

No. 14-410

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

GOOGLE, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE
IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITION**

CHARLES DUAN
Counsel of Record
SHERWIN SIY
PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE
1818 N Street NW, Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 861-0020
cduan@publicknowledge.org
Counsel for amicus curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (ii)

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 2

ARGUMENT 4

I. This Case Presents a Question of Importance to the Future of Technology 4

 A. Oracle Essentially Claims Copyright in a Way of Communicating with a Computer 5

 B. To Extend Copyright to Basic Computer Communication Methods Would Rapidly Decelerate Innovation 8

II. The Decision Below Misapprehends the Role of Functionality in Copyright 11

 A. Oracle’s Copyright Claim Is Entirely Foreclosed by *Baker v. Selden* 11

 B. Whether an Element Is Functional Turns on the Nature of the Element’s Use, Not the Existence of *Ex Ante* Alternatives 14

III. The Federal Circuit Mischaracterizes the Interface of Copyright and Patent 17

 A. Abstract Ideas Are Neither Copyrightable Nor Patentable 18

 B. Potentially Patentable Processes are Not Themselves Copyrightable Expression 19

 C. Arguments Regarding the Utility of Interfaces Are Not Addressed to Software as a Whole 21

CONCLUSION 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Affiliated Hosp. Prods., Inc. v. Merdel Game Mfg. Co., 513 F.2d 1183 (2d Cir. 1975) 15

Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) 11, 18, 21–22

Ansehl v. Puritan Pharm. Co., 61 F.2d 131 (8th Cir. 1932) 18

Anti-Monopoly, Inc. v. Gen. Mills Fun Group, 611 F.2d 296 (9th Cir. 1979) 15

Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., 35 F.3d 1435 (9th Cir. 1994) 6

Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc., 975 F.2d 832 (Fed. Cir. 1992) 14

Baker v. Selden, 101 U.S. 99 (1880) 2, 11, 13–15

Bilski v. Kappos, 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010) 19, 22

Brandir Int’l, Inc. v. Cascade Pac. Lumber Co., 834 F.2d 1142 (2d Cir. 1987) 15

Burrow-Giles Lithographic Co. v. Sarony, 111 U.S. 53 (1884) 18

Christianson v. W. Publ’g Co., 149 F.2d 202 (9th Cir. 1945) 18

(iii)

Computer Assocs. Int'l v. Altai, Inc., 982 F.2d 693
(2d Cir. 1992) 16, 18, 20, 22

Eldred v. Ashcroft, 537 U.S. 186 (2003) 1

Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., 499 U.S.
340 (1991) 10, 13–14, 16, 18, 22–23

Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co., 333 U.S.
127 (1948) 18

Golan v. Holder, 132 S. Ct. 873 (2012) 1

Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., v. Nation Enters.,
471 U.S. 539 (1985) 10, 18, 22–23

Hoopla Sports & Entm't v. Nike, Inc., 947 F. Supp.
347 (N.D. Ill. 1996) 15

Kieselstein-Cord v. Accessories by Pearl, Inc., 632
F.2d 989 (2d Cir. 1980) 19–20

Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 133 S. Ct.
1351 (2013) 1

Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Borland Int'l, Inc., 49 F.3d 807
(1st Cir. 1995), *aff'd by an equally divided Court*,
516 U.S. 233 (1996) (per curiam) 11, 14–16, 18, 22

Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Borland Int'l, Inc., 516 U.S. 233
(1996) (per curiam) 11, 16

Mazer v. Stein, 347 U.S. 201 (1954) 18–19

(iv)

<i>Morrissey v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , 379 F.2d 675 (1st Cir. 1967)	10
<i>Moseley v. V Secret Catalogue, Inc.</i> , 537 U.S. 418 (2003)	1
<i>Nichols v. Universal Pictures Corp.</i> , 45 F.2d 119 (2d Cir. 1930)	18
<i>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5, 7, 9, 13–14, 17, 20–23
<i>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> , 872 F. Supp. 2d 974 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	13, 17, 21
<i>Reed-Union Corp. v. Turtle Wax, Inc.</i> , 77 F.3d 909 (7th Cir. 1996)	20
<i>Rios v. Colon</i> , 819 F.2d 319 (1st Cir. 1987)	6
<i>Ross, Brovins & Oehmke, PC v. Lexis/Nexis Group</i> , 463 F.3d 478 (6th Cir. 2006)	12
<i>Sega Enters. Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.</i> , 977 F.2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1992)	4
<i>Trans-Lux Corp. v. United States</i> , 696 F.2d 963 (Fed. Cir. 1982)	6
<i>United States v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001)	6
<i>Uranita Found. v. Maaherra</i> , 114 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 1997)	19

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.