1   MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
     MICHAEL A. JACOBS (Bar No. 111664)
2   mjacobs@mofo.com
     KENNETH A. KUWAYTI (Bar No. 145384)
3   kkuwayti@mofo.com
     MARC DAVID PETERS (Bar No. 211725)
4   mdpeters@mofo.com
     DANIEL P. MUINO (Bar No. 209624)
5   dmuino@mofo.com
     755 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304-1018
6   Telephone: (650) 813-5600 / Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

7   BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
     DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
8   dboies@bsfllp.com
     333 Main Street, Armonk, NY 10504
9   Telephone: (914) 749-8200 / Facsimile: (914) 749-8300
     STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (Bar No. 144177)
10   sholtzman@bsfllp.com
     1999 Harrison St., Suite 900, Oakland, CA 94612
11   Telephone: (510) 874-1000 / Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

12   ORACLE CORPORATION
     DORIAN DALEY (Bar No. 129049)
13   dorian.daley@oracle.com
     DEBORAH K. MILLER (Bar No. 95527)
14   deborah.miller@oracle.com
     MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (Bar No. 211600)
15   matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com
     500 Oracle Parkway, Redwood City, CA 94065
16   Telephone: (650) 506-5200 / Facsimile: (650) 506-7114

17   *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
     ORACLE AMERICA, INC.
18

19   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

20   NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

21   SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

22   ORACLE AMERICA, INC.   Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA

23   Plaintiff,   **ORACLE'S MARCH 9, 2012 BRIEF
                                             REGARDING COPYRIGHT ISSUES**
24   v.

25   GOOGLE INC.   Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
                                             Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup
26   Defendant.

27

28

ORACLE'S MARCH 9, 2012 BRIEF REGARDING COPYRIGHT ISSUES
CASE NO. CV 10-03561 WHA
pa-1515953

1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2

Page

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

1   This brief responds to the Court's Feb. 1, 2012 Order Regarding Copyright Issues and its

2   Feb. 29 supplemental order.

3   **I.   COPYRIGHTS IN SUIT**

4   The copyrighted works at issue are (a) 37 Java API design specifications and

5   implementations and (b) 11 Java software code files. Google is liable for copyright infringement

6   because Google copied from and prepared derivative works from Oracle's copyrighted materials

7   to create Android specifications and implementations, which it then distributed.

8   **A.   Google copied 37 Java API specifications nearly verbatim into
         Android**

9

10   The 37 Java API specifications at issue are the blueprints for the design of Java core class

11   libraries. They describe an extraordinarily complex, intricate structure of hierarchy and

12   interdependency, painstakingly designed by Sun engineers over years of effort. Sun carefully

13   maintained the copyrighted status of the works at issue in this lawsuit. Google infringed the

14   copyrighted works in order to attract the 6-million-strong Java developer community, which

15   enabled Google to capture smartphone market share quickly, advertise thousands of applications

16   in a robust Android market, and create a loyal customer base.

17   Google initially copied from the documentation for Java 2 Standard Edition 5.0 ("J2SE

18   5.0"), and later copied from the updated J2SE 6.0 documentation. Oracle's copyright in J2SE 5.0

19   materials was registered with the U.S. Copyright Office under registration numbers TX 6-066-

20   538 and TX 6-143-306. J2SE 5.0 revised and built upon earlier versions of Java.[1]

21   Each of the 37 Java API specifications Google copied defines a package, and has a unique

22   name, such as "java.nio" or "java.util." (*See* Mitchell Opening Rep., ECF No. 397 ¶ 202 (listing

23   37 API specifications at issue).) Packages may include classes, interfaces, and subpackages. For

24   each class in a package, the API specification describes the fields and methods within it and

25   ───────────────
     [1] Sun obtained copyright registrations TX0004616088 [1.2 Beta 2]; TX0005359984 [1.2];
26   TX0005359985 [1.2]; TX0005359986 [1.2]; TX0005359987 [1.2]; TX0005271787 [1.3];
     TX0005316757 [1.3]; TX0005316758 [1.3]; TX0005392885 [1.3]; TX0006196514 [1.4]and
27   TX0006848555 [6.0]. Sun also obtained copyright registrations TX0004326014 on a book
     entitled "The Java Application Programming Interface, Volume 1 Core Packages," which
28   described an early version of the API specifications.

