

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 6 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

MICHAEL S. TRAYLOR,

Plaintiffs' Former Counsel-
Appellant,

v.

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
ET AL.,

Defendant-Appellee.

No. 21-56093

D.C. No. 5:20-cv-01280-SVW-KK

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Stephen V. Wilson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted on October 17, 2023
Pasadena, California

Before: PAEZ and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges, and RAKOFF, District Judge.**

This is an appeal from the grant of summary judgment and award of attorney's fees in a case brought under the Copyright Act. The district court initially granted the motions for summary judgment of defendants Al Gohary and the Orange County

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The Honorable Jed S. Rakoff, United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, sitting by designation.

Inland Empire Small Business Development Center Network (“OCIE”) based upon the failure of plaintiffs Lethia Davis and her company, Beautiful Minds Entrepreneurship, Inc., to provide the district court with a copy of the copyrighted works that were purportedly infringed. Plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration attaching one of the three allegedly infringed works. The district court denied that motion, finding, among other things, that even if the work had been included with the prior motion, it would not have changed the court’s conclusion. The district court then ordered plaintiffs to pay defendants’ attorney’s fees pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505 and, *sua sponte*, issued an order to show cause why plaintiffs’ attorney—Michael Traylor—should not be held liable for a portion of the fee award pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1927. The district court ultimately awarded Gohary \$75,424.50 in attorney’s fees, of which Traylor was held liable for \$31,006, and awarded OCIE \$75,613.13 in attorney’s fees, of which Traylor was held liable for \$71,056.13. Traylor is the only party remaining in this appeal. For the reasons set forth below, we affirm the district court’s grant of summary judgment and award of attorney’s fees.

Traylor first argues that the district court erred in granting defendants’ motions for summary judgment and denying plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration. Without these purportedly erroneous rulings, Traylor argues, no attorney’s fee award could have been entered against him. We review a grant of summary judgment de

novo, and a denial of a motion for reconsideration for abuse of discretion. *See Airlines for Am. v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 78 F.4th 1146, 1151 (9th Cir. 2023) (summary judgment); *Benson v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.*, 673 F.3d 1207, 1211 (9th Cir. 2012) (FRCP 60(b)); *Smith v. Pac. Props. & Dev. Corp.*, 358 F.3d 1097, 1100 (9th Cir. 2004) (FRCP 59(e)).

“Proof of copyright infringement requires [the plaintiff] to show: (1) that he owns a valid copyright in [the work]; and (2) that [the defendant] copied protected aspects of the work.” *Skidmore v. Led Zeppelin*, 952 F.3d 1051, 1064 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc). A plaintiff “can attempt to prove [copying] circumstantially by showing that the defendant had access to the plaintiff’s work and that the two works share similarities probative of copying.” *Id.* (quoting *Rentmeester v. Nike, Inc.*, 883 F.3d 1111, 1117 (9th Cir. 2018)).

To support their motions for summary judgment, defendants put forward substantial evidence that they did not copy the allegedly infringed work, including declarations that they had not seen the infringed work prior to the litigation, did not have access to the infringed work, and created the purportedly infringing work years before the creation of the allegedly infringed work. At this point, the burden shifted to plaintiffs to demonstrate a genuine dispute of material fact. *See Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322–23 (1986).

In response, plaintiffs argued that access to the copyrighted works combined with their substantial similarity to the infringing work was sufficient to satisfy the element of copying. But plaintiffs failed to actually identify or provide the district court with a copy of any work that was purportedly infringed, and thus the district court correctly concluded that no reasonable juror could evaluate whether the work was substantially similar such that it was copied.¹ And when an allegedly infringed work was submitted with plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration, it became clear that the infringed and infringing works were, as the district court ultimately held, "not remotely similar." Further, plaintiffs' only evidence of defendants' access to the infringed work was the bare assertion that the work was available on plaintiffs' website, which was insufficient to create a dispute of fact as to access in the face of defendants' contrary evidence. *See Art Attacks Ink, LLC v. MGA Ent. Inc.*, 581 F.3d 1138, 1143 (9th Cir. 2009) ("To prove access, a plaintiff must show a reasonable possibility, not merely a bare possibility, that an alleged infringer had the chance to view the protected work."). Accordingly, the district court did not err in granting

¹ On appeal, Traylor asserts that the allegedly infringed work was attached as an exhibit to a deposition transcript filed in support of OCIE's motion for summary judgment. But the PowerPoint slides Traylor cites are the allegedly infringing work created by Gohary, not the infringed work purportedly created by plaintiffs. The fact that, even on appeal, Traylor is unable to clearly identify what work was purportedly infringed further demonstrates the correctness of the district court's rulings.

defendants' motions for summary judgment and denying plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration.

Traylor next argues that the district court erred by awarding attorney's fees pursuant to the Copyright Act. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 505. The Copyright Act "grants courts wide latitude to award attorney's fees based on the totality of circumstances in a case." *Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.*, 579 U.S. 197, 203 (2016). Such an award is reviewed for abuse of discretion. *See Maljack Prods., Inc. v. GoodTimes Home Video Corp.*, 81 F.3d 881, 889 (9th Cir. 1996). Here, the district court correctly identified the six non-exclusive factors to be considered and found that each weighed in favor of awarding attorney's fees. Traylor simply asserts that the district court was wrong in making these findings but offers no real explanation as to why this is so. Accordingly, we hold that the district court's award of attorney's fees was not an abuse of discretion.

Finally, Traylor argues that the district court abused its discretion by requiring him to personally satisfy a portion of the attorney's fee award as a sanction. Imposition of sanctions pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1927 is appropriate "when an attorney knowingly or recklessly raises a frivolous argument, or argues a meritorious claim for the purpose of harassing an opponent." *B.K.B. v. Maui Police Dep't*, 276 F.3d 1091, 1107 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *In re Keegan Mgmt. Co., Sec. Litig.*, 78

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.