

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  
MICHAEL S. KWUN - # 198945  
mkwun@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 OPPOSITION TO ORACLE'S  
RULE 50(A) MOTION AT THE CLOSE  
OF PHASE ONE EVIDENCE**

Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. ARGUMENT .....	1
A. Oracle is not entitled to judgment as a matter of law of infringement. ....	1
1. Oracle has not demonstrated ownership of the materials allegedly copied by Google. ....	1
2. The evidence does not compel a finding of direct copying. ....	2
3. The evidence does not compel a finding that, by virtue of the SSO of the 37 API packages, Google’s implementation of the 37 API packages is substantially similar to compilable code for the 166 API packages in J2SE.....	2
4. Oracle is not entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the allegedly infringing portions of the 12 Android files are more than <i>de minimis</i> . ....	3
B. Google, not Oracle, is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s specifications claim, because Android’s specifications for the 37 API packages do not infringe Oracle’s API specifications. ....	4
C. Oracle failed to establish that no reasonable jury could find fair use. ....	5
1. A reasonable jury could find that the purpose and character of Google’s use of the SSO of the 37 API packages favors a finding of fair use.....	5
2. A reasonable jury could find that the nature of the SSO of the 37 API packages is highly functional, and that this favors a finding of fair use.....	9
3. A reasonable jury could find that Google took only so much of the J2SE API packages as is necessary for compatibility, and that this either favors fair use, or is at least neutral. ....	9
4. A reasonable jury could find that there has been no adverse impact on the actual or potential market for Oracle’s work, and that the fourth factor thus favors fair use.....	10
D. Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the SSO of the 37 API packages is not copyrightable.....	12
E. Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s SSO derivative work claim. ....	13
F. Google is entitled to judgment in its favor on its equitable defenses. ....	14
III. CONCLUSION.....	15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

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

**Page(s)**

**Federal Cases**

*A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.L. Chaides Const. Co.*  
960 F.2d 1020 (Fed. Cir. 1992)..... 15

*Baker v. Selden*  
101 U.S. 99 (1879)..... 9, 13, 14

*Bateman v. Mnemonics, Inc.*  
79 F.3d 1532 (11th Cir. 1996) ..... 8

*Boisson v. Banian, Ltd.*  
273 F.3d 262 (2d Cir. 2001)..... 1

*Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*  
510 U.S. 569 (1994)..... 5, 6, 7, 10

*Carmichael Lodge No. 2103 v. Leonard*  
CIV S-07-2665, 2009 WL 2985476 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2009)..... 15

*Collegenet, Inc. v. XAP Corp.*  
483 F. Supp. 2d 1058 (D. Or. 2007) ..... 14

*Corp. of Am. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.*  
464 U.S. 417 (1984)..... 10

*Danjaq LLC v. Sony Corp.*  
263 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2001) ..... 14

*Effects Associates, Inc. v. Cohen*  
908 F.2d 555 (9th Cir. 1990) ..... 15

*Haas v. Leo Feist, Inc.*  
234 F. 105 (S.D.N.Y. 1916)..... 14

*Hampton v. Paramount Pictures Corp.*  
279 F.2d 100 (9th Cir. 1960) ..... 15

*Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters*  
. 471 U.S. 539 (1985)..... 5

*Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*  
609 F. Supp. 2d 988 (N.D. Cal. 2009) *aff'd*, 645 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 15

*Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*  
645 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2011), *cert. denied*, 132 S. Ct. 1540 (2012)..... 15

*Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.*  
336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003) ..... 10

1 *Knickerbocker Toy Co. v. Azrak-Hamway Int’l, Inc.*  
 668 F.2d 699 (2d Cir. 1982)..... 4

2

3 *Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Borland Int’l, Inc.*  
 49 F.3d 807 (1995), *aff’d by an equally divided court*, 516 U.S. 233 (1996)  
 (Boudin, J., concurring) ..... 8

4

5 *Lulirama Ltd., Inc. v. Axxess Broad. Services, Inc.*  
 128 F.3d 872 (5th Cir. 1997) ..... 15

6 *Mazer v. Stein*  
 347 U.S. 201 (1954)..... 14

7

8 *McCoy v. Mitsuboshi Cutlery, Inc.*  
 67 F.3d 917 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 15

