

No. 18-1150

In the Supreme Court of the United States

STATE OF GEORGIA, ET AL., PETITIONERS,

v.

PUBLIC.RESOURCE.ORG, INC.

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT*

REPLY BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONERS

ANTHONY B. ASKEW
LISA C. PAVENTO
MEUNIER CARLIN &
CURFMAN LLC
*999 Peachtree St. NE,
Suite 1300
Atlanta, GA 30309
(404) 645-7700*

DANIEL R. ORTIZ
UNIVERSITY OF
VIRGINIA SCHOOL OF
LAW SUPREME COURT
LITIGATION CLINIC
*580 Massie Road
Charlottesville, VA
22903*

JOHN P. ELWOOD
JOSHUA S. JOHNSON
Counsel of Record
MATTHEW X. ETCHEMENDY
VINSON & ELKINS LLP
*2200 Pennsylvania Ave.,
NW, Suite 500 West
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 639-6623
joshjohnson@velaw.com*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table Of Authorities	II
A. The Split Is Real.....	2
B. The “Very Wrong” Decision Below Demands Review.....	7
C. This Case Is An Excellent Vehicle For Addressing An Important Question	11
Conclusion.....	12

II

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:	Page(s)
<i>American Soc’y for Testing & Materials v. Public.Resource.Org, Inc.</i> , 896 F.3d 437 (D.C. Cir. 2018)	10
<i>Banks v. Manchester</i> , 128 U.S. 244 (1888)	5
<i>Callaghan v. Myers</i> , 128 U.S. 617 (1888)	9
<i>CCC Info. Servs., Inc. v. Maclean Hunter Mkt. Reports, Inc.</i> , 44 F.3d 61 (2d Cir. 1994).....	5
<i>Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid</i> , 490 U.S. 730 (1989)	2
<i>County of Suffolk v. First Am. Real Estate Sols.</i> , 261 F.3d 179 (2d Cir. 2001).....	4, 5
<i>Eldred v. Ashcroft</i> , 537 U.S. 186 (2003)	3
<i>Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 517 (1994)	2
<i>Howell v. Miller</i> , 91 F. 129 (6th Cir. 1898)	3, 4
<i>Practice Mgmt. Info. Corp. v. Am. Med. Ass’n</i> , 121 F.3d 516 (9th Cir. 1997)	5
<i>Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co.</i> , 376 U.S. 225 (1964)	1
<i>Silvers v. Sony Pictures Entm’t, Inc.</i> , 402 F.3d 881 (9th Cir. 2005)	1

III

Cases—Continued:	Page(s)
<i>Southern Bldg. Code Cong. Int’l, Inc. v. Veeck</i> , 539 U.S. 969 (2003)	5
<i>Veeck v. S. Bldg. Code Cong. Int’l, Inc.</i> , 293 F.3d 791 (5th Cir. 2002)	5, 6
<i>Wheaton v. Peters</i> , 33 U.S. 591 (1834)	9
Statutes:	
17 U.S.C. § 107	3
1883 Mich. Pub. Acts 8	4
Other Authorities:	
1 Alexander Lindey & Michael Landau, <i>Lindey on Entertainment, Publishing and the Arts</i> (3d ed. 2019)	2, 8
Copyright Law Revision: Studies Prepared for the Subcomm. on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, Study No. 33, 86th Cong., 2d Sess. (1961)	10
U.S. Copyright Office, <i>Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices</i> (3d ed. 2017)	9

REPLY BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONERS

Respondent PRO, petitioners, and a diverse array of *amici* (including eight states) agree: This case presents an “excellent vehicle” in an “ideal” procedural posture to address the “confusion and perceived inconsistency among the lower courts” regarding the scope of the “judge-made common law doctrine[]” that government edicts are ineligible for copyright protection—an issue of unquestioned “significance.” Br. in Opp. (“BIO”) 1, 13-14, 28. As PRO acknowledges, this Court’s review is “sorely needed.” *Id.* at 9.

Despite acquiescing in petitioners’ request for review, PRO fruitlessly labors to distinguish this case from others in the circuit split. PRO’s hairsplitting efforts to draw factual distinctions ignore the reasoning underlying the courts of appeals’ decisions and provide no basis for reconciling them with the Eleventh Circuit’s decision here. Indeed, PRO ultimately concedes that “the courts of appeals diverge in their approaches to applying the government edicts doctrine.” BIO 14. The result: “case law is confusing and outcomes are difficult to predict.” *Id.* at 9.

Such disagreement among the courts of appeals is “particularly troublesome in the realm of copyright.” *Silvers v. Sony Pictures Entm’t, Inc.*, 402 F.3d 881, 890 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc); see also *Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co.*, 376 U.S. 225, 231 n.7 (1964) (noting “[t]he purpose of Congress to have national uniformity in * * * copyright laws”). Given “Congress’ paramount goal * * * of enhancing predictability and certainty of copyright ownership,” *Community for Creative Non-*

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.