

No. 25-449

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

STEPHEN THALER,

Petitioner,

v.

SHIRA PERLMUTTER, REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS
AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES
COPYRIGHT OFFICE, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE D.C. CIRCUIT

**REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

RYAN ABBOTT
Counsel of Record
BROWN, NERI, SMITH & KHAN, LLP
11601 Wilshire Boulevard,
Suite 2080
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 593-9890
ryan@bnsklaw.com

Counsel for Petitioner

389906



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | i |
| TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES | ii |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| ARGUMENT..... | 2 |
| I. The Copyright Office Erroneously Imported a Non-statutory Requirement to Create a Rule Against Granting Copyright for Works Created Using Computer Software | 2 |
| A. The Copyright Act Directly Contravenes the Human Authorship Requirement..... | 4 |
| B. This Court’s Precedent Allows for Protection of AI-Generated Works..... | 6 |
| C. Congress Has Not Acquiesced to the Human Authorship Requirement | 7 |
| II. This Case Presents an Ideal Vehicle to Resolve an Issue of Paramount Importance..... | 8 |
| III. CONCLUSION | 13 |

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

| | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Burrow-Giles Lithographic Co. v. Sarony</i> , 111 U.S. 53 (1884)..... | 6 |
| <i>Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid</i> , 490 U.S. 730 (1989)..... | 7 |
| <i>Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co., Inc.</i> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991)..... | 6 |
| <i>Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo</i> , 603 U.S. 369 (2024)..... | 8 |
| <i>Star Athletica, L.L.C. v. Varsity Brands, Inc.</i> , 580 U.S. 405 (2017)..... | 6, 7 |
| Statutes | |
| 17 U.S.C. § 101 | 5, 7 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 201(b)..... | 4 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 203(a)(2)(A)..... | 4 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 302(a)..... | 4 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 302(e)..... | 5 |
| Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988, c. 48 (UK)..... | 12 |

Cited Authorities

Page

Other Authorities

Aaron Winger, *Chinese Court Again Rules AI-Generated Images Are Eligible for Copyright Protection*, CHINA IP LAW UPDATE (Mar. 14, 2025), <https://www.chinaiplawupdate.com/2025/03/chinese-court-again-rules-there-is-copyright-in-ai-generated-images/>12

Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence, 88 Fed. Reg. 16190-01 (March 16, 2023).3

Théâtre D’opéra Spatial (SR # 1-11743923581) (September 5, 2023), <https://perma.cc/F97M-QFTJ> . . .9

Zarya of the Dawn (Registration # VAu001480196) (Feb. 21, 2023), <https://perma.cc/AD86-WGPM>.9

INTRODUCTION

This case presents an ideal vehicle for this Court to prevent a single executive agency from incorrectly deciding a legal question of paramount importance in a manner inconsistent with the text of the governing statute and applicable Court precedent.

The Copyright Office has imposed a non-statutory Human Authorship Requirement for copyright registration. It derived this rule not from the Constitution or the Copyright Act but from its own nonbinding agency materials, including its Compendium, guidance publications, and agency reports. This requirement, in effect, denies copyright protection to works created through certain, unclear uses of computer software.

Dr. Thaler transparently disclosed that an AI system that he designed and used generated the image for which he sought copyright protection. The Copyright Office denied registration based on its Human Authorship Requirement. In the time since Dr. Thaler's registration was denied, the Copyright Office has either rejected numerous applications disclosing the use of AI or required applicants to disclaim content made using AI and thus prevented registration of that content.

Other countries, like China and the United Kingdom, already permit copyright protection for AI-generated works. But the Copyright Office's reliance on its own non-statutory requirements have led to an improper cabining of United States copyright law in contradiction of this Court's precedent that copyright law should accommodate technological progress.

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.