Case 17-673, Document 68, 05/31/2017, 2047426, Page1 of 71



United States Court of Appeals

for the

Second Circuit

PAUL SPINELLI, SCOTT BOEHM, PAUL JASIENSKI, GEORGE NEWMAN LOWRANCE, DAVID STLUKA, DAVID DRAPKIN, THOMAS E. WITTE,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

– v. –

NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE, NFL VENTURES, L.P.,

(For Continuation of Caption See Inside Cover)

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK HONORABLE ROBERT W. SWEET, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

REDACTED JOINT BRIEF FOR DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES THE ASSOCIATED PRESS AND REPLAY PHOTOS, L.L.C.

JURA C. ZIBAS WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN & DICKER LLP 150 East 42nd Street New York, New York 10017 (212) 915-5756 Attorneys for Defendant-Appellee Replay Photos, L.L.C.

RM

ANDREW L. DEUTSCH TAMAR Y. DUVDEVANI DLA PIPER LLP (US) 1251 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10020 (212) 335-4500

Attorneys for Defendant-Appellee The Associated Press

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

NFL PRODUCTIONS, L.L.C., NFL ENTERPRISES, L.L.C., REPLAY PHOTOS, L.L.C., ASSOCIATED PRESS, NFL PROPERTIES, LLC, ARIZONA CARDINALS HOLDINGS, INC., ATLANTA FALCONS FOOTBALL CLUB LLC, BALTIMORE RAVENS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, BUFFALO BILLS, INC., PANTHERS FOOTBALL, INC., CHICAGO BEARS FOOTBALL CLUB, INC., CINCINNATI BENGALS, INC., CLEVELAND BROWNS LLC, DALLAS COWBOYS FOOTBALL CLUB, LTD., DENVER BRONCOS FOOTBALL CLUB, DETROIT LIONS, INC., GREEN BAY PACKERS, INC., HOUSTON NFL HOLDINGS LP, INDIANAPOLIS COLTS, INC., JACKSONVILLEJAGUARS LTD., KANSAS CITY CHIEFS FOOTBALL CLUB, INC., MIAMI DOLPHINS, LTD., MINNESOTA VIKINGS FOOTBALL CLUB LLC, NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS, LP, NEW ORLEANS LOUISIANA SAINTS, LLC, NEW YORK FOOTBALL GIANTS, INC., NEW YORK JETS FOOTBALL CLUB, INC., OAKLAND RAIDERS LP, PHILADELPHIA EAGLES FOOTBALL CLUB, INC., PITTSBURGH STEELERS SPORTS, INC., SAN DIEGO CHARGERS FOOTBALL CO., SAN FRANCISCO FORTY NINERS LTD., FOOTBALL NORTHWEST LLC, RAMS FOOTBALL CO. LLC, BUCCANEERS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, TENNESSEE FOOTBALL, INC., WASHINGTON FOOTBALL INC.,

Defendants-Appellees,

GETTY IMAGES (US), INC.,

Defendant.

STATEMENT PURSUANT TO FED. R. APP. P. 26.1

The Associated Press is a not-for-profit news cooperative. It has no parent corporation and no publicly-held stock. No publicly-held corporation owns 10% or more of any interest in The Associated Press.

Replay Photos, LLC is a limited liability company and a subsidiary of Lulu Enterprises, Inc. No publicly-held corporation owns more than 10% of its stock.

Table of Contents

Page

COUNTER	RSTAT	TEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED1
COUNTER	RSTAT	TEMENT OF THE CASE
	A.	AP's Photo Library Agreements With the NFL2
	В.	The NFL's Use of Plaintiffs' Photos Under an AP Sublicense.5
	C.	AP's Contributor Agreements with Plaintiffs7
		1. Execution of the Contributor Agreements7
		2. Terms of the Contributor Agreements7
		a. General Terms7
		b. <i>License of Plaintiffs' Copyrights to AP</i> 8
		c. Royalty Provisions9
	D.	The Economics of the NFL-AP-Plaintiffs' Relationships10
	E.	Plaintiffs' Continued Performance of their Contributor Agreements
	F.	Relevant Procedural History13
STANDAI	RD OF	REVIEW
SUMMAR	Y OF	ARGUMENT15
ARGUME	NT	
I.		INTIFFS FAILED TO PLAUSIBLY PLEAD CLAIMS FOR PYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT
	А.	A License Defense May Be Determined on a Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss
	В.	The Licenses Granted by Plaintiffs to AP are Unambiguous and Co-Extensive with Plaintiffs' Own Copyright Rights22
	C.	AP Was Entitled to Issue Non-Royalty-Bearing Sublicenses to the NFL
	D.	AP's Sublicense to the NFL Is Not Retroactive27
	E.	<i>Davis v. Blige</i> Does Not Invalidate AP's Sublicense to the NFL
		1. The Language in <i>Davis</i> on Which Plaintiffs Rely is Dictum and Not Precedential

Table of Contents (continued)

Page

		2. <i>Davis</i> Should Not Be Extended to Invalidate Retroad Licenses Authorized by a Single Copyright Owner	
	F.	The Court Should Affirm the Dismissal of the Copyright Claims.	39
II.		INTIFFS FAILED TO PLAUSIBLY PLEAD A CLAIM TH IR CONTRIBUTOR AGREEMENTS WERE INVALID	
	A.	Plaintiffs Waived Their Contract Invalidation Claims By Continued Performance of and Accepting Benefits Under Contracts	
	В.	Plaintiffs Failed to State a Claim for Duress, Fraud, or Unconscionability	44
		1. Duress	45
		2. <i>Fraud</i>	47
		3. Unconscionability	50
III.		INTIFFS' OTHER CLAIMS WERE PROPERLY DISMISS	
	A.	Breach of Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing	53
	B.	Breach of Fiduciary Duty	54
	C.	Violation of the Sherman Act	56
CONCLUS	ION		58

DOCKET A L A R M



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.