1 2 3 4 5 6 7	KELLY M. KLAUS (State Bar No. 16109 kelly.klaus@mto.com JOHN L. SCHWAB (State Bar No. 30138 john.schwab@mto.com MICA L. MOORE (State Bar No. 321473 mica.moore@mto.com MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 350 South Grand Avenue Fiftieth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-3426 Telephone: (213) 683-9100 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702  Attorneys for Netflix, Inc.	REDACTED VERSION  OF DOCUMENT  PROPOSED TO DE
8	Attorneys for Netffix, file.	
9	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
10	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CAL	IFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION
11		
12	HOLLYWOOD INNOVATIONS	Case No. 2:21-cv-9423
13	GROUP LLC,	DEFENDANT NETFLIX, INC.'S
14	Plaintiff,	REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT
15	VS.	Judge: Hon. André Birotte Jr. Date: March 25, 2022
16	NETFLIX, INC., a Delaware Corporation, ZIP CINEMA CO. LTD.,	Time: 10:00 a.m. Ctrm: 7B
17	a South Korean Corporation, KAKAO ENTERTAINMENT CORP., a South Korean Corporation, PERSPECTIVE	Cum. /B
18	PICTURES CO. LTD, a South Korean Corporation, and Does 1-10, inclusive,	
19	Defendants.	
20	Defendants.	
21		•
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		



1		TABLE OF CONTENTS					
2					<b>Page</b>		
3	I.	INTR	INTRODUCTION1				
4	II.	ARGUMENT3					
5		A.	Plaus	Opposition Confirms That HIG Does Not And Cannot ibly Allege Netflix Infringed Any Right That HIG Acquired Naylor	3		
7 8			1.	Netflix May Raise, And The Court May Consider, The Undisputed Text Of Article 99 Of The Korean Copyright Act			
9			2.	Naylor Did Not Retain The Right To Translate #Saraitda	6		
10			3.	The Is N			
11				Rights And, Even If It Were, HIG's Claim Would Still Fail	8		
12			4.	Any Amendment Would Be Futile			
13		В.	HIG'	s Opposition Confirms That, If The Complaint Is Not			
14			Dism Forur	G's Opposition Confirms That, If The Complaint Is Not smissed Under Rule 12(b)(6), It Should Be Dismissed For rum Non Conveniens Or Under Rule 19(b)	12		
15 16			1.	Both Private And Public Factors Favor Dismissal For Forum Non-Conveniens.	13		
17 18			2.	The Korean Defendants And Lotte Entertainment Are Indispensable Parties Because HIG Is Seeking To Invalidate Their Contractual Rights	1./		
19	III.	CON	CLUS	ION			
20	1111.	CON	CLUS.	1O1v	13		
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
20							



1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2 3	FEDERAL CASES  Page
4	Bassett v. Mashantucket Pequot Tribe, 204 F.3d 343 (2d Cir. 2000)
5 6	Costello Pub. Co. v. Rotelle, 670 F.2d 1035 (D.C. Cir. 1981)
7 8	Creative Tech., Ltd. v. Aztech Sys. Pte., Ltd., 61 F.3d 696 (9th Cir. 1995)
9 10	de Fontbrune v. Wofsy, 838 F.3d 992 (9th Cir. 2016)
11 12	Fahmy v. Jay-Z, 908 F.3d 383 (9th Cir. 2018)
13 14	Gilliam v. ABC, 538 F.2d 14 (2d Cir. 1976)
15	<i>Pizzorno v. Draper</i> , No. 17-00182-AB, 2017 WL 4712071 (C.D. Cal. July 7, 2017)12
<ul><li>16</li><li>17</li><li>18</li></ul>	So v. Land Base, LLC, No. CV 08-03336 DDP, 2009 WL 5088745 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2009)
19 20	Tierney v. Image Ent., Inc., No. CV-11-1305 DSF, 2012 WL 13008214 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 21, 2012)
<ul><li>21</li><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	United States v. A 10th Century Cambodian Sandstone Sculpture, No. 12 CIV. 2600(GBD), 2013 WL 1290515 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 28, 2013)
24 25	United States v. Ritchie, 342 F.3d 903 (9th Cir. 2003)
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	Vance v. Am. Soc'y of Composers, 271 F.2d 204 (8th Cir. 1959)
20	



1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (Continued)
2	Page
3	Federal Statutes
4	17 U.S.C. § 101
5	STATE RULES
6	Rule 12(b)(6)4, 12
7 8	Rule 1914
9	Rule 19(b)
10	Rule 44.15
11	Rules - Other
12	Fed. R. Civ. P. 19(a)(1)(B)
13	OTHER AUTHORITIES
14 15	Korean Copyright Act Article 99
16	3 Nimmer on Copyright § 12.02 (2021)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	



## I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

HIG's Opposition confirms it has no plausible copyright infringement claim against Netflix. The reasons for that are indisputable:

- HIG can only assert those rights to the *Devour* script that Matt Naylor, the author and original copyright owner, conveyed to HIG.<sup>1</sup>
  Specifically *excluded* from the rights Naylor conveyed to HIG were any that were

  Request for Judicial Notice ("RJN") Ex. C (Dkt. 40-2) § 2 (
- Korean law governs the Naylor/Zip Agreement. *Id.* Ex. B (Dkt. 40-1) § 18. Under Article 99 of the Korean Copyright Act, because the "author[] [Naylor]" "authorize[d] another person [Zip and Perspective] to exploit his/her work [the script] by means of cinematization [making #Saraitda]," Naylor's authorization is "presumed to include" the right "to exploit the translation of" the same "cinematographic work [#Saraitda]." Chung Decl. Ex. A at 2-3(Dkt. 30-3).
- The Article 99 presumption applies unless Naylor and Zip-Perspective (the "Korean Producers") "expressly stipulated" that it did not. *Id.* No such express stipulation appears in the Naylor/Zip Agreement.

HIG tried to distract from the underlying agreements by failing to attach them to its Complaint. Now, when confronted with the agreements, HIG throws everything at the wall to explain them away. Nothing sticks. For example, HIG argues that neither Netflix nor the Court can rely on Article 99 of the Korean Copyright Act on this 12(b)(6) motion, Opp. at 9, when Ninth Circuit law provides

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Naylor's agreement was with Rabih Aridi. But Mr. Aridi confirms that he is HIG's "sole member and managing member." Aridi Decl. ¶ 2 (Dkt. 44-6). This brief therefore uses "HIG" to include Mr. Aridi and the rights he did (and did not) acquire from Naylor.



# DOCKET

# 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.

