

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Alexandria Division

RMC PUBLICATIONS, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	1:15cv896(JCC/IDD)
)	
PHOENIX TECNOLOGY SOLUTIONS,)	
LLC.)	
)	
Defendant.)	

M E M O R A N D U M O P I N I O N

This matter is now before the Court on a motion to dismiss filed by Defendant Phoenix Technology Solutions, LLC. [Dkt. 31] For the following reasons, the Court denies Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.

I. Background

At the motion to dismiss stage, the Court must read the complaint as a whole, construe the complaint in a light most favorable to the plaintiff, and accept the facts alleged in the complaint as true. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).

The following facts, taken from the complaint and the parties' briefs are undisputed unless otherwise indicated.

Plaintiff RMC Publications Inc. ("RMC") is a Minnesota corporation with its principal place of business in Minnesota. (Compl. [Dkt. 1] ¶ 1.) Defendant Pheonix Technology Solutions

("Phoenix") is a Maryland corporation with its principal place of business in Maryland, that transacts business and conducts classes in Alexandria, Virginia. (*Id.* at ¶ 2.) RMC publishes books and other materials in the area of project management including the PMP Exam preparation book *PMP Exam Prep* (*Id.* at ¶ 7). *PMP Exam Prep* is the bestselling PMP exam preparation book in the world, and RMC's CAPM Exam Prep, PMI-ACP Exam Prep, and "Hot Topics Flashcards for Passing the PMP and CAPM Exams" are similarly leading publications. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.)

PMP Exam Prep was the creation of Rita Mulcahy, the former President and founder of RMC. (*Id.* at ¶ 8.) In 1999, Mulcahy received a copyright registration for the first edition of *PMP Exam Prep* from the United States Copyright Office with an effective date of June 14, 1999. (*Id.* at ¶ 11). In 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2005 Mulcahy received a copyright registration for the second, third, fourth, and fifth editions of PMP respectively. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 11-15). Mulcahy later assigned all her copyrights in *PMP Exam Prep* to RMC. (*Id.* at ¶ 16.) In 2009, 2011, and 2014 RMC received copyrights for the sixth, seventh, and eighth editions of *PMP Exam Prep* respectively. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 17-19.) In 2006, 2010, and 2014 RMC received a copyright registration for the first, second, and third editions of CAPM Exam Prep, respectively. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 20-22.) RMC also holds copyright registrations with respect to several editions of "Hot Topics

Flashcards for Passing the PMP and CAPM Exams.” (*Id.* at ¶¶ 25-30.) Phoenix is in the business of offering courses to help people pass the PMP Exam and other project management certification exams. (*Id.* at ¶ 32; Def.’s Mem. [Dkt. 32] at 3.) PMI is the leading professional association in project management, and administers the PMP Exam. (Compl. ¶ 8; Def.’s Mem. at 3.) In 2014 an individual named Al Howard is alleged to have informed RMC that Phoenix was using RMC’s copyrighted materials at least in the presentation materials for teaching one or more of its courses. (Compl. ¶ 33.) RMC has never licensed or otherwise authorized Phoenix to use its copyrighted materials in course presentation materials or other derivative work teaching materials. (*Id.* at ¶ 34.)

Sometime around January 15, 2015 Phoenix conducted a January 2015 PMP exam preparation class, charging \$1,990 for admission. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 35-36.) Among the course materials for Phoenix’s January 2015 class was RMC’s eighth edition of the *PMP Exam Prep* book. (*Id.* at ¶ 36). Plaintiff alleges that extensive portions of the presentation materials used by Phoenix during the January 2015 class were copied from several of Plaintiff’s copyrighted works. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 39-42). On July 10, 2015, Plaintiff filed this action against Phoenix alleging copyright infringement on several of Plaintiff’s copyrighted works, namely RMC’s *PMP Exam Prep* sixth, seventh, and eighth

editions and RMC's Topics Flashcards for Passing the PMP and CAPM Exams sixth, seventh, and eighth editions. (*Id.* at ¶ 45).

II. Legal Standard

Defendant moves to dismiss Plaintiff's claims pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). "While the court must accept well-pleaded allegations as true when ruling on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court need not accept as true legal conclusions disguised as factual allegations. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679-81 (2009). Therefore, a pleading that offers only a "formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678; *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 557 (2007). Nor will a complaint that tenders mere "naked assertion[s]" devoid of "further factual enhancement." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678; *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557. "The purpose of a Rule 12(b)(6) motion is to test the sufficiency of a complaint; importantly, [a Rule 12(b)(6) motion] does not resolve contests surrounding the facts, the merits of a claim, or the applicability of defenses." *Edwards v. City of Goldsboro*, 178 F.3d 231, 243-44 (4th Cir. 1999) (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted). In the instance where sufficient facts are alleged in the complaint to rule on an affirmative defense, such as the statute of limitations, the defense may be reached by a motion to dismiss filed under Rule 12(b)(6). This principle only applies,

however, if all facts necessary to the affirmative defense "clearly appear[] on the face of the complaint." *Goodman v. Praxair, Inc.*, 494 F.3d 458, 464 (4th Cir. 2007) (emphasis in original).

III. Analysis

To succeed in a copyright infringement action the plaintiff must prove both ownership of a valid copyright and copying of protected original elements of the work. *Ale House Mgmt. v. Raleigh Ale House*, F.3d 137,143 (4th Cir. 2000)(Citing *Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Svcs. Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991)). Defendant here does not challenge Plaintiff's ownership of a valid copyright. Rather, Defendant focuses its attack on the requirements that Plaintiff show Defendant has copied original elements of Plaintiff's work. Defendant first argues that Plaintiff has failed to adequately allege that any similarities between its products and Defendant's are the result of copying. (Def.'s Mem. at 11.) Defendant then argues that even if Plaintiff adequately alleges copying, it fails to adequately allege that the copied material was original in nature, and therefor protected by the copyright. (*Id.* at 15.) The Court first addresses Defendant's arguments on the adequacy of the copying allegations, then turns to the discussion of the originality requirement.

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.