

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
CASE NO: 9:19-cv-81160-RS

APPLE INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORELLIUM, LLC,  
Defendant.

---

**DEFENDANT CORELLIUM, LLC'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT ..... 1

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS ..... 3

    A. CORELLIUM’S CREATION..... 3

    B. APPLE’S IOS ..... 4

    C. THE UNIQUE CORELLIUM PRODUCT ..... 5

    D. CAUSES OF ACTION ..... 6

III. ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES..... 6

    A. LEGAL STANDARD..... 6

        1. Standard ..... 6

        2. Copyright Infringement ..... 7

        3. Fair Use..... 7

        4. Digital Millennium Copyright Act..... 8

    B. THE CORELLIUM PRODUCT CONTAINS NO APPLE CODE ..... 8

    C. COPYRIGHT DOES NOT PROTECT THE FUNCTION OF SOFTWARE ..... 9

    D. SECURITY RESEARCH IS FUNCTIONAL AND THUS FAIR USE..... 10

        1. Corellium’s Usage Is Highly Transformative..... 10

        2. Nature Of The Works At Issue: Software Is Accorded Less Protection... 12

        3. The Use Of Portions Of Apple’s iOS Software Package And Its Graphical User Interface Are Appropriate And Necessary To Bring About Corellium’s Transformative Purpose..... 13

        4. Corellium Has No Adverse Effect On The Market For Apple’s Products 14

E. APPLE MISUSED COPYRIGHT IN AN ATTEMPT TO GAIN A MONOPOLY ON SECURITY RESEARCH CONTRARY TO PUBLIC POLICY ..... 15

F. APPLE SHOULD BE ESTOPPED FROM ASSERTING COPYRIGHTS AGAINST CORELLIUM..... 15

G. APPLE CANNOT SHOW THAT CORELLIUM INFRINGES THE SPECIFIC REGISTERED COPYRIGHTS THAT APPLE ASSERTS HERE..... 16

H. CORELLIUM’S PRODUCT DOES NOT VIOLATE THE DMCA ..... 17

    1. No Technological Protection Mechanism Exists That Protects Access To Or Rights In iOS ..... 17

    2. If Apple Had An Effective Technological Protection Measure That The CP Circumvents, Substantial Fair Use Limits The DMCA Trafficking Prohibition..... 18

IV. CONCLUSION..... 20

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Alcatel USA, Inc. v. DGI Techs., Inc.</i> , 166 F.3d 772, 792 (5th Cir. 1999) .....	6
<i>Allen v. Tyson Foods, Inc.</i> , 121 F.3d 642 (11th Cir. 1997) .....	6
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	6
<i>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</i> , 804 F.3d 202 (2d Cir. 2015).....	6, 10, 11
<i>A.V. ex. rel. Vanderhye v. iParadigms, LLC</i> , 562 F.3d 630 (4th Cir. 2009) .....	9
<i>Bateman v. Mnemonics, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1532 (11th Cir. 1996) .....	8, 12
<i>Cambridge Univ. Press v. Patton</i> , 769 F.3d 1232 (11th Cir. 2014) .....	9
<i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 569 (1994).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Feist Publ’ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.</i> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991).....	6
<i>Fourth Estate Pub. Benefit Corp. v. Wall-Street.com, LLC</i> , 139 S. Ct. 881 (2019).....	16
<i>Harper &amp; Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters.</i> , 471 U.S. 539 (1985).....	7
<i>HCA Health Servs. of Ga., Inc. v. Employers Health Ins. Co.</i> , 240 F.3d 982 (11th Cir. 2001) .....	6
<i>HGI Assocs., Inc. v. Wetmore Printing Co.</i> , 427 F.3d 867 (11th Cir. 2005) .....	15
<i>Katz v. Google Inc.</i> , 802 F.3d 1178 (11th Cir. 2015) .....	7, 9
<i>Lexmark Int’l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.</i> , 387 F.3d 522 (6th Cir. 2004) .....	9, 18

*Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*,  
475 U.S. 574 (1986).....6

*Online Policy Group v. Diebold, Inc.*,  
337 F. Supp. 2d 1195 (N.D. Cal. 2004) .....18

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

*Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.*,  
977 F.2d 1510 (9th Cir.1992) .....9, 12

*Sony Computer Entertainment, Inc. v. Connectix Corp.*,  
203 F.3d 596 (9th Cir. 2000) .....11, 12

*Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc.*,  
464 U.S. 417 (1984) (Blackmun, J., dissenting).....6, 7, 12

*Tingley Sys., Inc. v. HealthLink, Inc.*,  
509 F. Supp. 2d 1209 (M.D. Fla. 2007).....14

**Statutes**

17 U.S.C. § 101.....8

17 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....8, 18

17 U.S.C. § 107..... *passim*

17 U.S.C. § 410(a) .....5

17 U.S.C. § 501.....5

17 U.S.C. § 1201..... *passim*

18 U.S.C. § 1030.....19

**Rules and Regulations**

Fed. R. Civ. Pro. Rule 56.....1

Local Rule 56.1 .....1

**Reports**

H.R. Rep. No. 105–551(II), (1998).....18

H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476 (1976).....7

# 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.