1   identifies those that are exposed to other classes. (*See, e.g., id.* ¶ 171; Mitchell Opp. Rep., ECF

2   No. 397-2 ¶¶ 20-28.) Methods are described by their "method signatures," which include the

3   method name and the method parameters and their order, as well as the method return type and

4   any exception types thrown by the method. Fields are described by their name and type. Field

5   and method declarations may also include various modifiers that change their behavior,

6   inheritability, and accessibility. The API specification also describes the relationship of each

7   class to other classes and packages of classes. The Java API designers who wrote the

8   specifications decided which packages, classes, Interfaces, methods, and fields to include in the

9   API specifications, as well as the relationships and interdependencies among the thousands of

10   individual elements. (*See id.*) These relationships can be found within a package or may extend

11   across different packages. This is a vast amount of expression: when printed out, Oracle's 37 API

12   specifications are more than 11,000 pages long. (Swoopes Decl., ECF No. 343 ¶ 28.)

13   Google copied nearly all of that expression verbatim. In the case of the java.util package

14   alone, Google copied 49 classes, 16 interfaces, 20 exceptions, 85 fields, and 369 methods.

15   Google also copied the structural relationships among these elements within java.util, as well as

16   their relationships to the elements of other packages. For example, according to Oracle's java.util

17   API specification, the Hashtable class is a subclass of Dictionary, and implements three

18   interfaces: Serializable, Cloneable, and Map, which are found in the java.lang, java.io, and

19   java.util packages, respectively. Android's Hashtable class is likewise a subclass of Dictionary,

20   and implements the same three interfaces, with the same three names, found in the same three

21   corresponding Android packages. This organization is hardly preordained, but Google copied it,

22   just as it did for all the other elements of java.util that it wanted for Android.

23   The Java API implementations are analogous to a multi-volume history, such as the

24   Durants' eleven-volume *The Story of Civilization*, and the Java API specifications are like the

25   author's meticulously detailed outline of those works. It would be copyright infringement for a

26   second author to take the outline and publish a second multi-volume work containing identical

27   names for each volume, chapter, and subchapter, identical topics, facts, and primary sources

28   discussed to the same level of detail, appearing in exactly the same order, and accompanied by

identical photographs and drawings, but change the wording of the text. And it would be copyright infringement for the second author to publish an outline of the second multi-volume work that matches the original author's outline almost exactly.

While Google copied far more than the core library names, its copying of the names is actionable as well. While the Court held individual names are not copyrightable, together the names copied in this case—at least 5,500—are copyrightable if they are "numerous enough and their selection and arrangement original enough that their combination constitutes an original work of authorship." *Merch. Transaction Sys., Inc. v. Nelcela, Inc.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25663, at *46 (D. Ariz. Mar. 17, 2009) (claim based on selection and arrangement of field names in software). The Court has held that Oracle may present at trial a theory of copyright infringement based on the selection and arrangement of names. (*See* ECF No. 433 at 8.)

B. Google copied source code, object code and comments from 11 Java code files into Android

Google also copied 11 of Oracle's Java software code files into 12 Android code files:

- the entire code for AclEntryImpl.java, AclImpl.java, GroupImpl.java, OwnerImpl.java, PermissionImpl.java, PrincipalImpl.java, PolicyNodeImpl.java, and AclEnumerator.java, obtained by decompiling object code for these classes
- code from Arrays.java
- comments from CodeSource.java
- comments from CollectionCertStoreParameters.java

II. ORACLE'S COPYRIGHT LIABILITY CLAIMS

Oracle has asserted two copyright liability theories: (1) direct infringement and (2) indirect infringement, including vicarious and contributory infringement.

A. Direct Infringement

"A plaintiff bringing a claim for copyright infringement must demonstrate '(1) ownership of a valid copyright, and (2) copying of constituent elements of the work that are original.'" *Funky Films, Inc. v. Time Warner Entm't Co.*, 462 F.3d 1072, 1076 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Feist*

1   *Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991)). The burdens of proof for these

2   elements are discussed separately below.

1. Ownership

4   "A certificate of registration raises the presumption of copyright validity and ownership."

5   *Dream Games of Ariz., Inc. v. PC Onsite*, 561 F.3d 983, 987 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009). As noted above,

6   Oracle's copyrights in J2SE 5.0 materials were registered with the U.S. Copyright Office under

7   registration numbers TX 6-066-538 and TX 6-143-306. J2SE 5.0 was registered as a collective

8   work, comprising prior works by Sun, licensed-in components, and new and revised computer

9   code and accompanying documentation and manuals. (*See* ECF No. 36-8 at 7.) The registration

10   form lists Sun's copyright registrations for earlier versions. (*See id.* at 7-8.) Oracle America, Inc.