9 *Newton v. Diamond*  
 388 F.3d 1189 (9th Cir. 2004) ..... 3

10

11 *Qualcomm Inc. v. Broadcom Corp.*  
 548 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 15

12 *Ringgold v. Black Enter. Tele., Inc.*  
 126 F.3d 70 (2d Cir. 1997)..... 3

13

14 *Sega Enters. Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.*  
 977 F.2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1992) ..... 9, 10, 11, 13, 14

15 *Sony Computer Enter. v. Connectix Corp.*  
 203 F.3d 596 (9th Cir. 2000) ..... *passim*

16

17 *Ty, Inc. v. GMA Accessories, Inc.*  
 132 F.3d 1167 (7th Cir. 1997) (Posner, J.) ..... 2

18 *United States v. King Features Ent., Inc.*  
 843 F.2d 394 (9th Cir. 1988) ..... 15

19

20 *Wang Laboratories, Inc. v. Mitsubishi Electronics America, Inc.*  
 103 F.3d 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 15

21 **Federal Statutes**

22 17 U.S.C. § 101..... 13

23 17 U.S.C. § 102(b) ..... 8, 9, 13

24 17 U.S.C. § 410(c) ..... 1

25 **Other Authorities**

26 Pierre N. Leval, *Toward a Fair Use Standard*, 103 HARV. L. REV. 1105, 1111  
 (1990)..... 6

27

28

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 The Court should deny Oracle’s motion for judgment as a matter of law. In large  
3 measure, its motion merely cites disputed evidence. It does not establish that no reasonable jury  
4 could find for Google. Indeed, on many of the issues raised by Oracle’s motion, Google, not  
5 Oracle, is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

6 **II. ARGUMENT**

7 **A. Oracle is not entitled to judgment as a matter of law of infringement.**

8 **1. Oracle has not demonstrated ownership of the materials allegedly**  
9 **copied by Google.**

10 Oracle correctly states that the registrations for *J2SE 1.4 and 5.0* are not contested, but  
11 incorrectly claims that this means that it “is entitled to judgment that it is the owner of valid  
12 copyrights to J2SE 1.4 and J2SE 5.0, *covering all components of those works, including the*  
13 *individual code files and the SSO of the API packages.*” Oracle JMOL [Dkt. 1044] at 3:12-14  
14 (emphasis added). Ownership of the *copyright registrations* does not imply ownership of “all  
15 components of those works,” and certainly not of the “individual code files” or the “SSO of the  
16 API packages.” As the Second Circuit succinctly held in *Boisson v. Banian, Ltd.*, “[s]imply  
17 because a work is copyrighted does not mean every element of that work is protected.” 273 F.3d  
18 262, 268 (2d Cir. 2001).

19 To the contrary, the certificates of registration in evidence affirmatively state that Oracle  
20 *does not* own “all components” of the works. *See* TX 464 at 2, 475 at 2 (stating in part 6a that the  
21 registered works include “licensed-in components”). The registrations are “prima facie evidence  
22 . . . of the facts stated in the certificate[s],” 17 U.S.C. § 410(c), which means that they are  
23 evidence that Oracle *does not* own all of the components of versions 1.4 and 5.0 of J2SE.  
24 Because Oracle has not established *which* components of the registered works it owns, it has not  
25 established that it owns the material that it alleges Google copied.

26 Indeed, for the reasons given in Google’s brief in support of its second motion for  
27 judgment as a matter of law, *see* Dkt. 1043 at 2:23-5:9, Oracle has not established what is  
28 included in the complete works that are the subject of the registrations.

