

No. 20-132

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

THE MOODSTERS COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY, ET AL.,
Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE
CALIFORNIA SOCIETY OF ENTERTAINMENT LAWYERS
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS

STEVEN T. LOWE
COUNSEL OF RECORD
LOWE & ASSOCIATES P.C.
8383 WILSHIRE BLVD.
SUITE 1038
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211
(310) 477-5811
STEVEN@LOWELAW.COM

SEPTEMBER 8, 2020
SUPREME COURT PRESS

COUNSEL FOR AMICUS CURIAE
◆ (888) 958-5705 ◆ BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT	5
A. THE “ORIGINALITY” STANDARD SET FORTH IN FEIST GOVERNS COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT CASES AND IS THE PROPER STANDARD TO DETERMINE THE COPYRIGHTABILITY OF CHARACTERS.....	5
B. CIRCUIT COURTS ARE SPLIT OVER WHEN COPYRIGHT LAW PROTECTS CHARACTERS AND THIS CONFUSION LEADS TO UNPREDICT- ABILITY, AND IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT, THE APPLICATION OF UNNECESSARILY HEIGHT- ENED STANDARDS THAT PREJUDICE INDE- PENDENT CREATORS	7
C. THE NINTH CIRCUIT’S IMPOSSIBLE-TO-SATISFY STANDARDS FRUSTRATE THE PURPOSE OF COPYRIGHT LAW	11
D. THE NINTH CIRCUIT’S FAILURE IN THIS CASE TO PROTECT ORIGINAL SELECTION AND ARRANGEMENT WHEN DETERMINING SUB- STANTIAL SIMILARITY IS INCONSISTENT WITH SUPREME COURT AND NINTH CIRCUIT PRECEDENT	13
CONCLUSION.....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Anderson v. Stallone</i> , No. 87-0592 WDKGX, 1989 WL 206431 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 1989).....	12
<i>Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 35 F.3d 1435 (9th Cir. 1994)	14
<i>Daniels v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 958 F.3d 767 (9th Cir. 2020)	10, 13, 14
<i>DC Comics v. Towle</i> , 802 F.3d 1012 (9th Cir. 2015)	passim
<i>Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., Inc.</i> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991)	passim
<i>Fleener v. Trinity Broad.</i> , 203 F.Supp.2d 1142 (C.D. Cal. 2001)	14
<i>Gaiman v. McFarlane</i> , 360 F.3d 644 (7th Cir. 2004)	7, 9, 10
<i>Golan v. Holder</i> , 132 U.S. 873 at 902 (2012)	4
<i>Harper House, Inc. v. Thomas Nelson, Inc.</i> , 889 F.2d 194 (9th Cir. 1989)	14
<i>L.A. Printex Inds., Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.</i> , 676 F.3d 841 (9th Cir. 2012)	14
<i>Lewinson v. Henry Holt & Co., LLC</i> , 659 F.Supp.2d 547 (S.D.N.Y. 2009).....	9
<i>Matthew Bender & Co. v. West Publishing Co.</i> , 158 F.3d 674 (2d Cir. 1998)	7
<i>Mazur v. Stein</i> , 347 U.S. 201 (1954)	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Metcalf v. Bochco</i> , 294 F.3d 1069 (9th Cir. 2002)	14
<i>Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc. v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , 900 F.Supp. 1287 (C.D. Cal. 1995)	10, 12, 13
<i>Miller v. Miramax</i> , No. CV 99-08526 DDP (AJWx), 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25967 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2001).....	14
<i>Miller v. Universal City Studio, Inc.</i> , 650 F.2d 1365 (1981)	6
<i>Nichols v. Universal Pictures Corp.</i> , 45 F.2d 119 (2d Cir. 1930),	8
<i>North Coast Industries v. Jason Maxwell, Inc.</i> , 972 F.2d 1031 (9th Cir. 1992).....	7
<i>Paramount Pictures Corp. v. Axanar Productions, Inc.</i> , 121 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1699 (C.D. Cal. 2017)	14
<i>Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc., et al.</i> , 572 U.S. 663 (2014)	1, 9
<i>Publications Int’l, Ltd. v. Meredith Corp.</i> , 88 F.3d 473 (7th Cir. 1996)	7
<i>Roth Greeting Cards v. United Card Co.</i> , 429 F.2d 1106 (9th Cir. 1970)	14
<i>Silverman v. CBS Inc.</i> , 870 F.2d 40 (2d Cir. 1989).....	8
<i>Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> , 464 U.S. 417 (2012).....	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Swirsky v. Carey</i> , 376 F.3d 841 (9th Cir. 2004).....	14
<i>Three Boys Music Corp. v. Bolton</i> , 212 F.3d 477 (9th Cir. 2000)	14
<i>Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken</i> , 422 U.S. 151 (1975)	5
<i>Universal Pictures Co. v. Harold Lloyd Corp.</i> , 162 F.2d 354 (9th Cir. 1947)	14
<i>Warner Bros. Pictures Inc. v. Columbia Broad Sys., Inc.</i> , 216 F.2d 945 (9th Cir. 1954).....	11, 12
<i>Warner Bros., Inc. v. Am. Broad. Cos.</i> , 720 F.2d 231 (2d Cir. 1983).....	7, 8, 13
<i>Worth v. Selchow & Righter Co.</i> , 827 F.2d 569 (9th Cir. 1987)	14
<i>Yankee Candle Co. v. Bridgewater Candle Co.</i> , 259 F.3d 25 (1st Cir. 2001).....	7

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. Art I, § 8, cl. 8.....	5, 6
------------------------------------	------

JUDICIAL RULES

Sup. Ct. R. 37	1
----------------------	---

LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS

HR Rep No. 1476.....	6
S Rep No. 473.....	6

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.