

**Case Nos. 16-56234, 16-56235 & 16-56252 (Consolidated)**

---

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

---

CHUCK CLOSE and LADDIE JOHN DILL,  
*Plaintiffs and Appellants,*

vs.

SOTHEBY'S, INC.,  
*Defendant and Appellee.*

---

THE SAM FRANCIS FOUNDATION, ET AL.,  
*Plaintiffs and Appellants,*

vs.

CHRISTIES, INC.,  
*Defendant and Appellee.*

---

THE SAM FRANCIS FOUNDATION, ET AL.,  
*Plaintiffs and Appellants,*

vs.

EBAY INC.,  
*Defendant and Appellee.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Central District of California  
Nos. 11-cv-8604 JHN (FFMx), 11-cv-8605 JHN (FFMx), 11-cv-8622 JHN (PLAx)  
The Honorable Michael W. Fitzgerald

---

**APPELLANTS' REPLY TO (1) JOINT BRIEF OF APPELLEES  
CHRISTIE'S, INC. AND SOTHEBY'S, INC. AND (2) ANSWERING BRIEF  
OF DEFENDANT-APPELLEE EBAY INC.**

---

ERIC M. GEORGE  
MICHAEL A. BOWSE  
IRA IBBERO  
BROWNE GEORGE ROSS LLP  
2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2800  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Tel.: (310) 274-7100; Fax: (310) 275-5697

Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants  
The Sam Francis Foundation, Chuck Close;  
Laddie John Dill; and all others similarly situated

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. THE JUDGMENT SHOULD BE REVERSED: THERE IS NO – AND DEFENDANTS HAVE NOT DEMONSTRATED THERE IS ANY – TENABLE BASIS FOR UPHOLDING THE DISTRICT COURT’S PREEMPTION DETERMINATION.....	2
A. Defendants’ Contention That the CRRA Conflicts With the First Sale Doctrine Found in §109(a) of the Copyright Act Fundamentally Misstates That Doctrine in Order to Invent a Conflict That Does not Actually Exist. ....	2
1. The Supreme Court’s Recent <i>Lexmark</i> Decision, as Well as Multiple Preceding Authorities, Conclusively Disprove Defendants’ First-Sale Theory. ....	2
2. As Binding Precedent From This Circuit Correctly Establishes, the CRRA Is Not in Conflict With the First Sale Doctrine in §109(a) of The Copyright Act: There Is Not a Word in the Copyright Act That Precludes a Copyright Owner From Reserving or Being Afforded a Right to Receive Future Income From Sales Occurring After the First Sale. ....	7
a. There Is Not a Word in Section 109(a) of the Copyright Act That Precludes a Copyright Owner From Asserting Claims to Enforce State-Based Entitlements Arising After the First Sale. ....	8
b. Binding Ninth Circuit Precedent Compels a Conclusion That There Is No Conflict Between the CRRA and the First Sale Doctrine. ....	13
(i) <i>Morseburg</i> Considered and Expressly Held That the CRRA Does Not Conflict With the First Sale Doctrine.....	13
(ii) Defendants’ Criticisms of <i>Morseburg</i> Are Baseless .....	13
(iii) <i>Morseburg</i> Has Not Been Superseded by Subsequent Decisions.....	16

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Continued)**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
3. Defendants Grossly Distort the Meaning of the Cases on Which They Rely. ....	19
a. The Cases Defendants Cite Accurately Are Consistent With And Support Our Position. ....	19
b. Defendants Cite Other Cases Misleadingly; When Honestly Read, These Cases Support Our Position, Not Defendants’ Position.....	22
B. Defendants Express Preemption Argument Is Meritless: It Is Based on a Misunderstanding of the Distribution Right and of the First-Sale Doctrine and It Is Refuted by Controlling Precedent .....	27
1. Section 301(a) Preempts Only Those State Law Rights That Are “Equivalent” to Those in Section 106 .....	28
2. An Artist’s Right to a 5% Royalty Under the CRRA Is Not Equivalent to Any Right Afforded By The Copyright Act.....	28
3. Defendants’ Invitation to Ignore <i>Morseburg</i> Should Be Rejected: <i>Morseburg</i> Cannot Be Ignored Unless It Is Overruled by the Supreme Court or an <i>En Banc</i> Panel. ....	34
II. THE DISTRICT COURT CORRECTLY FOUND THAT THE CRRA DOES NOT AFFECT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL “TAKING” .....	37
A. The CRRA is Entitled to a Presumption of Constitutionality.....	37
B. Defendants Lack Standing to Challenge the CRRA as an Improper “Taking”. ....	38
C. Even if the Owners of The Artwork Were Parties to This Action, a Takings Argument by Them Would Still Fail.....	41
1. A Mere Obligation to Pay Money Does Not Qualify As A “Taking” .....	41
2. The Money the CRRA Requires to Be Paid to Artists Is Not Specific, Identifiable Property .....	43

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Continued)**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
3. The CRRA Does Not Burden Sellers' Ownership of Artwork .....	45
III. EBAY'S SEPARATE ARGUMENTS SHOULD ALSO BE REJECTED .....	46
A. The District Court Permitted Plaintiffs Leave to Amend Their Complaint as to eBay; eBay Offers No Reason why Plaintiffs Should Be Denied That Right .....	46
B. The CRRA Is Made Expressly Applicable to eBay and Other Auction Houses .....	48
1. The California Legislature Made the CRRA's Requirements Applicable to eBay and Others Who Operate Auctions.....	48
2. The Complaint Specifically Alleges That eBay Sold Artwork at Auctions It Conducted in California; eBay's Effort to Dispute That Allegation Here Is Improper. ....	51
C. eBay Must Comply With the CRRA Because It Is an Agent of Its Sellers .....	53
1. The Complaint Sufficiently Alleges That eBay Has Been an Agent in Connection With Sales of Artwork.....	54
2. eBay's Effort to Dispute Its Status as an Agent of Sellers Hinges on Assertions of Fact That Are Improper at This Stage of the Proceedings.....	56
3. eBay's Complaint That It Has Structured Its Business in a Way That Would Make Compliance With the CRRA Difficult Is Neither Relevant Nor Persuasive. ....	60
IV. CONCLUSION.....	61

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page****FEDERAL CASES**

<i>Adams v. U.S.</i> , 391 F.3d 1212 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	44
<i>Adobe Sys. Inc. v. Christenson</i> , 809 F.3d 1071 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	21
<i>Apple Inc. v. Psystar Corp.</i> , 658 F.3d 1150 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	25
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	54, 55, 56
<i>Atlas Corp. v. United States</i> , 895 F.2d 745 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....	42
<i>Bel-Bel Int’l Corp. v. Cmty. Bank of Homestead</i> , 162 F.3d 1101 (11th Cir. 1998) .....	44
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	55
<i>Big Eagle v. Andera</i> , 508 F.2d 1293 (8th Cir. 1975) .....	39
<i>Bingham v. Holder</i> , 637 F.3d 1040 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	52
<i>Block v. eBay, Inc.</i> , No. C 11-06718 CRB, 2012 WL 1601471 (N.D. Cal. May 7, 2012).....	59
<i>Bobbs-Merrill Co. v. Straus</i> , 210 U.S. 339 (1908).....	35
<i>Chevron W. Virginia CWP Fund v. Stacy</i> , 671 F.3d 378 (4th Cir. 2011) .....	41-42
<i>County Court of Ulster County v. Allen</i> , 442 U.S. 140 (1979).....	39

# 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.