In the

Supreme Court of the United States

GEORGIA, et al.,

Petitioners,

v

PUBLIC.RESOURCE.ORG, INC.,

Respondent.

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

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE 116 LAW LIBRARIANS AND 5 LAW LIBRARY ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT

On the Brief:
LESLIE A. STREET
WILLIAM & MARY
SCHOOL OF LAW*
613 South Henry Street
Williamsburg, VA 23185

DAVID R. HANSEN DUKE UNIVERSITY* 411 Chapel Drive Durham, NC 27708

October 16, 2019

Kyle K. Courtney

Counsel of Record

Harvard University*
One Harvard Yard

Widener Library G-20
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 495-4089

kyle courtney@harvard.edu

Counsel for Amici Curiae

* Institutions are listed for identification purposes only.

291697



COUNSEL PRESS (800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859



i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page	
BLE OF CONTENTSi	TABL
BLE OF CITED AUTHORITIESiii	TABL
TEREST OF AMICI CURIAE	INTE
MMARY OF ARGUMENT	SUMN
GUMENT4	ARGU
PRINCIPLES OF DUE PROCESS AND THE RULE OF LAW REQUIRE MEANINGFUL PUBLIC ACCESS TO OFFICIAL VERSIONS OF "THE LAW"	I.
legislative enactments	



$Table\ of\ Contents$

Pa	ige
II. "THE LAW" IS INSEPARABLE FROM THE OFFICIAL, AUTHORITATIVE LEGAL PUBLICATIONS IN WHICH IT IS PUBLISHED	.12
III. COPYRIGHT OF OFFICIAL LEGAL PUBLICATIONS FRUSTRATES PRINCIPLES OF DUE PROCESS AND DOES NOT SERVE THE PURPOSES OF COPYRIGHT LAW	.16
A. The expansive control that copyright owners wield is incompatible with the due process interests of the public in access to and use of official legal publications	16
B. Granting Exclusive Rights in the OCGA Does Not Serve the Purposes of Copyright	.19
CONCLUSION	.23
APPENDIX	.1a



iii

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page
CASES
Banks v. Manchester, 128 U.S. 244 (1888)
Bldg. Officials & Code Adm. v. Code Tech., Inc., 628 F.2d 730 (1st Cir. 1980)
Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977)
Callaghan v. Myers, 128 U.S. 617 (1888)19-20
CompuServe, Inc. v. Patterson, 89 F.3d 1257 (6th Cir. 1996)
Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn, 420 U.S. 469 (1975)6
Davidson v. Wheelock, 27 F. 61 (C.C.D. Minn. 1866)
Ford Motor Co. v. Abercrombie, 62 S.E.2d 209 (1950)
Fox Film Corp. v. Doyal, 286 U.S. 123 (1932)
Georgia v. The Harrison Co., 548 F. Supp. 110 (N.D. Ga 1982)11



iv

$Cited\ Authorities$

Page
Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises, 471 U.S. 539 (1985)
Hill v. Gateway 2000, Inc., 105 F.3d 1147 (7th Cir. 1997)17
Howell v. Miller, 91 F. 129 (6th Cir. 1898)20
In re Appeal of Tenet HealthSystems Bucks County, LLC, 880 A.2d 721 (Pa. Super. 2005)10
Mazer v. Stein, 347 U.S. 201 (1954)
Nash v. Lathrop, 6 N.E. 559 (Mass. 1886)
Peterson v. Peterson, 156 Idaho 85 (2014)
Petrick v. Maynard, 11 F.3d 991 (10th Cir. 1993)
Shuman v. State, 358 So. 2d 1333 (Fl. 1978)
State v. Boecker, 893 N.W.2d 348 (Minn. 2017)



DOCKET

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.