11   is the same corporate entity as Sun, which changed its corporate name after Oracle acquired it.

12   Thus Oracle America, Inc. is the owner of the registered copyrights in J2SE 5.0 and Sun's other

13   registered copyrights covering earlier and later versions of the Java API specifications,

14   implementations, and other documentation. (*See* n.1, *supra*.)

15   If Google disputes ownership based on the legal interpretation of copyright regulations or

16   registrations, that interpretation is for the Court to make. If Google is raising a factual challenge

17   to ownership, such as to authorship, that issue is for the jury to decide. *See, e.g., Del Madera*

18   *Props. v. Rhodes & Gardner, Inc.*, 820 F.2d 973, 980 (9th Cir. 1987) ("The question of

19   authorship of a copyrighted work is a question of fact for the jury.").

2. Validity of Copyright

21   The parties agree that the Court decides copyrightability. (ECF No. 525 at 10.)

22   A "certificate of copyright registration constitutes prima facie evidence of copyrightability

23   and shifts the burden to the defendant to demonstrate why the copyright is not valid." *Bibbero*

24   *Sys., Inc. v. Colwell Sys., Inc.*, 893 F.2d 1104, 1106 (9th Cir. 1990); *see also* 17 U.S.C. § 410(c)

25   ("In any judicial proceedings the certificate of a registration made before or within five years after

26   first publication of the work shall constitute prima facie evidence of the validity of the copyright

27   and of the facts stated in the certificate.").

28

1   The presumption that a work is entitled to copyright protection also extends to constituent

2   elements of the work. The presumption can be rebutted.

3   In *Lanard Toys Ltd. v. Novelty, Inc.*, the Ninth Circuit approved use of a jury instruction

4   requiring defendants to prove elements were not subject to copyright protection:

5   As Nimmer explains, "[U]nlike a patent claim, a claim to copyright is not
         examined for basic validity before a certificate is issued. ... There is one important
6   respect, however, in which the Copyright Office does perform a substantive
         examination within its particular expertise to determine validity: whether the work
7   falls within the subject matter of copyright. The Office will register only works as
         to which, 'after examination,' it determines that 'the material deposited constitutes
8   copyrightable subject matter...'" 3-12 Nimmer § 12.11[B][3] (citing 17 U.S.C. §
         410(a)). Accordingly, *the district court did not err by instructing the jury that*
9   *appellants bore the burden of proving that any functional elements of Lanard's*
         toys were not subject to copyright protection, and that any similarity between their
10   products and Lanard's works were limited to such functional elements.

11   375 Fed. Appx. 705, 711 (9th Cir. 2010) (omission in original and emphasis added); *see also*

12   *Maljack Prods., Inc. v. UAV Corp.*, 964 F. Supp. 1416, 1426 (C.D. Cal. 1997) ("The burden of

13   proving invalidity lies with the party making the invalidity claim").

14   Other courts, however, have characterized the burden as one to come forward with

15   evidence: "'To rebut the presumption, an infringement defendant must simply offer some

16   evidence or proof to dispute or deny the plaintiff's prima facie case of infringement.'" *Ets-Hokin*

17   *v. Skyy Spirits, Inc.*, 225 F.3d 1068, 1076 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted). *Ets-Hokin* sums up

18   the burden with respect to a photograph this way: "In short, to overcome the presumption of

19   validity, defendants must demonstrate why the photographs are not copyrightable." *Id.*

20   The Court should follow *Lanard Toys* and hold that Google has the burden of proving that

21   the elements it copied are not subject to copyright protection. But regardless of how it is

22   articulated, Google's burden extends to each feature Google copied. As Judge Murguia held in

23   *Merchant Transaction Systems v. Nelcela*:

24   Th[e] presumption extends to the Court's use of analytic dissection under the
         extrinsic test to determine whether any of the allegedly similar features are
25   protected by copyright. *See Apple Computer*, 35 F.3d at 1443. Because Lexcel
         satisfied its prima facie burden and was determined to possess a valid copyright,
26   Lexcel is entitled to a presumption that the common features and elements in the
         Lexcel and Nelcela software are copyrightable. *See Swirsky*, 376 F.3d at 851. As
27   such, contrary to Nelcela's assertion that "it is Lexcel's burden to prove the
         significance of the elements copied" (Dkt. # 603, p.4), the burden in fact shifts to
28

ORACLE'S MARCH 9, 2012 BRIEF REGARDING COPYRIGHT ISSUES
CASE NO. CV 10-03561 WHA   5
pa-1515953

1

Nelcela to demonstrate why those common features and elements are not protected by copyright.

