

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

JAMES HAYDEN,)	CASE NO. 1:17CV2635
)	
Plaintiff,)	SENIOR JUDGE
)	CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO
vs.)	
)	<u>OPINION AND ORDER</u>
2K GAMES, INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO, SR. J.:

This matter comes before the Court upon the Motion (ECF DKT # 91*SEALED & ECF DKT #92*PUBLIC VERSION) of Plaintiff James Hayden to Exclude the Expert Testimony of Dr. Ian Bogost. For the following reasons, the Motion is granted in part and denied in part.

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff James Hayden filed his original Complaint on December 18, 2017. His Fourth Amended Complaint was filed on August 19, 2019, alleging copyright infringement by Defendants 2K Games, Inc. and Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc. Defendant Take-Two is a worldwide developer, publisher and marketer of interactive entertainment and video games.

Plaintiff alleges that he is the tattoo artist who inked the copyrighted Tattoos on NBA players Danny Green, LeBron James and Tristan Thompson, individuals depicted in Take-Two's popular basketball simulation series NBA 2K.

Ian Bogost, Ph.D., provided his Expert Report and Declaration on behalf of Defendants on May 27, 2021. (ECF DKT #91-2*SEALED). Dr. Bogost is a Professor and Director of Film & Media Studies and a Professor of Computer Science & Engineering at Washington University in St. Louis. Previously, he was the Ivan Allen College Distinguished Chair in Media Studies, Professor of Interactive Computing, Professor of Architecture, and Professor of Business at the Georgia Institute of Technology. He holds a Ph.D. from the University of California, Los Angeles. He is internationally recognized as a key figure in game studies, including design and criticism. He has published ten books on the history, structure, design, and role of video games and related digital culture.

In addition to his academic work, Dr. Bogost has personal experience in the video game industry. He is the co-founder of Persuasive Games, an award-winning video game studio. He also works as an independent game developer and his games have earned him multiple awards. Dr. Bogost has been named a Digital Games Research Association Distinguished Scholar and a Higher Education Video Game Alliance Lifetime Fellow.

Defendants retained Dr. Bogost to provide his opinion on these issues:

- a). Is there any technical difference between reproducing the image of a person in a video game in comparison to a digital photograph, television program, or film;
- b). To what extent are the tattoos that Plaintiff James Hayden ("Plaintiff") asserts that he inked on the NBA players LeBron James, Danny Green, and Tristan Thompson (the

“NBA Players”) and that Take-Two has infringed (the “Tattoos”) observable in the NBA 2K series;

- c). How is NBA 2K generally played, and what would an average player see and hear in doing so;
- d). Is there a market for licensing tattoos as they appear in real life for use in video games.

Dr. Bogost summarizes his opinions in this way:

First, there is essentially no difference between the replication of the NBA Players’ images with a digital camera, whether for a static or motion picture, and the rendering of the NBA Players’ likenesses in NBA 2K. Both involve making a digital file of electronic information to reproduce an image of the NBA Players.

Second, beyond digital photographs, video games have commonalities with other forms of audio-visual media, like films and television, such that many of the same factors that would be considered in determining whether something is observable in a film or show also would be considered in determining whether something is observable in a video game. Because video games are interactive computer programs, however, they have many additional numerous components that make any given element of the game even less likely to be observed.

Third, NBA 2K is a highly expressive video game that simulates the sport of basketball. As a result, an average player will see and hear a huge number of visual and auditory elements as he or she plays the game.

Fourth, whether considered in terms of NBA 2K’s audio-visual display or the data contained in its computer program, NBA 2K is a massive video game. As a result, by any measure, the Tattoos are a fractional, fleeting part of NBA 2K. In fact, many times the players on whom the Tattoos are inked will not be among the players selected for a game, meaning that the Tattoos will never appear. Even when the Tattoos do appear, because the typical smartphone, computer or television screen is small compared to the actual size of a professional basketball player, the Tattoos will appear approximately 1.11–10.3% the size that they appear in real life. Each Tattoo also is only one of a plethora of other visual and auditory elements (including other tattoos) in

NBA 2K. And the Tattoos are hard to observe due to their obstruction by other game elements, because they often appear out-of-focus, and because players on whom the Tattoos appear move quickly in the game. Any manipulation of NBA 2K to make the Tattoos more observable, in practice, is not typical of the average user and ultimately ineffectual.

Fifth, each Tattoo would constitute 0.000496%–0.000515% of the data in NBA 2K16–2K20’s computer program and 0.0006%–0.0015% of NBA 2K Mobile’s computer program.

Finally, there is no market for licensing the Tattoos for inclusion in a video game. This is clear from the fact that Plaintiff admits that he is not aware of any video game that has ever licensed rights to tattoos, including from Plaintiff himself. It also is supported by the fact that Take-Two’s use—incidental, fleeting use on the players on which the Tattoos are inked to increase NBA 2K’s realism—is not something that reasonably would be anticipated to be licensed for use in a video game. It also is supported by the fact that NBA players have been depicted with the tattoos they bear in real life in NBA 2K games since at least 2001, and the Tattoos were depicted in NBA 2K games for many years prior to Plaintiff bringing this lawsuit. Moreover, based on my understanding of the times that the NBA Players’ images have been produced in photographs, television, or on merchandise, I am not aware of any instance in which they have licensed their tattoos separate from their image and likenesses. This is also consistent with my understanding that they have tattoos inked by other tattooists on their bodies, none of whom have contended that reproducing their images or likenesses in some audiovisual medium requires a license and payment to them.

(ECF DKT #91-2*SEALED at 5-7).

In moving to exclude, Plaintiff argues that Dr. Bogost offers an opinion on how “observable” the Tattoos are in Defendants’ games based on a “contrived assessment” of how “ordinary” players interact with the game. Dr. Bogost repeatedly admits that he did not interview a single player of any of Defendants’ games in order to arrive at his determination of “ordinary” interaction. Dr. Bogost intentionally ignores various game modes and features because they are not “ordinary” in his assessment. His opinion on how observable the Tattoos are in Defendants’ games is not proper expert testimony; rather it is a factual issue for the jury

to decide. In addition, Dr. Bogost ventures far outside his “video game” expertise and offers an opinion about the existence of a tattoo licensing market.

In opposition, Defendants argue that Dr. Bogost spent hours himself reviewing the six relevant games and explored each of the modes in each of the games. Dr. Bogost’s goal was to determine what the average player would encounter in a “typical ordinary experience” of playing the game. In formulating his opinions, he also considered Take-Two’s documents and deposition testimony by ten members of NBA 2K’s creative and production teams, which revealed to him how playing NBA 2K mirrors the real world. Dr. Bogost’s analysis places the Tattoos in the context of the larger NBA 2K game and offers opinions on how observable they are in that context. Dr. Bogost considered how often the Tattoos appear, their size, the average size screens on which NBA 2K is played, other audiovisual elements that may obscure their view, the camera’s focus, the constant action and more. Dr. Bogost calculated the percentage of the file size that includes the Tattoos and compared that number to the total size of the NBA 2K computer program. Defendants contend that such a calculation is directly relevant to Defendants’ *de minimis* use and fair use defenses and would undoubtedly be helpful to a lay juror.

II. LAW AND ANALYSIS

Expert Testimony

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 702, an expert by virtue of knowledge, skill, experience, training or education may provide testimony to assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue if the expert testimony is based on sufficient facts or data; the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and



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.