

No. 18-956

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

—◆—
GOOGLE LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Respondent.

—◆—
**On Writ Of Certiorari To The
United States Court Of Appeals
For The Federal Circuit**

—◆—
**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY AND TECHNOLOGY,
INSTITUTE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY &
SOCIAL JUSTICE, NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE,
AND NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND
SUPPORTING PETITIONER**

LISA A. HAYES
ROBERT S. ADAMS IV
AVERY GARDINER
CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY
AND TECHNOLOGY
1401 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20005

JOSEPH C. GRATZ
Counsel of Record
MARK A. LEMLEY
SAMUEL J. ZEITLIN
DURIE TANGRI LLP
217 Leidesdorff Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 362-6666
jgratz@durietangri.com

January 10, 2020

Counsel for Amici Curiae

COCKLE LEGAL BRIEFS (800) 225-6964
WWW.COCKLELEGALBRIEFS.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | i |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | iii |
| INTEREST OF THE AMICI CURIAE | 1 |
| SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT | 3 |
| ARGUMENT | 5 |
| A. Granting copyright to interfaces would harm consumers by giving incumbents a veto over the creation of programs and devices we now take for granted | 5 |
| 1. Copyrighted interfaces would restrict the creation of devices that work with products from many manufacturers | 6 |
| 2. Copyrighted interfaces would restrict the creation of third-party software or devices that enhance or customize products consumers lawfully purchase | 9 |
| 3. Copyrighted interfaces would harm the market for inexpensive third-party replacement parts | 12 |
| B. Granting copyright to interfaces would harm consumers by raising the costs of learning new software | 14 |
| 1. Consistent software interfaces make it easier for consumers to learn new software | 14 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

| | Page |
|---|------|
| 2. Copyrighted interfaces would make it harder for consumers to switch products and enable developers to raise prices | 17 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 19 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page |
|---|-------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Baker v. Selden</i> , 101 U.S. 99 (1879) | 5, 19 |
| <i>Chamberlain Grp., Inc. v. Skylink Techs., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1178 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 7 |
| <i>Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Tech. Servs., Inc.</i> , 504 U.S. 451 (1992) | 18 |
| <i>Impression Prods., Inc. v. Lexmark Int’l, Inc.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1523 (2017) | 12 |
| <i>Lexmark Int’l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.</i> , 387 F.3d 522 (6th Cir. 2004) | 13 |
| <i>Lexmark Int’l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 118 (2014) | 12 |
| <i>Lotus Development Corp. v. Borland Interna- tional, Inc.</i> , 49 F.3d 807 (1st Cir. 1995), <i>aff’d</i> by <i>an equally divided court</i> , 513 U.S. 233 (1996) | 16 |
| CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION | |
| U.S. Const. art. I, § 8 | 13 |
| OTHER AUTHORITIES | |
| Anhong Guo et al., <i>StateLens: A Reverse Engi- neering Solution for Making Existing Dy- namic Touchscreens Accessible</i> , 2019 Proc. ACM Symposium on User Interface Software & Tech. 371 (2019), at https://arxiv.org/abs/ 1908.07144 | 8 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page |
|--|--------|
| Apple, <i>Functions</i> , https://www.apple.com/mac/numbers/compatibility/functions.html (last visited Jan. 7, 2020) | 15 |
| Chris Jay Hoofnagle et al., <i>The Tethered Economy</i> , 87 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 783 (2019)..... | 18 |
| Clark D. Asay, <i>Software Copyright’s Anticommons</i> , 66 Emory L.J. 265 (2017) | 9 |
| Compatibility List for GE Universal Remote, https://perma.cc/KVC6-FR22 | 8 |
| Google, <i>Google Sheets function list</i> , https://support.google.com/docs/table/25273?hl=en (last visited Jan. 7, 2020) | 15 |
| Kate Linebaugh, <i>Citizen Hackers Tinker With Medical Devices</i> , Wall St. J. (Sept. 26, 2014), https://www.wsj.com/articles/citizen-hackers-concoct-upgrades-for-medical-devices-1411762843 | 10 |
| Larry Tesler et al., <i>Gypsy: The Ginn Typescript System</i> , http://www.bitsavers.org/pdf/xerox/alto/memos_1975/Gypsy_The_Ginn_Typescript_System_Apr75.pdf | 16, 17 |
| Larry Tesler, <i>A Personal History of Modeless Text Editing and Cut/Copy-Paste</i> , Interactions, July & Aug. 2012 | 17 |
| Lotus Dev. Corp., <i>@Functions and Macros Guide</i> (1991)..... | 16 |

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.