

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

JAMES HAYDEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

2K GAMES, INC. and TAKE-TWO  
INTERACTIVE SOFTWARE, INC.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:17-cv-02635-CAB

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS  
2K GAMES, INC. AND TAKE-TWO INTERACTIVE SOFTWARE, INC.'S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
I.     THE TATTOOS.....	4
II.    TAKE-TWO'S <i>NBA 2K</i> VIDEO GAME SERIES .....	7
III.   TAKE-TWO'S USE OF THE TATTOOS IN <i>NBA 2K</i> .....	8
IV.    PLAINTIFF AND THE MARKET FOR TATTOOS .....	9
<b>ARGUMENT.....</b>	<b>11</b>
I.     TAKE-TWO'S USE OF THE TATTOOS WAS FAIR .....	11
A.    Factor One: Take-Two's Use Is Transformative and Its Profits Are Not Attributable to the Tattoos .....	11
1.    Take-Two's Use of the Tattoos Is Transformative .....	11
2.    The Commercial Use Sub-factor Is Of Little Weight Here .....	15
B.    Factor Two: The Tattoos Are Not Creative and Were Published.....	15
C.    Factor Three: Take-Two's Copying Was Reasonable In Light of Its Purpose.....	17
D.    Factor Four: Take-Two Has Not Harmed the Tattoos' Markets.....	18
II.    TAKE-TWO'S USE OF THE TATTOOS WAS AUTHORIZED.....	21
III.   TAKE-TWO'S USE OF THE TATTOOS IS <i>DE MINIMIS</i> .....	24
IV.    TWO OF THE TATTOOS ARE UNPROTECTABLE AND, IN ANY CASE, PLAINTIFF CANNOT SHOW SUBSTANTIAL SIMILARITY .....	27
V.     PLAINTIFF IS NOT ENTITLED TO CERTAIN REMEDIES.....	29
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>30</b>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Alexander v. Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc.</i> , 489 F. Supp. 3d 812 (S.D. Ill. 2020).....	1, 23, 25
<i>Authors Guild, Inc. v. HathiTrust</i> , 755 F.3d 87 (2d Cir. 2014).....	18
<i>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</i> , 804 F.3d 202 (2d Cir. 2015).....	15, 18
<i>B2B CFO Partners, LLC v. Kaufman</i> , 787 F. Supp. 2d 1002 (D. Ariz. 2011) .....	30
<i>Bell v. Worthington City Sch. Dist.</i> , No. 18 Civ. 961, 2020 WL 2905803 (S.D. Ohio June 2, 2020).....	17, 18
<i>Bill Graham Archives v. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.</i> , 448 F.3d 605 (2d Cir. 2006).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Blanch v. Koons</i> , 467 F.3d 244 (2d Cir. 2006).....	20
<i>Bouchat v. Balt. Ravens Ltd. P'ship</i> , 737 F.3d 932 (4th Cir. 2013) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bouchat v. Balt. Ravens Ltd. P'ship</i> , No. 08 Civ. 397, 2011 WL 5445947 (D. Md. Nov. 9, 2011).....	20
<i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 569 (1994).....	11
<i>Castle v. Kingsport Publ'g Corp.</i> , No. 19 Civ. 92, 2020 WL 7348157 (E.D. Tenn. Dec. 14, 2020).....	12, 15, 17
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	11
<i>Compass Homes, Inc. v. Trinity Health Grp., Ltd.</i> , No. 13 Civ. 647, 2016 WL 3406054 (S.D. Ohio June 21, 2016).....	29
<i>Consumers Union of U.S. v. Gen. Signal Corp.</i> , 724 F.2d 1044 (2d Cir. 1983).....	16