1                   **2. The evidence does not compel a finding of direct copying.**

2                   Oracle claims that the evidence compels a finding that Google directly copied from  
3 Oracle's works. The testimony Oracle cites, however, is not evidence of direct copying, but  
4 evidence of *access*. "Obviously, access does not entail copying. An eyewitness might have seen  
5 the defendant buy the copyrighted work; this would be proof of access, but not of copying." *Ty,*  
6 *Inc. v. GMA Accessories, Inc.*, 132 F.3d 1167, 1170 (7th Cir. 1997) (Posner, J.). Bob Lee  
7 testified that he *consulted* the J2SE API specifications, but not that he *copied* expression from  
8 them. RT 982:25-983:3. He testified that Noser was hired to *implement* libraries that followed  
9 the J2SE API specifications, but not that Noser *copied* expression from them. RT 985:3-6. Dan  
10 Bornstein testified that he and his team *looked* at the specifications, and used *information* from  
11 them, but not that he or his team *copied* expression from them. RT 1836:19-1837:2. Oracle  
12 argues that Android engineers "effectively" had "access" to the SSO of the source code itself, but  
13 even if the inference Oracle asks the Court to draw were correct (and Oracle fails to establish that  
14 a reasonable jury would have no choice but to draw this inference), having effective access to the  
15 SSO of the source code is very different from directly copying expression from the source code.

16                   None of the evidence cited by Oracle comes close to compelling a finding of direct  
17 copying. *Ty*, 132 F.3d at 1170. Indeed, the only arguable evidence of *direct copying* is the code  
18 and comments that allegedly were literally copied, for which Google relies on Oracle's failure to  
19 prove more than *de minimis* copying, as explained below.

20                   **3. The evidence does not compel a finding that, by virtue of the SSO of  
21 the 37 API packages, Google's implementation of the 37 API packages  
22 is substantially similar to compilable code for the 166 API packages in  
23 J2SE.**

23                   For purposes of determining whether Google's use of the SSO for the 37 API packages  
24 infringes, the Court instructed the jury that Oracle's work as a whole is "all of the compilable  
25 code associated with all of the 166 API packages (not just the 37) in the registered work." Dkt.  
26 1018, JI 29.<sup>1</sup> Professor Astrachan testified that the Android platform as a whole is not  
27 substantially similar to the J2SE platform as a whole. RT 2181:12-2182:12. Professor Astrachan

28 <sup>1</sup> Google reserves its objections to this jury instruction.

1 further testified that, for the 37 packages in particular, there are similarities in the method  
2 signatures, but the implementing code is completely different. RT 2182:13-2183:1. Professor  
3 Astrachan also compared the code in the 166 API packages in J2SE to the 37 accused packages in  
4 Android, and opined that they are very different. RT 2185:10-2187:3. Professor Astrachan  
5 testified that the SSO of the 37 API packages is represented in approximately 7,000 lines of code  
6 out of the approximately 2.8 million lines of code in the 166 API packages in J2SE. *See* RT  
7 2185:10-14, 2189:22-2191:20. He further testified that this SSO, standing alone, “doesn’t  
8 actually do anything.” RT 2191:3-7. Based on this testimony, a reasonable jury could find that  
9 the 37 accused API packages in Android are not substantially similar to the 166 J2SE packages.

10 **4. Oracle is not entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the allegedly**  
11 **infringing portions of the 12 Android files are more than *de minimis*.**

12 Oracle’s literal copying claims are directed to three groups of files. First, Oracle claims  
13 that two Android files include the nine-line `rangeCheck` method from Oracle’s `Arrays.java` file—a  
14 file that is over 3,000 lines long. Second, Oracle claims that eight Android test files—files that  
15 do not contribute even a *single byte* to the code that ships on Android phones—are decompiled  
16 versions of eight Oracle files. Third, Oracle claims that two Android test files include *comments*  
17 that were taken from two Oracle files, while conceding that the comments have *no effect*  
18 *whatsoever* on the compiled code that ships on Android phones.

19 *De minimis* acts of copying are not actionable. *Newton v. Diamond*, 388 F.3d 1189, 1192-  
20 93 (9th Cir. 2004); *see also Ringgold v. Black Enter. Tele., Inc.*, 126 F.3d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1997)  
21 (“*de minimis* can mean that copying has occurred to such a trivial extent as to fall below the  
22 quantitative threshold of substantial similarity, which is always a required element of actionable  
23 copying”). A use is *de minimis* “if the average audience would not recognize the appropriation.”  
24 *Newton*, 388 F.3d at 1193. Oracle presented *no* evidence that *anyone* ever noticed any of this  
25 allegedly misappropriated code or comments until an extensive forensic analysis of the Android  
26 source code was undertaken as part of this litigation. *See* RT 1308:2-1313:11 (Mitchell)  
27 (testifying about forensic analysis). On this basis alone, a reasonable jury could find for Google  
28 on all of Oracle’s literal copying claims.

