

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*
SMALL, MEDIUM, AND OPEN SOURCE TECHNOLOGY
ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

JASON M. SCHULTZ
(COUNSEL OF RECORD)
CHRISTOPHER J. MORTEN
NYU TECHNOLOGY LAW AND POLICY CLINIC
NYU SCHOOL OF LAW
245 SULLIVAN STREET, 609
NEW YORK, NY 10012
TELEPHONE: (212) 992-7365
JASON.SCHULTZ@LAW.NYU.EDU

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
INTERESTS OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	5
ARGUMENT	7
I. Introduction	7
II. The Court Should Reverse the Decisions Below To Prevent Chilling of Innovation and Competition in the Software Field.....	10
A. Successful software development requires platform SSO compatibility.	10
B. Clear copyright rules contribute meaningfully to open source and SME software development.	13
III. Reversing the Federal Circuit’s Decision Would Preserve Bedrock Copyright Precedents That Software Engineers Have Relied upon for Decades.	17
A. Open source and SME software developers benefit from this Court’s rule that functional aspects of copyrighted works, including SSOs of API packages, are not protected by copyright law.	18
B. Even if this Court does not reverse the copyrightability ruling, it should nonetheless reverse the Federal Circuit’s rejection of Google’s fair use defense.....	21
1. This Court should reverse the Federal Circuit’s overly-narrow construction of transformative use, which inappropriately	

excludes from fair use “new opportunities” to reuse API package SSOs.21

2. This Court should reaffirm its analysis of the third fair use factor in *Campbell*, where it held that amount and substantiality of the original work taken need only be “reasonable” in light of the purpose, not “necessary,” as the Federal Circuit erroneously held.24

CONCLUSION25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>A.V. ex rel. Vanderhye v. iParadigms, LLC</i> , 562 F.3d 630 (4th Cir. 2009)	22
<i>Authors Guild v. Google, Inc.</i> , 804 F.3d 202 (2d Cir. 2015)	22
<i>Baker v. Selden</i> , 101 U.S. 99 (1879)	passim
<i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 569 (1994).....	21, 22, 23, 24
<i>Comput. Assocs. Int’l, Inc. v. Altai, Inc.</i> , 982 F.2d 693 (2d Cir. 1992)	17, 19, 21
<i>Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Borland Int’l, Inc.</i> , 49 F.3d 807 (1st Cir. 1995), <i>aff’d by an equally divided court</i> , 516 U.S. 233 (1996).....	17, 19, 20, 21
<i>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (<i>Oracle I</i>)	18, 20, 21, 22
<i>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> , 872 F. Supp. 2d 974 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	20
<i>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google LLC</i> , 886 F.3d 1179 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (<i>Oracle II</i>).....	23, 24
<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 508 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2007).....	21, 22
<i>Sega Enters. Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.</i> , 977 F.2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1992).....	passim
<i>Sony Comput. Entm’t, Inc. v. Connectix Corp.</i> , 203 F.3d 596 (9th Cir. 2000)	passim

Statutes

17 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	passim
17 U.S.C. § 107(3).....	24

Other Authorities

<i>Browser Extensions</i> , MDN Web Docs	12
Chris Riley, <i>Mozilla Files FTC Comments Calling for Interoperability to Promote Competition</i> , Mozilla: Open Pol’y & Advoc. (Aug. 21, 2018)	16
H.R. Rep. No. 94-1476 (1976).....	19
Letter from Chris Riley, Dir., Pub. Policy, Mozilla Corp., to Office of the Sec’y, Fed. Trade Comm’n (Aug. 20, 2018)	16
Microsoft Edge (EdgeHTML) extensions, Microsoft Docs.....	12
<i>Porting an Extension from Chrome to Microsoft Edge</i> , Microsoft Docs.....	12
S. Rep. No. 94-473 (1975).....	19
Steven Weber, <i>The Success of Open Source</i> (2006).....	11

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.