

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

VIACOM INTERNATIONAL INC.,)	
COMEDY PARTNERS,)	
COUNTRY MUSIC TELEVISION, INC.,)	
PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION,)	ECF Case
and BLACK ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION)	
LLC,)	
)	Case No. 1:07-cv-02103 (LLS)
)	(related case no. 1:07-cv-03582 (LLS))
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and)	
GOOGLE INC.,)	
)	
)	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'
RENEWED MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Paul M. Smith (No. PS-2362)
Scott B. Wilkens (*pro hac vice*)
Luke C. Platzer (No. LP-0734)
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
1099 New York Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 639-6000

Stuart J. Baskin (No. SB-9936)
Kirsten Nelson Cunha (No. KN-0283)
SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 848-4000

Susan J. Kohlmann (No. SK-1855)
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 891-1600

Matthew D. McGill (No. MM-4545)
GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-8500

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
GLOSSARY.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
LEGAL STANDARD	4
ARGUMENT.....	7
I. QUESTIONS OF FACT REGARDING YOUTUBE’S AWARENESS OF INFRINGING ACTIVITY PRECLUDE ENTRY OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON YOUTUBE’S DMCA DEFENSE.....	7
A. YouTube Has Not Shown That It Lacked Actual Knowledge or Awareness of Viacom’s Clips-in-Suit.....	8
B. Extensive Evidence of YouTube’s Willful Blindness Raises Multiple Factual Disputes That Preclude Summary Judgment in YouTube’s Favor.	10
1. YouTube’s Motion Misconstrues The Second Circuit’s Willful Blindness Doctrine.	10
2. The Summary Judgment Record Raises Numerous Genuine Disputes Of Material Fact as to YouTube’s Willful Blindness.	16
a. YouTube Was Aware of a High Probability of Infringement of Viacom’s Copyrighted Works.	16
b. YouTube Deliberately Shielded Itself From Learning Of Particular Infringements of Viacom’s Clips-In-Suit.....	21
C. YouTube’s Inaccurate Assertions About Viacom’s Marketing and Enforcement Practices Do Not Demonstrate the Absence of Fact Issues on YouTube’s Awareness of Infringement.	28
1. Viacom’s Lawful Marketing Practices Did Not Deprive YouTube of Knowledge of Infringement.	29
2. Viacom’s Decision to Forebear from Some Copyright Enforcement Did Not Deprive YouTube of Knowledge of Infringement or Create an Implied License.	31

II. QUESTIONS OF FACT REGARDING YOUTUBE’S CONTROL OF AND DIRECT FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THE INFRINGING ACTIVITY PRECLUDE ENTRY OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON YOUTUBE’S DMCA DEFENSE.....33

A. Triable Issues of Fact Preclude Summary Judgment for YouTube on the Control Element of the DMCA.33

1. Control Can Exist in a Variety of Factual Circumstances Including Those Present in *Grokster* and *Cybernet*.....33

2. Triable Issues of Fact Exist as to YouTube’s Control Under *Grokster* and *Cybernet*.....39

B. Triable Issues of Fact Preclude Summary Judgment for YouTube on the Direct Financial Benefit Element of the DMCA.....46

III. TRIABLE ISSUES OF FACT EXIST AS TO WHETHER YOUTUBE’S SYNDICATION OF VIACOM’S WORKS TO THIRD PARTIES FALLS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE DMCA SAFE HARBOR.....50

