

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 AMICUS CURIAE
ENGINE ADVOCACY
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

Jef Pearlman
Counsel of Record
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY &
TECHNOLOGY LAW CLINIC
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA GOULD
SCHOOL OF LAW
699 Exposition Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0071
(213) 740-7088
jef@law.usc.edu

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
ARGUMENT	4
I. The API Declarations at Issue Are a Fundamentally Functional System.	5
II. Congress and the Courts Have Carefully Avoided Awarding Copyright Protection to Functionality and Invading the Domain of Patents.	7
A. For 140 Years, Copyright Protection Has Been Unavailable for the Ideas or Systems Described in Works.	8
B. Section 102(b) Confirms that Protection of Functionality Is the Domain of Patents, Not Copyright.	10
C. Courts and Agencies Since <i>Baker</i> and § 102(b) Have Consistently Cabined Copyright.	12
D. The Federal Circuit Erroneously Allowed Copyright to Protect Functionality by Confusing “Software Programs” and “Declarations.”	16
III. The Decision Below Permits Parties to Evade the Carefully Constructed Requirements for and Limitations on Patenting.....	18
A. Patent Applicants Must Satisfy Numerous Requirements to Prove New Inventions or Technologies Warrant Patent Protection. ...	20

- B. Limitations on the Nature and Scope of Patent and Copyright Protection Diverge in Important Ways. 25
- IV. The Consequences of Allowing This End-Run Are Particularly Bad for Startups. 27
 - A. Startups Drive Innovation and Job Creation. 27
 - B. Copyright-Protected APIs Threaten Interoperability. 28
 - C. Holding APIs Copyrightable Would Create Unsustainable Legal Costs for Startups. 29
 - D. Discouraging Startups Would Stunt Innovation and Competition in the Industry. 33
- CONCLUSION 33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 573 U.S. 208 (2014)	23, 24
<i>Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 35 F.3d 1435 (9th Cir. 1994)	16
<i>Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 799 F. Supp. 1006 (N.D. Cal. 1992)	16
<i>Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of America, Inc.</i> , 975 F.2d 832 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	12
<i>Baker v. Selden</i> , 101 U.S. 99 (1879)	8, 9, 10, 30
<i>Computer Assocs. Int’l, Inc. v. Altai, Inc.</i> , 982 F.2d 693 (2d Cir. 1992)	14, 15
<i>Dawson Chem. Co. v. Rohm & Haas Co.</i> , 448 U.S. 176 (1980)	26
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F. 3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	24
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972)	24
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	22
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Financial Corp.</i> , 850 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	24
<i>J.E.M. Ag Supply, Inc. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred Int’l, Inc.</i> , 534 U.S. 124 (2001)	21

<i>Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Borland Int’l, Inc.</i> , 49 F.3d 807 (1st Cir. 1995)	<i>passim</i>
<i>MiTek Holdings, Inc. v. Arce Engineering Co.</i> , 89 F.3d 1548 (11th Cir. 1996)	14
<i>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5, 17
<i>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> , 872 F. Supp. 2d 974 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	19, 30
<i>Parker v. Flook</i> , 437 U.S. 584 (1978)	24
<i>Whelan Associates, Inc. v. Jaslow Dental Laboratory, Inc.</i> , 797 F.2d 1222 (3d Cir. 1986)	15

Statutes

17 U.S.C. § 101	8, 16
17 U.S.C. § 102(a)	21
17 U.S.C. § 302	26
17 U.S.C. § 408	21
35 U.S.C. § 102	22
35 U.S.C. § 103	22
35 U.S.C. § 112(f)	25
35 U.S.C. § 154	26

Legislative Authorities

H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476 (1976)	11
Uses of Copyrighted Works, <i>Final Report</i> (1979)	12

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.