1           Moreover, a reasonable jury could *only* find that the rangeCheck method is both  
2 qualitatively and quantitatively insignificant, whether judged against the Arrays.java file alone (as  
3 the Court instructed the jury to do) or either of the registered works as a whole (as Google  
4 requested the jury be instructed). *See* Dkt. 1043 at 9:22-11:22 (brief in support of Google’s  
5 second motion for judgment as a matter of law). As to the other files, the jury once again could  
6 only find that Google’s use—which does not affect any code that ships on an Android device—is  
7 *de minimis*. *See Knickerbocker Toy Co. v. Azrak-Hamway Int’l, Inc.*, 668 F.2d 699, 702-03 (2d  
8 Cir. 1982) (use of plaintiff’s work in a mock-up product display that was never used in a  
9 production run was *de minimis*); *see also* Dkt. 1043 at 11:23-14:6. For these reasons, Google, not  
10 Oracle, is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on the issue of whether the alleged literal  
11 copying is *de minimis*. Even if Oracle proved that it owned the eleven individual files that it  
12 claims were copied (and it did not), Oracle is not entitled to judgment as a matter of law on its  
13 claim that Google’s use of portions of material allegedly from the 11 files was more than *de*  
14 *minimis*.

15           **B. Google, not Oracle, is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s**  
16 **specifications claim, because Android’s specifications for the 37 API packages**  
**do not infringe Oracle’s API specifications.**

17           Google, not Oracle, is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s claim that  
18 Android’s specifications for the 37 API packages infringe the English-language descriptions in  
19 Oracle’s specifications for the 166 API packages in J2SE. Oracle presented only three examples  
20 of alleged similarities between the Android and J2SE specifications, and no reasonable jury could  
21 conclude that even those examples are virtually identical. RT 1169:25-1170:19, 1171:3-1172:25,  
22 1174:17-1175:9 (Lee). Indeed, the few similarities in those examples are due to the fact that, as  
23 to the 37 API packages, the Android and J2SE specifications *are describing the same things*. *See*  
24 RT 1175:10-24 (Lee). A reasonable jury could only find that the Android specifications for the  
25 37 packages are *not* virtually identical to the specifications for the 166 J2SE API packages. *See*  
26 *also* Dkt. 1043 at 14:20-17:8.

27           Oracle’s other claim—that the Android specifications include the SSO for the 37 API  
28 packages—fails because the SSO is not copyrightable. *See* Part II.D, *infra*. For these reasons,



1 Oracle is not entitled to judgment as a matter of law on its claim that Android’s specifications for  
2 the 37 API packages infringe Oracle’s API specifications.

3 **C. Oracle failed to establish that no reasonable jury could find fair use.**

4 For the reasons given below, a reasonable jury could find that all four of the statutory fair  
5 use factors favor Google, or at least that three factors favor Google while the other is neutral.  
6 Weighing these factors together, a reasonable jury could find that Google is making a fair use of  
7 the SSO of the 37 API packages.

8 **1. A reasonable jury could find that the purpose and character of**  
9 **Google’s use of the SSO of the 37 API packages favors a finding of fair**  
10 **use.**

11 “The language of the statute makes clear that the commercial or nonprofit educational  
12 purpose of a work is only one element of the first factor enquiry into its purpose and character.”  
13 *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 584 (1994). “Congress resisted attempts to  
14 narrow the ambit of this traditional enquiry by adopting categories of presumptively fair use, and  
15 it urged courts to preserve *the breadth of their traditionally ample view of the universe of relevant*  
16 *evidence.*” *Id.* (citing *Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters.*, 471 U.S. 539, 561  
17 (1985)) (emphasis added). “Accordingly, the mere fact that a use is educational and not for profit  
18 does not insulate it from a finding of infringement, *any more than the commercial character of a*  
19 *use bars a finding of fairness.*” *Campbell*, 510 U.S. at 584 (emphasis added). Indeed, most of the  
20 exemplary fair uses listed in the preamble to section 107 are “generally conducted for profit in  
21 this country.” *Id.* (quotation marks and citation omitted). The Ninth Circuit has recognized that,  
22 after *Campbell*, it is improper to apply a presumption against fair use based on a defendant’s  
23 commercial purpose. *Sony Computer Enter. v. Connectix Corp.*, 203 F.3d 596, 606 (9th Cir.  
24 2000). Instead, a commercial purpose “is only a ‘separate factor that tends to weigh against a  
25 finding of fair use.’” *Id.* (quoting *Campbell*, 510 U.S. at 585).