CONCLUSION54

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2001).....	34, 46
<i>ALS Scan, Inc. v. RemarQ Communities, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 619 (4th Cir. 2001)	5
<i>Arista Records LLC v. Doe 3</i> , 604 F.3d 110 (2d Cir. 2010).....	9
<i>Arista Records LLC v. Lime Group LLC</i> , 784 F. Supp. 2d 398 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	46-47
<i>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</i> , 282 F.R.D. 384 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....	25-26, 41
<i>Capitol Records, Inc. v. MP3tunes, LLC</i> , 821 F. Supp. 2d 627 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	5, 48
<i>Dandamudi v. Tisch</i> , 686 F.3d 66 (2d Cir. July 10, 2012).....	15
<i>Design Options, Inc. v. BellePointe, Inc.</i> , 940 F. Supp. 86 (S.D.N.Y. 1986).....	32, 33
<i>Ellison v. Robertson</i> , 357 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2004).....	48, 49
<i>Fonovisa, Inc. v. Cherry Auction, Inc.</i> , 76 F.3d 259 (9th Cir. 1996).....	46
<i>Gelb v. Bd. of Elections</i> , 224 F.3d 149 (2d Cir. 2000).....	26, 40
<i>Gershwin Publishing Corp. v. Columbia Artists Management, Inc.</i> , 443 F.2d 1159 (2d Cir. 1971)	9
<i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 131 S. Ct. 2060 (2011).....	12, 14, 26
<i>Io Group, Inc. v. Veoh Networks, Inc.</i> , 586 F. Supp. 2d 1132 (N.D. Cal. 2008)	22
<i>Jackan v. New York State Department of Labor</i> , 205 F.3d 562 (2d Cir. 2000).....	15
<i>Krishna v. Colgate Palmolive Co.</i> , 7 F.3d 11 (2d Cir.1993)	26, 40
<i>Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.</i> , 454 F. Supp. 2d 966 (C.D. Cal. 2006)	35
<i>Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.</i> , 545 U.S. 913 (2005)	9, 34, 35, 38
<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. CCBill</i> , 488 F.3d 1102 (9th Cir. 2007).....	46
<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Cybernet Ventures, Inc.</i> , 213 F. Supp. 2d 1146 (C.D. Cal. 2002)	34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 48, 49
<i>Perfect10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. CV-05-4753, slip op. (C.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2008).....	6
<i>Perma Research & Development Co. v. Singer Co.</i> , 410 F.2d 572 (2d Cir. 1969)	8

PUBLIC VERSION

<i>Psihoyos v. Pearson Education, Inc.</i> , 855 F. Supp. 2d 103 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)	33
<i>Redd v. New York State Division of Parole</i> , 678 F.3d 166 (2d Cir. 2012)	4
<i>Rojas v. Roman Catholic Diocese of Rochester</i> , 660 F.3d 98 (2d Cir. 2011), <i>cert. denied</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1744 (2012).....	4
<i>Rosetta Stone Ltd. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 676 F.3d 144 (4th Cir. 2012).....	27
<i>Shapiro, Bernstein & Co. v. H.L. Green Co.</i> , 316 F.2d 304 (2d Cir. 1963)	46
<i>Smithkline Beecham Consumer Healthcare, L.P., v. Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , 211 F.3d 21 (2d Cir. 2000).....	33
<i>Tiffany (NJ) Inc. v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 576 F. Supp. 2d 463 (S.D.N.Y. 2008), <i>aff'd in part, rev'd</i> <i>in part</i> , 600 F.3d 93 (2d Cir. 2010).....	27, 28
<i>Tiffany (NJ) Inc. v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 600 F.3d 93 (2d Cir. 2010)	10, 11, 13, 15, 16
<i>Tur v. YouTube</i> , No. CV 064436, 2007 WL 1893635 (C.D. Cal. June 20, 2007).....	6, 44
<i>Ulloa v. Universal Music Video & Distribution Corp.</i> , 303 F. Supp. 2d 409 (S.D.N.Y. 2004).....	33
<i>UMG Recordings, Inc. v. Veoh Networks, Inc.</i> , 665 F. Supp. 2d 1099 (C.D. Cal. 2009), <i>aff'd</i> , 667 F.2d 1022 (9th Cir. 2011).....	6, 46
<i>Viacom International Inc. v. YouTube, Inc.</i> , 718 F. Supp. 2d 514 (S.D.N.Y. 2010), <i>aff'd</i> <i>in part, rev'd in part</i> , 676 F.3d 19 (2d Cir. 2012).....	16
<i>Viacom International Inc. v. YouTube, Inc.</i> , 676 F.3d 19 (2d Cir. 2012).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Vermont Teddy Bear Co. v. 1-800 BEARGRAM Co.</i> , 373 F.3d 241 (2d Cir. 2004).....	6
<i>Wolk v. Kodak Imaging Network, Inc.</i> , 840 F. Supp. 2d 724 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	5, 48
STATUTES	
17 U.S.C. § 106.....	53
17 U.S.C. § 512(c)	53
17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(A).....	37
17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(B)	47
LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS	
H.R. Rep. No. 105-551(I) (1998).....	6

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.