2

2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25663, at *26-27 (citing *Bibbero*, 893 F.2d at 1106); *see also Brocade*

3

Commc'ns Sys., Inc. v. A10 Networks, Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91384, at *7 (N.D. Cal. Aug.

4

16, 2011) ("[I]t is also true that if Brocade registered its software within 5 years of publication,

5

this entitles Brocade to a presumption of validity, and shifts the burden to A10 to rebut that the

6

allegedly copied elements are not protectable expression.") (citing *Merch. Transaction*).

7

3.   Copying

8

Copying is an issue of fact for the jury, and Oracle bears the burden of proof. *See Three*

9

Boys Music Corp. v. Bolton, 212 F.3d 477, 481-82 (9th Cir. 2000). Oracle can fulfill this burden

10

with evidence of direct copying or by showing that Google had access to the copyrighted work

11

and that there is a substantial similarity between the copyrighted and infringing works. *Id.* at 481.

12

The Ninth Circuit has held there is no need to prove similarity if direct copying is shown:

13

14

"Substantial similarity" is not an element of a claim of copyright infringement. Rather, it is a doctrine that helps courts adjudicate whether copying of the "constituent elements of the work that are original" actually occurred when an allegedly infringing work appropriates elements of an original without reproducing it *in toto*.

15

16

Range Road Music, Inc. v. East Coast Food, Inc., 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS 3173, at *10 (9th Cir.

17

Feb. 16, 2012). Here, there is substantial evidence proving copying under either theory.

18

a.   Google copied the Java API specifications

19

Google copied the designs expressed in the Java API specifications, which include

20

thousands of elements and the relationships among them, essentially in their entirety. Google

21

does not deny that this copying took place. To the contrary, its expert, Owen Astrachan,

22

acknowledges that Google copied the API specifications deliberately, opining that "Even the

23

slightest changes to the names or organization of API elements will thwart compatibility and

24

interoperability, because existing code that used those elements would not run properly, and

25

programmers would have to learn new API element names." (Astrachan Opening Rep., ECF No.

26

262-1 ¶ 131). This is sufficient to satisfy Oracle's burden to show copying under *Range Road*

27

Music, supra. It is no defense for Google to claim it copied from a third party. A defendant is

28

1   liable when it copies from a third party, with or without a license. *Pye v. Mitchell*, 574 F.2d 476,

2   481 (9th Cir. 1978).

3   While Oracle is not required to also prove copying through access and substantial

4   similarity, it can do so. The Java API specifications were available on the Sun (now Oracle)

5   website, subject to explicit copyright protection, and Google admits Android developers had

6   access to them. (Google Resp. to RFA No. 168.) Bob Lee, the lead developer for the Android

7   core libraries, testified that Google worked to "implement core libraries *according to Java APIs*."

8   (Lee Dep. 14:7-11 (emphasis added).) Mr. Lee "consulted Sun's website for the API

9   specifications when doing the work for Google." (*Id.* at 66:7-9.) He did so knowing that the

10 specifications were subject to a copyright notice. (*Id.* at 65:8-67:5.)

11   There is no real question of substantial similarity. (*See, e.g.,* Mitchell Opening Rep. Ex.

12 Copyright A-D, ECF No. 397 at 124-160 (comparing specifications).) On summary judgment,

13 the Court ruled as to the API specifications that "Because Google has not proven that a

14 substantial portion of the specifications is unprotected, Google's justification for applying the

15 virtual identity standard fails." (ECF No. 433 at 11.) Google will not be able to prove so at trial

16 either. However, Oracle could satisfy a virtual identity standard as well.

17   **b.   Google copied Java Software Code**

18   Oracle will show that Google copied source code, object code, and comments from 11

19 Java software code files. Google's expert has not denied this copying, but only denies its

20 significance. (*See* Astrachan Opening Rep., ECF No. 262-1 ¶¶ 145-175.) Again, evidence of this

21 direct copying satisfies *Range Road Music*, but Oracle can show access and similarity as well.

