20-3816 <u>ABKCO Music, Inc. v. Sagan</u>

1	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
2	FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT
3	
4	
5	August Term, 2021
6	
7 8	(Argued: March 14, 2022 Decided: October 6, 2022)
9	Docket Nos. 20-3816(L), 20-4020(CON), 20-4099(XAP)
10	
11	
12	ABKCO Music, Inc., Colgems-EMI Music Inc., EMI Algee Music Corp., EMI
13	April Music Inc., EMI Blackwood Music Inc., EMI Consortium Music
14	Publishing, Inc., DBA EMI Full Keel Music, EMI Consortium Songs, Inc.,
15	DBA EMI Longitude Music, EMI Feist Catalog Inc., EMI Robbins Catalog
16	INC., EMI UNART CATALOG, INC., JOBETE MUSIC CO., INC., SCREENGEMS-EMI
17	MUSIC INC., STONE AGATE MUSIC, STONE DIAMOND MUSIC CORP., IMAGEM MUSIC
18	LLC, PEER INTERNATIONAL CORP., PSO LTD., PEERMUSIC LTD., PEERMUSIC III, LTD.,
19	SONGS OF PEER, LTD., SPIRIT CATALOG HOLDINGS S.A.R.L, SPIRIT TWO MUSIC, INC.,
20	WARNER-TAMERLANE PUBLISHING CORP., WB MUSIC CORP.,
21	Plaintiffs-Counter-Defendants-Appellees-Cross-
22	Appellants,
23	<u>v.</u>
24	—
25	WILLIAM SAGAN, NORTON LLC, BILL GRAHAM ARCHIVES, LLC,
26	DBA WOLFGANG'S VAULT, DBA CONCERT VAULT, DBA MUSIC VAULT, DBA
27	Daytrotter,
28	Defendants-Counterclaimants-Appellants-Cross-
29	<u>Appellees</u> .

1		
2		
3		

4 Before: JACOBS, WESLEY, and MENASHI, Circuit Judges.

5 6 A collection of music publishers alleged infringement of their copyrights in 7 197 musical works when a series of live concert recordings was made available by the defendants for download and streaming on their websites. Plaintiffs 8 9 sought damages and a permanent injunction pursuant to the Copyright Act. The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Ramos, J.) 10 11 held on summary judgment that defendants had no valid licenses and therefore 12 infringed each of the musical works, and that the principal was personally liable. 13 The district court denied plaintiffs' request for a permanent injunction. Two years later, after a nine-day damages trial, the jury awarded plaintiffs a minimal 14 \$189,500 in statutory damages. The district court denied plaintiffs' motion for a 15 16 new trial but awarded them roughly \$2.4 million in attorneys' fees. Defendants appeal from the district court's summary judgment order and 17 18 the order granting fees and costs. Plaintiffs cross-appeal from the district court's 19 denial of a permanent injunction, several evidentiary rulings, and the denial of a 20 new trial.

1	We AFFIRM in part, VACATE in part, and REVERSE in part, the grant of
2	summary judgment, and AFFIRM the denial of a permanent injunction; REJECT
3	the challenges to the evidentiary rulings; AFFIRM the denial of plaintiffs' motion
4	for a new trial; VACATE the award of attorneys' fees; and REMAND for further
5	proceedings consistent with this opinion.
6	
7 8	MICHAEL S. ELKIN (Erin R. Ranahan, <u>on</u> <u>the brief</u>), Winston & Strawn LLP, New
9	York, NY, <u>for Defendants-</u>
10	<u>Counterclaimants-Appellants-Cross-</u>
11	<u>Appellees</u> .
12	
13	BARRY I. SLOTNICK (Christian D.
14	Carbone, Tal E. Dickstein, Sarah Schacter,
15	and Priy Sinha, <u>on the brief</u>), Loeb & Loeb
16	LLP, New York, NY, for Plaintiffs-Counter-
17	Defendants-Appellees-Cross-Appellants.
18	
19	
20	Dennis Jacobs, <u>Circuit Judge</u> :
21	
22	In 2002, William Sagan acquired a trove of live concert recordings that
23	included performances by The Rolling Stones, The Who, the Grateful Dead, and
24	many others. At the time, the sellers cautioned that Sagan "may be buying the
25	world['s] greatest private collection [of recordings] that no one will ever hear."

1	App'x at 453. But in 2006, Sagan made those and other recordings available to
2	the world through digital download and streaming services offered for a fee
3	through various websites. Sagan did this through his companies Norton LLC
4	and the Bill Graham Archives, LLC (together with Sagan, "defendants").
5	In 2015, a collection of music publishers (together, the "Publishers")
6	brought this suit under the Copyright Act, alleging that defendants infringed the
7	Publishers' copyrights in 197 musical works that were performed in the live
8	concert recordings. The Publishers sought about \$30 million in damages and a
9	permanent injunction. On March 30, 2018, the United States District Court for
10	the Southern District of New York (Ramos, <u>I.</u>) held on summary judgment that
11	defendants had no valid licenses and therefore infringed each of the musical
11	defendants had no valid licenses and therefore infringed each of the musical
11 12	defendants had no valid licenses and therefore infringed each of the musical works and that Sagan was personally liable. The district court denied the
11 12 13	defendants had no valid licenses and therefore infringed each of the musical works and that Sagan was personally liable. The district court denied the Publishers' request for a permanent injunction. Two years later, after a nine-day
 11 12 13 14 	defendants had no valid licenses and therefore infringed each of the musical works and that Sagan was personally liable. The district court denied the Publishers' request for a permanent injunction. Two years later, after a nine-day damages trial, the jury awarded the Publishers \$189,500, which was near the
 11 12 13 14 15 	defendants had no valid licenses and therefore infringed each of the musical works and that Sagan was personally liable. The district court denied the Publishers' request for a permanent injunction. Two years later, after a nine-day damages trial, the jury awarded the Publishers \$189,500, which was near the minimum statutory damages. The Publishers argued that the minimal award

4

1	On appeal, defendants challenge the district court's summary judgment
2	rulings and the order granting fees and costs. The Publishers cross-appeal the
3	district court's denial of a permanent injunction, several evidentiary rulings, and
4	its denial of the new trial.
5	
6	BACKGROUND
7	Ι
8	Congress has created two types of copyrights in a musical recording. One
9	is for the underlying "musical work," which encompasses the notes and lyrics of
10	a song. See 17 U.S.C. § 102(a)(2). The other is for the "sound recording," which
11	covers the rights to a recording of a particular performance by a particular artist.
12	See id. \S 102(a)(7). This case concerns the first type of copyright. (The second
13	type was at issue in a prior litigation.)
14	A person seeking to make and distribute phonorecords-that is, material
15	objects in which sounds are fixed-of a previously published musical work can do

5

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.