<i>Durham Indus., Inc. v. Tomy Corp.</i> , 630 F.2d 905 (2d Cir. 1980).....	16
<i>Dyer v. Napier</i> , No. 04 Civ. 408, 2006 WL 680551 (D. Ariz. Mar. 16, 2006) .....	30
<i>EarthCam, Inc. v. OxBlue Corp.</i> , 49 F. Supp. 3d 1210 (N.D. Ga. 2014).....	30
<i>Est. of Smith v. Cash Money Records, Inc.</i> , 253 F. Supp. 3d 737 (S.D.N.Y. 2017).....	20
<i>Foad Consulting Grp., Inc. v. Azzalino</i> , 270 F. 3d 821 (9th Cir. 2001) .....	22
<i>Gloster v. Relios, Inc.</i> , No. 02 Civ. 7140, 2006 WL 1804572 (E.D. Pa. June 28, 2006) .....	30
<i>Google LLC v. Oracle America, Inc.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1183 (2021).....	2, 15, 18, 21
<i>Gordon v. Nextel Commc 'ns &amp; Mullen Advert., Inc.</i> , 345 F.3d 922 (6th Cir. 2003) .....	24, 25, 27, 29
<i>Gottlieb Dev. LLC v. Paramount Pictures Corp.</i> , 590 F. Supp. 2d 625 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).....	26
<i>Great Minds v. FedEx Office &amp; Print Servs., Inc.</i> , 886 F.3d 91 (2d Cir. 2018).....	21
<i>Hofheinz v. Discovery Commc 'ns, Inc.</i> , No. 00 Civ. 3802, 2001 WL 1111970 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 20, 2001) .....	13
<i>I.A.E., Inc. v. Shaver</i> , 74 F.3d 768 (7th Cir. 1996) .....	22, 23
<i>ITOFCA, Inc. v. MegaTrans Logistics, Inc.</i> , 322 F.3d 928 (7th Cir. 2003) .....	24
<i>Johnson v. Jones</i> , 149 F.3d 494 (6th Cir. 1998) .....	21, 29
<i>Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.</i> , 336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	13, 17
<i>Lexmark Int'l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.</i> , 387 F.3d 522 (6th Cir. 2004) .....	12, 16

<i>LimeCoral, Ltd. v. CareerBuilder, LLC,</i> 889 F.3d 847 (7th Cir. 2018) .....	24
<i>Mahavisno v. Compendia Biosci., Inc.,</i> 164 F. Supp. 3d 964 (E.D. Mich. 2016).....	22
<i>Mason v. Montgomery Data, Inc.,</i> 967 F.2d 135 (5th Cir. 1992) .....	29
<i>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.,</i> 475 U.S. 574 (1986).....	11
<i>Matthew Bender &amp; Co., Inc. v. West Publ'g Co.,</i> 158 F.3d 693 (2d Cir. 1998).....	1
<i>MiTek Holdings, Inc. v. Arce Eng'g Co., Inc.,</i> 89 F.3d 1548 (11th Cir. 1996) .....	27
<i>Monster Commc'ns, Inc. v. Turner Broad. Sys., Inc.,</i> 935 F. Supp. 490 (S.D.N.Y. 1996).....	13
<i>Murphy v. Lazarev,</i> 589 F. App'x 757 (6th Cir. 2014) .....	21
<i>Nat'l Rifle Ass'n of Am. v. Handgun Control Fed'n of Ohio,</i> 15 F.3d 559 (6th Cir. 1994) .....	11
<i>New Name, Inc. v. The Walt Disney Co.,</i> No. 07 Civ. 5034, 2008 WL 5587487 (C.D. Cal. July 23, 2008) .....	30
<i>Núñez v. Caribbean Int'l News Corp.,</i> 235 F.3d 18 (1st Cir. 2000).....	17
<i>Photographic Illustrators, Corp. v. Orgill, Inc.,</i> 953 F. 3d 56 (1st Cir. 2020).....	22, 23, 24
<i>Psychopathic Recs., Inc. v. Anderson,</i> No. 08 Civ. 13407, 2009 WL 2591385 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 24, 2009) .....	27
<i>Reinicke v. Creative Empire, LLC,</i> 38 F. Supp. 3d 1192 (S.D. Cal. 2014).....	23
<i>Sandoval v. New Line Cinema Corp.,</i> 147 F.3d 215 (2d Cir. 1998).....	26
<i>Sarl Louis Feraud Int'l v. Viewfinder Inc.,</i> 627 F. Supp. 2d 123 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).....	14, 20

# 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.