22 Google engineer Josh Bloch, formerly of Sun, conceded that there "is a strong indication that it is

23 likely" that he accessed the Oracle source code for the method called "rangeCheck" when he

24 wrote the same method in Android. (Bloch Dep. 181:7-14.) And the evidence shows Google

25 decompiled Java object code, which can be retrieved from most desktops or many other places

26 Java is available. A side-by-side comparison of the copied code and comments shows they are

27 virtually identical. (*See* Mitchell Opening Rep., ECF No. 397 ¶¶ 77, 206-26.)

28

4. Originality

Google's challenge to originality is a question for the Court to decide. *See* 3-12 *Nimmer on Copyright* § 12.10[B][1]. But threshold determinations of fact are for the jury. *Id.* When there are no genuine issues of fact, as is the case here, originality may be resolved as a matter of law. *Jacobsen v. Katzer*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115204, at *9-10 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2009).

The Court denied Oracle's request to file a summary judgment motion on the issue of originality of selection and arrangement of names of APIs, stating that "The judge will understand the complications of the issues much better after the detailed trial evidence is laid out and cross-examined. It would be hard for the judge to master the material with the same grasp via a cold written record." (ECF No. 584.) Accordingly, the Court should decide the originality issue on a full record, after hearing fact and expert witness testimony regarding the API design, and should instruct the jury on this issue. While the Court may determine it wishes to submit a threshold issue of fact to the jury, Oracle does not believe that will be necessary.

Because its copyrights were timely registered, Oracle is entitled to a presumption of originality as to the copied elements, and the burden shifts to Google to demonstrate why they are not original. *See, e.g., Ets-Hokin*, 225 F.3d at 1075-76 ("In short, to overcome the presumption of validity, defendants must demonstrate why the photographs are not copyrightable."). Moreover, a copyright registration creates a presumption of originality as to the *specific elements* of a registered work. *See, e.g., Swirsky v. Carey*, 376 F.3d 841, 851 (9th Cir. 2004) (valid registration certificate entitled plaintiff to presumption of originality "as to first measure of chorus" of song); *Merch. Transaction*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25663, at *26-27 (registration shifts burden to defendant "to demonstrate why those common features and elements are not protected by copyright"); *Brocade*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91384, at *7 (registration shifts burden to defendant "to rebut that the allegedly copied elements are not protectable expression"). Google's burden is a difficult one to meet, in part because there is only a minimal degree of originality required. In ruling on summary judgment on the copyrightability of individual names, the Court stated that Oracle had not shown that it was entitled to a presumption of originality because it cited "no authority requiring a presumption of *originality* as to *specific elements* of a registered

1   work." (ECF No. 433 at 8 (emphasis in original).) Based on the authority cited immediately

2   above, however, the presumption should be applied at trial.

3   Regardless, the legal threshold for originality is low: "To be sure, the requisite level of

4   creativity is extremely low; even a slight amount will suffice." *Feist*, 499 U.S. at 345 (citation

5   omitted). In *CDN Inc. v. Kapes*, for example, the Ninth Circuit found that prices in a guide for

6   collectible coins were protected by copyright, emphasizing that the required level of originality is

7   "minimal." 197 F.3d 1256, 1262 (9th Cir. 1999). The court explained that the white pages phone

8   listings in *Feist* "did not qualify because they fell into the 'narrow category of works in which the

9   creative spark is utterly lacking or so trivial as to be virtually nonexistent." *Id.* at 1259-60

10 (quoting *Feist*, 499 U.S. at 359).

11   The API specifications express a highly creative, complex interplay of elements. Oracle

12 will present evidence at trial about the many design choices involved in creating the Java APIs,

13 their uniqueness, and the skill required to write them. Google's own employees have extolled the

14 creative expression in a well-constructed API. For example, former Sun engineer and current

15 Google employee Josh Bloch testified that a good API will "read like prose" and wrote that "API

16 design is a noble and rewarding craft." (Bloch Dep. 81:13-82:7, 90:8-91:11.) No court has ever

17 held that a structure with the level of expression, intricacy, complexity and interdependency

18 present here lacks the creativity to qualify for copyright protection.

19   Google cannot mount a serious challenge to the originality of code it literally copied

20 either. Indeed, its only defense is that its copying was minimal. "Source and object code, the

21 literal components of a program, are consistently held protected by a copyright on the program."

22 *Johnson Controls, Inc. v. Phoenix Control Sys., Inc.*, 886 F.2d 1173, 1175 (9th Cir. 1989).

