

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065
rvannest@kvn.com
CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - # 184325
canderson@kvn.com
DANIEL PURCELL - # 191424
dpurcell@kvn.com
633 Battery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
Telephone: 415 391 5400
Facsimile: 415 397 7188

KING & SPALDING LLP
DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279
fzimmer@kslaw.com
CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323
csabnis@kslaw.com
101 Second Street, Suite 2300
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415.318.1200
Fax: 415.318.1300

KING & SPALDING LLP
SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER
(Pro Hac Vice)
sweingaertner@kslaw.com
ROBERT F. PERRY
rperry@kslaw.com
BRUCE W. BABER (Pro Hac Vice)
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Tel: 212.556.2100
Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819
ballon@gtlaw.com
HEATHER MEEKER - #172148
meekerh@gtlaw.com
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
1900 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Tel: 650.328.8500
Fax: 650.328.8508

Attorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA

**GOOGLE'S SECOND MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW ON
SECTIONS OF COUNT VIII OF
ORACLE'S AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 50, Google hereby moves for Judgment as a Matter of Law on sections of Count VIII of Oracle's Amended Complaint. Pursuant to the Court's request, Google will file supplemental briefing in support of its motion on Tuesday, May 1.

II. ARGUMENT

First, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the source code and object code implementing the 37 API packages are not derivative works of Oracle's specifications. As explained in Google's April 25, 2012 Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law [Dkt. No. 984] ("Apr. 25 JMOL") at 2-3, Oracle's derivative work claim is foreclosed by 17 U.S.C. § 102(b) and *Baker v. Selden*, 101 U.S. 99 (1879).

Second, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the method signatures are not protected by copyright under both section 102(b) and the short words and phrases doctrine. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 3-4; *Sega Enters. Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.*, 977 F.2d 1510, 1524 n.7 (9th Cir. 1992).

Third, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the alleged literal copying is *de minimis* and thus non-actionable. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 4-6.

Fourth, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that its specifications for the 37 API packages do not infringe Oracle's specifications. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 6-10.

Fifth, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle's claims based on "direct code copying" relating to the rangeCheck code, the eight "Impl/ACL" test files and the allegedly copied comments, as a result of Oracle's failure to prove that either of the two copyright registrations on which Oracle relies provides protection for or covers the individual files on which those claims are based.

Sixth, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle's copyright claim as a result of Oracle's failure to prove the contents of the works that are the subject of the two copyright registrations on which Oracle relies. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 10-11.

Seventh, to the extent Oracle has not already withdrawn with prejudice its "collective

1 work” argument, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law of non-infringement as to all
 2 constituent elements of the registered works, because Oracle has failed to prove authorship of any
 3 component parts of the works. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 11-12.

4 Google’s Rule 50 motion is based on this Motion, Google’s April 25th motion for
 5 judgment as a matter of law and the evidence and authorities cited therein, the brief in support
 6 and the evidence and authorities cited therein that the Court has directed Google to file in support
 7 of this Motion, the entire trial record, and such argument as the Court allows on this Motion.

8 Rule 50 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure applies only to issues on which the jury is
 9 being asked to render a verdict. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(a)(1) (rule applies where “a party has been
 10 fully heard on an issue during a jury trial and the court finds that a reasonable jury would not have
 11 a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for the party on that issue”). Google’s Rule 50
 12 motion therefore does not address copyrightability or its equitable defenses—issues which are
 13 reserved for the Court. To the extent that the Court concludes Rule 50 motions can be directed to
 14 issues reserved to the Court (or such issues in combination with issues left for the jury), Google
 15 further moves for judgment as a matter of law on Count VIII in its entirety on the grounds that (a)
 16 the structure, sequence, and organization of the Java APIs is not protectable by copyright, and
 17 Oracle has not carried its burden of proof as to the remaining parts of its claim, namely the
 18 specifications and allegedly copied items (as referenced in the paragraphs beginning with “*Third*”
 19 and “*Fourth*” above); and (b) Count VIII of the Oracle’s Amended Complaint is barred by
 20 Google’s equitable defenses of laches, equitable estoppel, waiver, and implied license. Such
 21 further motion is based on this Motion, the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and
 22 the evidence and authorities cited therein that the Court has directed Google to file on issues
 23 reserved for the Court, the entire trial record, and such argument as the Court allows on this
 24 Motion.

25 Dated: April 29, 2012

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

26 By: /s/ Robert A. Van Nest
 ROBERT A. VAN NEST

27 Attorneys for Defendant
 28 GOOGLE INC.