

23-1260

IN THE
United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

HACHETTE BOOK GROUP, INC., HARPERCOLLINS PUBLISHERS L.L.C.,
JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC., PENGUIN RANDOM HOUSE LLC,

—against— *Plaintiffs-Appellees,*

INTERNET ARCHIVE, *Defendant-Appellant,*

DOES 1-5, INCLUSIVE, *Defendants.*

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

**BRIEF FOR AMICI CURIAE COPYRIGHT SCHOLARS
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT AND REVERSAL**

JASON M. SCHULTZ
SUNOO PARK (*admission pending*)
JAKE KARR
TECHNOLOGY LAW AND POLICY CLINIC
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW
245 Sullivan Street #609
New York, New York 10012
(212) 992-7365

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... iii

INTERESTS OF *AMICI CURIAE* 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 3

ARGUMENT 7

 I. The purpose and character of CDL heavily favor fair use.....8

 A. The district court’s broad characterization of commercial purpose improperly swept in nonprofit library lending.....8

 B. Adapting one-to-one library lending to the digital age facilitates access to information, strongly favoring fair use. 10

 1. Facilitating digital library lending furthers the objectives of copyright law, regardless of transformativeness..... 11

 2. CDL is transformative because it makes books available in a more convenient and usable form..... 14

 II. The publishers failed to demonstrate CDL caused cognizable market harm. 17

 A. The district court failed to consider the public benefits of CDL and the risk of harm to the public. 18

 B. CDL has a distinct market niche that does not usurp the market for licensed lending ebooks. 25

 1. Any market harm caused by CDL is not cognizable under copyright law..... 25

 2. The district court improperly presumed market harm based on the mere existence of a secondary market..... 28

3.	CDL has a distinct audience which separates it from the market for licensed ebooks.....	30
4.	The district court failed to consider the possibility of non-substituting market effects.....	32
	CONCLUSION	34
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Am. Geophysical Union v. Texaco Inc.</i> , 60 F.3d 913 (2d Cir. 1994)	4, 9, 26, 29
<i>Am. Soc’y for Testing & Materials v. Public.Resource.Org, Inc.</i> , 82 F.4th 1262 (D.C. Cir. 2023)	29, 30
<i>Am. Soc’y for Testing & Materials v. Public.Resource.Org, Inc.</i> , 896 F.3d 437 (D.C. Cir. 2018)	10, 14
<i>Andy Warhol Found. for the Visual Arts, Inc. v. Goldsmith</i> , 11 F.4th 26 (2d Cir. 2021)	29, 32
<i>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</i> , 804 F.3d 202 (2d Cir. 2015).....	10, 14, 15, 16
<i>Authors Guild, Inc. v. HathiTrust</i> , 755 F.3d 87 (2d Cir. 2014).....	11, 20
<i>Bill Graham Archives v. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.</i> , 448 F.3d 605 (2d Cir. 2006)....	25
<i>Bobbs-Merrill Co. v. Straus</i> , 210 U.S. 339 (1908).....	6, 12, 27
<i>Cambridge Univ. Press v. Patton</i> , 769 F.3d 1232 (11th Cir. 2014).....	26, 29
<i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 569 (1994)	28, 29
<i>Capitol Records, LLC v. ReDigi Inc.</i> , 910 F.3d 649 (2d Cir. 2018).....	16, 17
<i>Cariou v. Prince</i> , 714 F.3d 694 (2d Cir. 2013)	6
<i>Diversey v. Schmidly</i> , 738 F.3d 1196 (10th Cir. 2013)	8
<i>Doan v. Am. Book Co.</i> , 105 F. 772 (7th Cir. 1901)	12
<i>Fox News Network, LLC v. TVEyes, Inc.</i> , 883 F.3d 169 (2d Cir. 2018)	15
<i>Google LLC v. Oracle Am., Inc.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1183 (2021)	6, 18, 22, 33

Hachette Book Grp., Inc. v. Internet Archive, No. 20-CV-4160, 2023 WL 2623787 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 24, 2023).....passim

Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enter., 471 U.S. 539 (1985) 18

Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 568 U.S. 519 (2013).....passim

Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc., 464 U.S. 417 (1984)..... 15, 16, 29

Swatch Grp. Mgmt. Servs. Ltd. v. Bloomberg L.P., 756 F.3d 73 (2d Cir. 2014)..... 10, 11, 32

Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken, 422 U.S. 151 (1975)..... 27

Ty, Inc. v. Publ’ns Int’l Ltd., 292 F.3d 512 (7th Cir. 2002) 29, 33

United States v. Paramount Pictures, 334 U.S. 131 (1948)..... 19

Williams & Wilkins Co. v. United States, 487 F.2d 1345 (U.S. Ct. Cl. 1973) 8, 32

Statutes

17 U.S.C. § 107 8

17 U.S.C. § 108 20

17 U.S.C. § 109 12, 16

17 U.S.C. § 121 13, 22

42 U.S.C. § 12101 13, 22

Other Authorities

Aaron Perzanowski & Jason Schultz, *Copyright Exhaustion and the Personal Use Dilemma*, 96 Minn. L. Rev. 2067 (2012)..... 26

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.