23   **B.   Indirect Infringement**

24   Oracle has claims against Google for both contributory and vicarious infringement.

25   To establish contributory infringement Oracle must show: (1) Google knew or had reason

26 to know of the infringing activity of others; and (2) Google intentionally or materially contributed

27 to the infringing activity. *Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. v. Akanoc Solutions, Inc.*, 658 F.3d 936,

28 943-44 (9th Cir. 2011). Intent to infringe is not required. *Id.* at 943.

ORACLE'S MARCH 9, 2012 BRIEF REGARDING COPYRIGHT ISSUES
CASE NO. CV 10-03561 WHA
pa-1515953

9

1   To establish vicarious infringement, Oracle must show that: (1) Google profited directly

2 from the infringing activity of others; (2) Google had the right and ability to supervise and control

3 the infringing activity; and (3) Google failed to exercise that right and ability. *MDY Indus., LLC*

4 *v. Blizzard Entm't, Inc.*, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 3428, at *10 (9th Cir. Feb. 17, 2011).

5   The evidence will show Google *requires* mobile manufacturers to include the 37

6 infringing API implementations on their devices as part of its licensing terms, and has profited

7 handsomely from the infringing activity. Google also knowingly included the infringing

8 rangeCheck code on Android handsets, where it remains to this day. Google has the ability to

9 force updates to code on existing handsets remotely, but has not done so. Google published the

10 other 10 files containing copied code and comments on its Android developer website, but took

11 them down after it was caught.

12   **III.   GOOGLE'S AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

13   **A.   Elements Are Not Protected By Copyright**

14   Google's answer incorporates several different arguments under this general heading.

15 (*See* ECF No. 51 at 10-11.)

16   **1.   Merger and Scenes A Faire**

17   In the Ninth Circuit, merger and *scenes a faire* are both viewed as defenses to a claim of

18 infringement, rather than challenges to copyrightability. *See Ets-Hokin*, 225 F. 3d at 1082.

19 Google accordingly has the burden of proof. *Merch. Transaction*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25663,

20 at *27-28.

21   In ruling on summary judgment, the Court rejected Google's attempt to claim that entire

22 categories of elements in the APIs were unprotectable, stating that, "This order declines to hold

23 that API package specifications, or any particular category of elements they contain, are

24 unprotectable under the *scenes a faire* or merger doctrines." (ECF No. 433 at 9.) The Court ruled

25 that, "If Google believes, for example, that a particular method declaration is a *scene a faire* or is

26 the only possible way to express a given function, then Google should provide evidence and

27 argument supporting its views as to that method declaration." (*Id.*)

28

1   Merger and *scenes a faire* are issues for the Court to decide. *Ets-Hokin,* 225 F.3d at 1082.

2   But these fact intensive questions will require examination of a full record at trial. The Court

3   may wish to seek an advisory verdict from the jury on the underlying factual question of whether

4   a challenged element is "the only possible way to express a given function" (ECF No. 433 at 9) or

5   a "commonplace expression[] that [is] indispensable and naturally associated with the treatment

6   of a given idea." (*Id.* at 8 (quoting *Swirsky v. Carey,* 376 F.3d at 850).)

2.   Other challenges based on functionality

8   Google generally alleges as its affirmative defense that the copyrights at issue are not

9   protectable because they are works that are "functional." (ECF No. 51 at 10.) It has framed this

10   argument in various ways throughout the case, claiming that the APIs are unprotectable "methods

11   of operation" or "functional requirements for compatibility." The parties agree that

12   copyrightability is an issue of law to be addressed by the Court. (ECF No. 525 at 10.)

13   The Court should follow the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Lanard Toys* and hold that Google

14   has the burden of proving the allegedly functional elements it copied are not subject to copyright

15   protection. *Lanard Toys,* 375 Fed. Appx. at 711. Oracle's registration certificates create a

16   rebuttable presumption that shifts the burden to Google to demonstrate why Oracle's copyrights

17   as to the API specifications are invalid. *Bibbero,* 893 F.2d at 1106.