26 But even a commercial use does not imply that the first factor must weigh against fair use,  
27 because the more the purpose and character of the defendant’s use is transformative, “the less will  
28 be the significance of other factors, like commercialism, that may weigh against a finding of fair  
use.” *Campbell*, 510 U.S. at 579. A use is transformative where it “adds something new, with a

1 further purpose or different character, altering the first with new expression, meaning, or  
2 message[.]” *Id.* (citing Pierre N. Leval, *Toward a Fair Use Standard*, 103 HARV. L. REV. 1105,  
3 1111 (1990)). “[T]he goal of copyright, to promote science and the arts, is generally furthered by  
4 the creation of transformative works . . . .” *Campbell*, 510 U.S. at 579.

5 In *Sony v. Connectix*, the Ninth Circuit found that Connectix’s Virtual Game Station  
6 software (“VGS”) was a product that “creates a new platform, the personal computer, on which  
7 consumers can play games designed for the Sony PlayStation.” 203 F.3d at 606. Because VGS  
8 was an “innovation” that “affords opportunities for game play in new environments,” the Ninth  
9 Circuit found that VGS was “modestly transformative.” *Id.* The court so found “notwithstanding  
10 the similarity of uses and functions between the Sony PlayStation and the Virtual Game  
11 Station”—that is, notwithstanding that the very purpose of VGS was to allow users to play *the*  
12 *same games* that users play using the Sony PlayStation. The Ninth Circuit was “at a loss” to see  
13 “how Connectix’s drafting of entirely new object code for its VGS program could not be  
14 transformative, despite the similarities in function and screen output.” *Id.* at 606-07.

15 When Google created Android, it, too, created a new platform. Sun itself recognized that  
16 Android was innovative. *See* TX 435 (email from Schwartz to Schmidt stating, “Sun is ready  
17 embrace Google’s innovation . . . .”). In contrast to J2SE, Android provides a “full stack”  
18 solution for mobile computing. RT 1938:10-1939:12 (Rizvi). Android builds on the SSO of the  
19 37 API packages to provide developers with access to a full application framework suitable for  
20 smartphone applications. RT 1682:23-1684:1 (Rubin). All of this work required approximately  
21 three years of development to complete. RT 1684:20-24 (Rubin). Through these efforts, Android  
22 created opportunities to use the APIs in the 37 packages in a new environment, namely the  
23 Android smartphone platform. RT 2182:3-7 (Astrachan) (Android is a mobile platform that has a  
24 very different purpose than J2SE).

25 And although there are similarities between Android and the J2SE platforms in the  
26 structure, sequence and organization of the API elements in the 37 packages, the structure,  
27 sequence and organization of the *implementing code* is very different in Android, as compared  
28 with J2SE. RT 2182:25-2183:1 (Astrachan) (“The implementation code in Android is completely

1 different than the implementation code in Java.”); *see also* RT 2184:8-21, 2185:10-2186:17  
2 (Astrachan) (implementing code “completely different”); RT 2297:7-2299:13 (Mitchell)  
3 (agreeing code is different). In fact, the nine-line rangeCheck method is the only evidence of any  
4 similarities in the *implementing code* itself. *See* RT 1309:8-1313:11 (Mitchell); RT 2182:13-  
5 2183:1 (Astrachan). Thus, notwithstanding any similarities between how those APIs are used in  
6 Android and the J2SE platforms, a reasonable jury could find that Android is, at a minimum,  
7 “modestly transformative.” *See Sony v. Connectix*, 203 F.3d at 606-07. Oracle’s motion does not  
8 address any of this evidence. Based on this evidence, a reasonable jury could find that Android  
9 is, like VGS was, at least modestly transformative.

