16
Christopher Buccafusco, <i>A Theory of Copyright Authorship</i> , 102 Va. L. Rev. (2016)	16
Compendium of the Copyright Office (2014)	22
The Copyright Act of 1909	15
David Aronoff, <i>Exploding the Inverse Ratio Rule</i> , 55 J. Copyright Soc’y U.S.A. 125 (2008)	7, 8
H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476 (1976).....	17
Jessica Goudreault, <i>Copyrighting the Quotidian: An Analysis of Copyright Law for Postmodern Choreographers</i> , 39 Cardozo L. Rev. (2017)	16, 17
Joseph P. Fishman, <i>Music as a Matter of Law</i> , 131 Harv. L. Rev. 1861 (2018).....	12, 15, 18
Mark A. Lemley, <i>Our Bizarre System for Proving Copyright Infringement</i> , 57 J. Copyright Soc’y U.S.A. (2010)	7, 8
Mark A. Lemley & Mark P. McKenna, <i>Scope</i> , 57 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 2197 (2016).....	11
<i>Nimmer on Copyright</i> (2011).....	3, 24
Peter S. Menell, Mark A. Lemley, & Robert P. Merges, <i>2 Intellectual Property in the New Technological Age</i> 641 (2018 edition).....	9

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.