18   Merely labeling something "functional" or a "method of operation" does not decide the

19   issue of copyrightability. All computer programs are functional. "Whether the non-literal

20   components of a program, including the structure, sequence and organization and user interface,

21   are protected depends on whether, on the particular facts of each case, the component in question

22   qualifies as the expression of an idea, or an idea itself." *Johnson Controls,* 886 F.2d at 1175. To

23   establish that an element is disqualified from copyright protection because of functionality,

24   Google should be required to satisfy the merger doctrine's requirement that it is "the only

25   possible way to express a given function." (*See* ECF No. 433 at 9 (citing *Satava v. Lowry,* 323

26   F.3d 805, 812 n.5 (9th Cir. 2003).)

27   The Court has already rejected Google's argument that the API specifications are

28   "methods of operation." (*Id.* at 11.) As discussed in Oracle's opposition to summary judgment,

1   Google's method of operation argument relies on *Lotus v. Borland*, which is factually

2   distinguishable because it related to a much simpler consumer user menu. Just as importantly,

3   *Lotus* has never been followed in the Ninth Circuit, and other Circuit courts have expressly

4   refused to adopt its reasoning. (*See* ECF No. 339 at 9-12.)

5   Google's tautological claim that it copied "functional requirements for compatibility" ―

6   by which it means it copied in order to be compatible with those features of Java it wished to

7   copy ― should be evaluated as part of Google's fair use defense, discussed below.

8   **B.   Fair Use**

9   The parties agree that the jury should decide Google's fair use defense. (ECF No. 525 at

10   15.) *See, e.g.*, *Jartech, Inc. v. Clancy*, 666 F.2d 403, 405, 407 (9th Cir. 1982) (upholding special

11   jury verdict finding that defendants' use of films was fair use). Google bears the burden of

12   proving fair use. *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 508 F.3d 1146, 1158 (9th Cir. 2007).

13   The Court previously rejected Google's efforts to determine fair use as a matter of law,

14   finding that "fact issues preclude a summary judgment finding." (ECF No. 433 at 13.) Google

15   must therefore present its defense of fair use to the jury. However, Oracle believes a directed

16   verdict in its favor is appropriate because Google cannot meet its burden of proof.

17   In determining whether a use is fair, 17 U.S.C. § 107 sets out four factors to consider,

18   although other factors may be considered as well:

19   **(1) Purpose and character of use** – This expressly includes "whether such use is of a

20   commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes." 17 U.S.C. § 107(1). Google's use is

21   clearly commercial, which "tends to weigh against a finding of fair use." *Harper & Row*

22   *Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters.*, 471 U.S. 539, 562 (1985). The Supreme Court held that

23   "[a]lso relevant to the 'character' of the use is 'the propriety of the defendant's conduct.'" *Id.*

24   (quoting 3 *Nimmer on Copyright* § 13.05[A], at 13-72). Google's decision to push forward with

25   Android without a license, when it knew one was required, weighs strongly against fair use.

26   **(2) Nature of the copyrighted work** – The Java APIs are highly creative works, as

27   discussed above. (*See, e.g.*, Astrachan Dep. 128:9-13 ("Just as it's hard to find people that are

28   really good at anything that's hard, whether it be, you know, being an artist, a football player, a

1   concert violinist. Those things are hard. This [API design] is something that's hard in the same

2   way."); *see also* evidence discussed at section I.A, *supra*.)

3   **(3) Amount and substantiality of the work used** – This inquiry includes both qualitative

4   and quantitative evaluations. In *Harper*, the Supreme Court found that copying even 300 words

5   from Gerald Ford's unpublished manuscript was not fair use because of the "qualitative nature of

6   the taking." 471 U.S. at 545, 564-65. Google copied from the core Java API specifications —

7   about one-quarter of the Java APIs in total — and will not be able to establish that its copying

8   was quantitatively or qualitatively insignificant.

9   **(4) Effect of the Use on the Market for or Value of the Copyrighted Work** – The

10 Supreme Court has stated that "This last factor is undoubtedly the single most important element

11 of fair use." *Id.* at 566-67 (citation omitted). Google's copying has dramatically impaired the

12 market and value of Java, by creating a free competing platform in the mobile device arena, and

13 by fragmenting Java and undermining its "write once, run anywhere" promise.

14   **C.   De Minimis Copying**

15   Google asserts its literal copying of Oracle source code and comments is not actionable

16 because it is *de minimis*. "[A] use is de minimis only if the average audience would not recognize

17 the appropriation." *Newton v. Diamond*, 388 F.3d 1189, 1193 (9th Cir. 2004). Whether the

18 "average audience" would recognize Google's copying is a jury issue. Google has the burden to

19 show its copying was de minimis. *See, e.g., Range Road Music*, 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS 3173, at

20 * 10 (plaintiff with evidence of direct copying not required to show substantial infringement).

21   The Court, however, should instruct the jury which "works" it should compare. Google

22 copied eight source code files in their entirety, and those are the works the jury should compare.

