

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 72 INTELLECTUAL  
PROPERTY SCHOLARS AS *AMICI*  
CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

—◆—  
PAMELA SAMUELSON  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
BERKELEY, SCHOOL OF LAW  
892 Simon Hall  
Berkeley, CA 94720

CATHERINE CRUMP  
*Counsel of Record*  
SAMUELSON LAW,  
TECHNOLOGY & PUBLIC  
POLICY CLINIC  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
BERKELEY, SCHOOL OF LAW  
353 Boalt Hall  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
(510) 292-6860  
ccrump@law.berkeley.edu

---

---

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	3
I. This Court’s Precedents, the Text of the Copyright Act, and Sound Copyright Policy Require the Exclusion of Program Interfaces from Copyright’s Scope .....	3
A. This Court Originated the Exclusion of Systems, Methods, and Their Constituent Elements from the Scope of Copyright Protection .....	6
B. Congress Codified the Well-Established Exclusion of Systems and Methods in § 102(b).....	11
C. The Federal Circuit’s <i>Oracle</i> Decision Ignored the § 102(b) System/Method Exclusions .....	12
1. The Method and System Exclusions of § 102(b) Avert Patent/Copyright Overlaps .....	14
2. Unprotectable Elements in Computer Programs Must Be Filtered Out Before Assessing Infringement.....	15

## TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
3. Methods and Systems Are Part of Program Structure, Sequence, and Organization, so SSO Obscures Rather Than Clarifies Expressive Aspects of Software.....	16
D. Key Post-1976 Act Decisions Follow <i>Baker</i> in Excluding Methods, Systems, and Their Constituent Elements from Copyright's Scope .....	17
E. Consistent with <i>Baker</i> and § 102(b), Program Interfaces Should Be Considered Unprotectable Procedures, Methods, or Systems .....	21
II. The Federal Circuit's Merger Analysis Is Irreconcilable with <i>Baker</i> and Other Persuasive Decisions.....	22
A. The Federal Circuit's Analysis of the Merger Doctrine Is at Odds with <i>Baker</i> in Three Key Respects .....	24
B. The Merger Doctrine Provides a Sound Basis for Holding That Program Interfaces That Enable Compatibility Are Uncopyrightable .....	27
C. The Federal Circuit Ignored the District Court's Fact Findings That Supported Its Holding That the Interfaces at Issue Were Unprotectable Under the Merger Doctrine.....	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
D. The District Court Properly Held That Names and Short Phrases Are Not Pro- tectable by Copyright .....	32
CONCLUSION.....	34
APPENDIX: List of <i>Amici</i> .....	1a

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

## CASES

<i>Aldrich v. Remington Rand, Inc.</i> , 52 F. Supp. 732 (N.D. Tex. 1942) .....	11
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 573 U.S. 208 (2014) .....	16
<i>Apple Computer, Inc. v. Franklin Computer Corp.</i> , 714 F.2d 1240 (3d Cir. 1983) .....	28, 29
<i>Arica Inst., Inc. v. Palmer</i> , 970 F.2d 1067 (2d Cir. 1992) .....	22
<i>Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 975 F.2d 832 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	3, 14, 15, 29
<i>ATC Distribution Group v. Whatever It Takes Transmissions &amp; Parts, Inc.</i> , 402 F.3d 700 (6th Cir. 2005) .....	33
<i>Baker v. Selden</i> , 101 U.S. 99 (1880) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bateman v. Mnemonics, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1532 (11th Cir. 1996) .....	4, 30
<i>Bikram's Yoga College of India, L.P. v. Evolation Yoga, LLC</i> , 803 F.3d 1032 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	17, 18
<i>Brief English Systems, Inc. v. Owen</i> , 48 F.2d 555 (2d Cir. 1931) .....	11
<i>Computer Assocs. Int'l, Inc. v. Altai, Inc.</i> , 982 F.2d 693 (2d Cir. 1992) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Eldred v. Ashcroft</i> , 537 U.S. 186 (2003) .....	13
<i>Griggs v. Perrin</i> , 49 F. 15 (C.C.N.D.N.Y. 1892) .....	11
<i>Ho v. Tafllove</i> , 648 F.3d 489 (7th Cir. 2011) .....	2, 18

# 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.