

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-56057; 16-56287

SKIDMORE ET AL.

*Michael Skidmore, Trustee for the
Randy Craig Wolfe Trust
Plaintiff-Appellant/Cross Appellee*

v.

LED ZEPPELIN *ET AL.*

Defendants-Appellees

and

WARNER/CHAPPELL MUSIC, INC.

Defendant, Cross Appellant

SKIDMORE'S COMBINED REPLY BRIEF AND
OPENING BRIEF RESPONDING TO
DEFENDANT'S COSTS AND FEES APPEAL

(Music copyright infringement, on appeal from the final Order dated June 23, 2016 of the Honorable R. Gary Klausner, of the United States District Court for the Central District of California. The case was docketed in the Central District at 15-cv-03462)

FRANCIS ALEXANDER, LLC

Francis Malofiy, Esquire

Alfred Joseph Fluehr, Esquire

280 N. Providence Road | Suite 1

Media, PA 19063

T: (215) 500-1000

F: (215) 500-1005

Law Firm / Lawyer for Michael Skidmore

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	5
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	7
REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT	12
PART I - ARGUMENT ON REPLY	13
1. The 1909 Copyright Act and the Case Law Do Not Limit the Scope of a Musical Copyright’s Composition to Written Sheet Music	13
a. Plaintiff’s Opening Argument and Defendants’ Response	13
b. Plaintiff’s Reply on Why Recordings of a Song May Be Used to Establish the Composition of Songs and Why The 1909 Copyright Act Does Not Limit the Protected Composition of a Song to Sheet Music	17
i. Defendants’ Response Fails to Explain why Recordings of a Song Cannot be Used to Establish the Composition of the Song Under the 1909 Act	17
ii. Plaintiff Has Clearly Shown Why Sections 11-12 Do Not Control or Define the Scope of Protected Expression in a Musical Composition	21
c. The Ninth Circuit and Sixth Circuit Have Previously Ruled That Album Recordings May Be Used to Establish the Composition of a Song Copyrighted under the 1909 Act	24
d. Plaintiff and Future Litigants Will Suffer Severe Consequences if the Lower Court’s Decision Restricting the Substantial Similarity Comparison is Affirmed	28
2. The Court Should have Permitted Plaintiff to Present Expert Testimony that the Composition in the “Taurus” Album Recording was Embodied in the Deposit Sheet Music Composition of “Taurus”, as the Plaintiff was Allowed to Do in <u>Williams</u>	29
3. Plaintiff Demonstrated in His Opening Brief Through Expert Testimony, Expert Reports, and Audio Exhibits that the Album Composition of “Taurus” was “Identical” to “Stairway to Heaven” Whereas the Deposit Copy was Merely “Substantially Similar”	31
4. Plaintiff Has Never Attempted to Claim a Sound Recording Copyright Exists or was Copied; Defendants’ Argument to the	

	Contrary is Nonsensical	36
5.	Plaintiff Proved a High Degree of Access at Trial and Requested an Inverse Ratio Rule Instruction; The Lower Court Erroneously Refused to Give the Instruction and Caused Plaintiff Severe Prejudice	38
	a. The Jury Found that Defendants had Access to “Taurus” Because Plaintiff Proved a High Degree of Access with both Direct and Circumstantial Evidence	39
	b. There is No Case Which Limits the Applicability of an Inverse Ratio Rule Jury Instruction to Cases with “High Degrees” of Access	41
6.	Plaintiff Explicitly Complied with Central District L.R. 51, the Prescribed Method for Preserving Exceptions to Jury Instructions, and <u>the Trial Court Acknowledged that All Exceptions and Objections were Preserved</u>; Defendants’ Argument that Plaintiff Waived these Objections is Disingenuous	43
7.	Plaintiff Did Not Waive Any Claim of Error Regarding the Court’s Failure to Instruct the Jury that Combinations and Arrangements of Musical Elements are Copyrightable; This Erroneous Omission was Highly Prejudicial	45
8.	The Originality Instruction Given by the Court was Inadequate, Not Legally Correct, and Severely Harmed Plaintiff’s Case; Plaintiff Did Not Waive this Objection as Defendants Erroneously Claim	49
	a. Plaintiff Suffered Severe Harm Due to the Incorrect Instruction on Originality	49
	b. Plaintiff Did Not Waive any Objection to the Erroneous Originality Instruction and In Fact Explicitly Preserved that Objection in Writing	50
9.	During Jury Deliberations the Jury’s Final Question was to Hear Plaintiff’s Audio of “Taurus”—The Court Ordered An Irrelevant Version of “Taurus” To Be Played, Which Seriously Prejudiced Plaintiff By Ending the Case; Plaintiff Specifically Objected and Did Not Waive this Error	53
10.	The Ten-Hour Time Limit Placed on Plaintiff Severely Hindered His Ability to Prove Substantial Similarity and Abused the Court’s Discretion; This Objection was Explicitly Preserved and Not Waived	56