23 Google argues its code copying should be compared to the entire Java platform because Oracle

24 registered it as a single work. The Court rejected this argument on summary judgment, finding

25 that "Google has not shown that the Java platform is the proper basis for comparison." (ECF No.

26 433 at 6.) The Court ruled that "[t]he plain meaning of [37 C.F.R. § 202.3(b)(4)(i)(A)] is that

27 when a single published unit contains multiple elements 'that are otherwise recognizable as self-

28

1 contained works,' the unit is considered a single work *for the limited purpose of registration*,

2 while its elements may be recognized as separate works for other purposes." (*Id.*)

3 But if Google is correct that its copying should be compared to the Java platform as a

4 whole, the significance of its copying cannot be determined by examining its literal code copying

5 in isolation. The jury should also take into account its copying of the 37 API specifications.

6 ### D. Equitable Defenses

7 Finally, Google raises defenses of implied license, equitable estoppel, laches, and waiver.

8 Google has the burden to prove all elements of these defenses. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. King*

9 *Features Entm't, Inc.*, 843 F.2d 394, 399 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming summary judgment where

10 defendant "has not shown that he has evidence to establish three of the[] elements" of estoppel.)

11 The parties agree these are equitable defenses for the Court to decide. Nevertheless,

12 Google has requested an advisory verdict from the jury on these defenses. There is no reason for

13 jury input on these defenses, because they are equitable, meritless, and prejudicial. Google will

14 not be able to establish that there is a triable issue on the necessary elements of these defenses,

15 such as reasonable reliance, and they can be decided against Google as a matter of law.

16 ## IV. EFFECT OF PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE

17 The Court has asked "whether or not the copyrightability of the selection, arrangement,

18 and structure of the APIs depend on the underlying programming language being Java as opposed

19 to Python or QBASIC or other non-Java-programming language." (ECF No. 754.) The Java

20 programming language provides many options that facilitate expressive, copyrightable API

21 design. But it does not compel or require any particular design.

22 The Java programming language places almost no requirements on the selection,

23 arrangement, and structure of the Java API elements. Java is a powerful, flexible, state-of-the-art

24 programming language for expressing APIs. It includes several features, such as interfaces and

25 packages, intended to facilitate API design. This empowers developers to express Java API

26 specifications in myriad ways, and supports their copyrightability. *Cf. Satava*, 323 F.3d at 812

27 n.5 ("Under the merger doctrine, courts will not protect a copyrighted work from infringement if

28 the idea underlying the copyrighted work can be expressed in only one way, lest there be a

1 monopoly on the underlying idea."). But, while the language created the opportunity for Sun to

2 develop rich, expressive APIs, it did not compel Sun to do so. Sun made a deliberate design

3 decision to include extensive class libraries and a robust set of APIs. In contrast, although C++ is

4 as powerful a language as Java, it has a much more Spartan set of APIs, reflecting the minimalist

5 philosophy of their designer. (*See* Bjarne Stroustrup, THE C++ PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE § 16.1

6 (3d ed. 1997).) Only a very small number of API elements are so closely tied to the language that

7 they are formally required by the language specification. For example, the language requires the

8 classes java.lang.Object, java.lang.Class and java.lang.String to be present. (*See* James Gosling

9 et al., JAVA LANGUAGE SPECIFICATION § 4.3.2 (3d ed. 2005).)

10   QBASIC is a simpler programming language than Java, with fewer linguistic options. It

11 is not an object-oriented language, and so has fewer alternatives available for expressing

12 arrangement and structure of API elements. It can be compared to a human language that has

13 only the present tense: there are obviously more expressive options in languages that allow for

14 past, future, and other tenses. Python is a more extensive and sophisticated language than

15 QBASIC, but still does not include all of the same features that Java has to facilitate API design.

16 For example, Python's method signatures do not have types associated with the parameters. In

17 Java, an API designer can give each parameter a type, such as a class or interface created by the

18 designer, expressing how developers should use the parameter. This form of expression is

19 unavailable in Python and related languages.

20   Like Sun, Google had many options in creating the Android API specifications and

21 libraries, as illustrated by the other APIs it chose to design itself without copying from Sun.

22 Google took what it wanted. It copied by choice, not by necessity.

23

Dated: March 9, 2012   MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

24

25   By: /s/ _____

26   Michael A. Jacobs
                             Attorneys for Plaintiff

27   ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

28