

1 Henry L. Self III (California State Bar No. 223153)
2 Ryan W. Powers (California State Bar No. 291784)
3 SELF & POWERS
4 1645 Vine Street, Suite 307
5 Los Angeles, California 90028-8805
6 Phone: (323) 487-0383
7 Fax: (323) 487-0384
8 E-mail: hself@selfandpowers.com

6 Matthew F. Schwartz * *Pro Hac Vice to be filed*
7 Brian S. Levenson * *Pro Hac Vice to be filed*
8 SCHWARTZ, PONTERIO & LEVENSON, PLLC
9 134 West 29th Street, Suite 1006
New York, New York 10001
Phone: (212) 714-1200
Fax: (212) 714-1264
E-mail: mschwartz@splaw.us
E-mail: blevenson@splaw.us

10 Oren S. Giskan * *Pro Hac Vice to be filed*
11 GISKAN SOLOTAROFF & ANDERSON LLP
12 90 Broad Street, 10th Floor
13 New York, New York 10004
Phone: (212) 847-8315
Fax: (646) 520-3237
E-mail: ogiskan@gslawny.com

14
15 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
SA MUSIC, LLC and
HAROLD ARLEN TRUST

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SA MUSIC, LLC and HAROLD ARLEN TRUST,

Plaintiffs,

Case No.

**COMPLAINT
FOR COPYRIGHT
INFRINGEMENT
AND JURY DEMAND**

1 CLEOPATRA RECORDS, INC., PICKWICK GROUP
2 LIMITED, CUGATE LTD., WNTS, IDEAL MUSIC,
3 SHAMI MEDIA INC., BLUE SOUNDS, TVP, INC., J.
4 JOES J. EDIZIONI MUSICALI, MARATHON
5 MEDIA INT. LTD., THOMAS COLLEY, BEST
6 RECORDS, WERNER LAST'S FAVOURITES JAZZ,
7 BROKEN AUDIO, RELOADED MUSIC, VINTAGE
8 MUSIC SL, ACROBAT MUSIC LTD., FUTURE
9 NOISE MUSIC LIMITED, PINK DOT,
10 PRIMEPHONIC USA INC., DWK RECORDS,
11 SENDDIGITAL, CTS DIGITAL, MICHAEL
12 BENNETT, AP MUSIC LTD, JAZZSENTIAL,
13 HASMICK PROMOTIONS LIMITED, HENRY
14 HADAWAY ORGANIZATION LIMITED,
15 ENTERTAIN ME LTD., OVC MEDIA, MACH60
16 MUSIC, AVID GROUP, IMPRESSIONS, GRALIN
17 MUSIC, JAZZ CO., MOVE, XELON
18 ENTERTAINMENT PTY. LTD., CHERISHED
19 RECORDS, RAILROAD, VINTAGE RECORDS,
20 PLENTY JAZZ RECORDS, JAZZ MOON,
21 FAVORITE CLASSICS, HISTORICAL JAZZ,
22 RARITY MUSIC, LIONFISH MUSIC, LLC, TRITON,
23 SMITH & CO B.V., BRISA RECORDS, CLASSICS,
24 ROBA MUSIC VERLAG GMBH, BACCI BROS
25 RECORDS, DIGITAL GRAMOPHONE, PLAZA
26 MAYOR COMPANY LIMITED, BLARICUM C.D.
27 COMPANY (B.C.D.) BV, and John Doe Distributors
28 and John Doe Pirate Labels 1-10,

Defendants.

Introduction

1. This case is about massive music piracy operations in the digital music
2 stores and streaming services of some of the largest tech companies in the world.
3 Apple, Amazon, Google, Microsoft, and Pandora and their distributors have joined
4 with notorious music pirates to sell and stream thousands of pirated recordings
5 embodying copyrighted musical works owned by plaintiffs SA Music, LLC and the
6 Harold Arlen Trust (“Plaintiffs”).

2. Plaintiffs are the legal and/or beneficial copyright owners of musical
3 works authored by Harold Arlen, a premier composer of American music. Arlen
4 wrote and co-wrote some of the most popular modern songs, including *Over the
5 Rainbow* from The Wizard of Oz and many other seminal works in the American
6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 songbook, including *I've Got the World on a String*, *Stormy Weather*, *The Devil and*
2 *the Deep Blue Sea*, *Come Rain or Come Shine*, *Get Happy*, *Ill Wind* and *It's Only A*
3 *Paper Moon*. A list of Plaintiffs' copyrighted compositions at issue in this case is
4 annexed as Exhibit A (the "Subject Compositions").

5 3. Arlen's masterpieces have been recorded by the most prominent jazz
6 and popular artists of all time, including Art Tatum, Benny Goodman, Billie
7 Holliday, Cab Calloway, Charlie Parker, Coleman Hawkins, Count Basie, Dizzy
8 Gillespie, Duke Ellington, Ella Fitzgerald, Etta James, Frank Sinatra, John Coltrane,
9 Lena Horne, Louis Armstrong, Miles Davis, Ray Charles, and Sarah Vaughan to
10 name only a few. These monumental works of art are, quite literally, national
11 treasures.