- 11. **Dr. Lawrence Ferrara’s Testimony Should Have Been Precluded for Failing to Disclose that He Had Been Previously Hired by Plaintiff’s Publisher to Compare “Taurus” and “Stairway to Heaven”** 59

PART II - PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSE BRIEF TO DEFENDANT’S COSTS AND FEES APPEAL..... 63

- 1. **Defendant Erroneously and Disingenuously Claims the Trial Court Failed to Consider the Purpose of the Copyright Act when Denying their Costs and Fees Motion** 63
- 2. **The District Court’s Opinion was Correct and Did Not Abuse Its Discretion** 65
- 3. **Defendants Spuriously Argue that the Trial Court Erred Because, In their Mind, the Musical Expression in “Taurus” was Unprotected and the Lawsuit was Unreasonable; This Argument Fails Because Defendants Failed to Preserve this Claim of Error and are Improperly Asking this Circuit to Resolve a Dispute of Fact between Musical Experts**..... 69
 - a. **The Court Properly Found that there was a Dispute of Fact Between the Opposing Experts Over the Protectability of “Taurus” and its Substantial Similarity to “Stairway to Heaven”** 70
 - b. **Defendants Ignore that There Were Novel Issues of Law At Play Which Precluded a Finding that Plaintiff’s Lawsuit was Unreasonable or Frivolous** 72
 - c. **Defendant Waived any Reasonableness/Frivolousness Argument by Failing to Appeal the Underlying Rulings, Failing to Develop this Point in the Costs and Fees Motion, and By Failing to Develop this Argument in its Opening Brief** 75
- 4. **Defendant’s Litigation Misconduct Argument Does Not Make Sense** 78

CONCLUSION 81

STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES82

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE83

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<u>ABKCO Music, Inc. v. LaVere</u> , 217 F. 3d 684 (9th Cir. 2000)	17, 19
<u>Berkla v. Corel Corp.</u> , 302 F.3d 909, 922 (9th Cir. 2002)	65
<u>Bridgeport Music, Inc. v. UMG Recordings, Inc.</u> , 585 F.3d 267, 276 (6th Cir. 2009)	1, 20-28, 37
<u>Chaidez v. US</u> , 133 S. Ct. 1103, 1108 (2013)	80
<u>Chambers v. Mississippi</u> , 410 US 284, 304 (1973)	76-77
<u>Fantasy, Inc. v. Fogerty</u> , 94 F.3d 553, 558 (9th Cir. 1996)	66
<u>Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.</u> , 510 US 517, 526 (1994)	64-66
<u>Goldstein v. California</u> , 412 US 546 (1973)	14, 20-23, 37
<u>Inhale, Inc. v. Starbuzz Tobacco, Inc.</u> , 75 F.3d 1038, 1042-43 (9th Cir. 2014)	67
<u>Kensington Rock Island Ltd. Partnership v. American Eagle Historic Partners</u> , 921 F.2d 122, 124-25, n. 1 (7th Cir.1990)	77
<u>Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.</u> , 136 S. Ct. 1979, 1989 (2016)	65, 69, 79-80
<u>Lieb v. Topstone Indus.</u> , 788 F.2d 151, 156 (3d. Cir. 1986)	66
<u>Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Com'n v. NFL</u> , 726 F. 2d 1381, 1398 (9th Cir. 1984)..	48, 50
<u>Lotus Development Corp. v. Borland International</u> , 140 F.3d 70, 75 (1st Cir. 1998).....	67
<u>Montclair v. Ramsdell</u> , 107 U. S. 147, 152 (1883)	23
<u>Monotype Corp., PLC v. Int'l Typeface Corp.</u> , 43 F.3d 443, 451 (9th Cir.1994)	80
<u>National Conference of Bar Examiners v. Multistate Legal Studies</u> , 692 F. 2d 478 (7th Cir. 1982).....	17, 21, 22
<u>Newton v. Diamond</u> , 204 F. Supp. 2d 1244, 1259 (C.D. Cal. 2002)	24, 38
<u>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa Int'l Ass'n, Inc.</u> , 2005 WL 2007932 at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2005)	67

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.