12 4. These and other recordings of Arlen's musical works have been pirated
13 by the Defendants in this case. They are players in the digital music business that
14 participate in, and jointly profit from, making digital phonorecord deliveries, (*i.e.*,
15 downloads and interactive streams), of pirated recordings of the Subject
16 Compositions.

17 5. Digital phonorecord deliveries of musical recordings constitute a
18 reproduction and distribution of the musical work embodied in the digital recording
19 and require a negotiated license from the copyright owner of the musical
20 composition, sometimes referred to as a "mechanical license."

21 6. Defendants have failed to obtain any license that would authorize them
22 to reproduce, distribute, sell or stream the pirated recordings of the Subject
23 Compositions and, as a result, Defendants have infringed Plaintiffs' exclusive rights
24 of reproduction and distribution of the Subject Compositions, under 17 U.S.C. §§
25 106(1) and 106(3).

26

27

28

1 7. Further, the activity of making digital phonorecord deliveries of pirated
2 recordings of the Subject Compositions does not qualify for a compulsory license
3 under Section 115 of the Copyright Act.

4 8. A list of the pirated recordings of the Subject Compositions that
5 Defendants have reproduced and distributed without authorization, including by
6 making digital phonorecord deliveries, and various methods of reproduction and
7 distribution, thus far identified, is set forth in the Infringement Chart annexed as
8 Exhibit B.

9 9. Over 6,000 pirated recordings of the Subject Compositions have been
10 separately reproduced and distributed as digital phonorecord deliveries by
11 Defendants as set forth in the Infringement Chart annexed as Exhibit B. Defendants
12 have infringed these works in concerted and distinct distribution chains, each of
13 which gives rise to an award for statutory damages under the Copyright Act.

14 10. To put this case in context, in 2007, Jammie Thomas-Rasset, a single
15 mother of four in Brainerd, Minnesota, was found liable, after three separate jury
16 trials, for copyright infringement for using file sharing software that enabled the
17 unauthorized downloading and distribution of 24 recordings by the Goo Goo Dolls
18 and Def Leppard, among others. The juries awarded statutory damages in all three
19 trials of up to \$80,000 per infringement. The Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals
20 ultimately affirmed statutory damages in the amount of \$9,250 for each infringed
21 recording, for a total award of \$222,000. Ms. Thomas-Rassett declared bankruptcy
22 as she had “no other option.”

23 11. In 2009, Joel Tenenbaum, a Massachusetts college student, who also
24 used file-sharing software that permitted others to download 30 recordings by Limp
25 Bizkit and Blink-182, was found liable and the jury awarded statutory damages of
26 \$22,500 per recording, for a judgment that totaled \$675,000 forcing Mr. Tenenbaum
27 to file for Chapter 7 bankruptcy.

28

1 12. Unlike Ms. Thomas-Rassett and Mr. Tenenbaum who were not alleged
 2 to have sold their infringing recordings or profited from their conduct, Defendants in
 3 this case have engaged in massive music piracy operation for the purpose of
 4 generating profits from their sales and streams of pirated recordings and by other
 5 means.

6 13. The copyright infringement operation detailed in this Complaint is only
 7 the latest in a long line of piracy schemes that have plagued composers, publishers,
 8 and record labels since the inception of the music industry over 100 years ago, when
 9 the perforated rolls used by player pianos to perform musical works were pirated.
 10 See *Aeolian Co. v. Royal Music Co.*, 196 F. 926 (W.D.N.Y. 1912).

11 14. As the technology employed by the music industry to reproduce
 12 musical works advanced, bootlegging efforts by music pirates kept pace. In the
 13 1960s and 1970s, organized criminal enterprises engaged in record and tape piracy
 14 operations on a scale that is dwarfed by the infringing conduct explained herein.
 15 Like the Defendants in this case, the “tape pirates” and “record pirates” of years past
 16 unlawfully duplicated popular pre-existing recordings, and then claimed their
 17 liability was limited by the compulsory license provision of the 1909 Copyright Act,
 18 Section 1(e).

19 15. The landmark case *Duchess Music Corp. v. Stern*, 458 F.2d 1305 (9th
 20 Cir. 1972) settled the issue as to whether tape pirates could limit their liability for
 21 piracy under the compulsory license provision of the 1909 Copyright Act. In
 22 *Duchess*, the defendant tape pirate engaged in the same conduct identified in this
 23 Complaint, and claimed her conduct was lawful because the compulsory license
 24 provision of the Copyright Act authorized the reproduction and distribution of the
 25 musical works embodied on the recordings she pirated. The Ninth Circuit rejected
 26 the argument, stating, “She may not continue her piracy under the flag of
 27 compulsory licensing.” The *Duchess* court concluded that the tape pirates’ activity
 28

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.