10 Oracle argues that in order to be transformative, the defendant’s work must have an  
11 *entirely* different purpose than the plaintiff’s work. This ignores the Supreme Court’s definition  
12 of “transformative” in *Campbell*. 510 U.S. at 579 (use is transformative where it “adds  
13 something new, with a further purpose or different character, altering the first with new  
14 expression, meaning, or message”). Indeed, in *Campbell*, the transformative use was a popular  
15 song recording that parodied the plaintiff’s popular song recording. While the original was a rock  
16 ballad and the other from the hip hop genre, the two works both were commercial entertainment  
17 targeting mainstream audiences. Moreover, although the cases Oracle cites involved situations  
18 where the defendant’s work had a very different purpose than the plaintiff’s work, none of those  
19 cases hold that a work *cannot* be transformative if it has a less than entirely different purpose.  
20 Thus, none of those cases narrow *Campbell*—nor could they, given that *Campbell* is a Supreme  
21 Court decision that is binding on the Ninth Circuit.

22 Here, Android not only provided a further purpose and different character to the 37 API  
23 packages at issue, allowing them to be used in a new environment and platform, but also added  
24 over one hundred new API packages that interact with and inter-depend on those 37 packages,  
25 transforming the SSO of the API packages at issue into something new. RT 1680:24-1682:5,  
26 1682:23-1684:1 (Rubin); TX 51 (list of API packages in Android version 2.1). In addition, the  
27 purpose of implementing the API packages was to achieve compatibility with code written to use  
28 APIs from those 37 packages. RT 1782:6-17 (Bornstein); RT 2183:6-11 (Astrachan); RT 803:9-

1 20 (Bloch).

2 To reach a final finding on the first factor, the *Sony v. Connectix* court weighed VGS's  
3 modestly transformative purpose against Connectix's commercial use of Sony's copyrighted  
4 work. Connectix had reverse engineered Sony's code in order to determine its functional  
5 requirements. 203 F.3d at 601. Because the final VGS product did not incorporate Sony's  
6 copyrighted code, the court found that Connectix's commercial use was only indirect or  
7 derivative. *Id.* at 607. Moreover, the use was for the purpose of achieving compatibility, a  
8 legitimate use under the first factor. *Id.*; see also *Bateman v. Mnemonics, Inc.*, 79 F.3d 1532,  
9 1547 (11th Cir. 1996) (external factors such as compatibility can negate a finding of infringement  
10 "per 17 U.S.C. § 102(b)" or "a finding of fair use, copyright estoppel, or misuse"); *Lotus Dev.*  
11 *Corp. v. Borland Int'l, Inc.*, 49 F.3d 807, 821 (1995), *aff'd by an equally divided court*, 516 U.S.  
12 233 (1996) (Boudin, J., concurring) (suggesting Borland's use of Lotus's menu hierarchy, in  
13 addition to being noninfringing by virtue of 17 U.S.C. § 102(b), might also be a fair use).

14 Weighing these facts together, the Ninth Circuit found that the first factor favored Connectix.

15 Assuming, for the limited purpose of opposing Oracle's motion for judgment as a matter  
16 of law on Google's fair use defense, that the SSO is copyrightable,<sup>2</sup> Android uses copyrighted  
17 material. Although the commerciality of Google's use would not be indirect in exactly the same  
18 sense as in *Sony v. Connectix*, see 203 F.3d at 607, the commerciality of Google's use would  
19 nonetheless still be indirect, because Google does not directly generate revenue by selling or  
20 licensing the SSO of the API packages or the APIs themselves. Instead, Google generates  
21 revenue from Android indirectly, mostly by way of revenue received on advertisements that  
22 appear on Android phones, which is the same way that Google generally generates most of its  
23 revenue from any platform, mobile or otherwise. See RT 1458:12-16 (Schmidt). And, as was the  
24 case in *Sony v. Connectix*, Google's challenged use is for the purpose of achieving  
25 compatibility—in this case compatibility with the APIs in the 37 packages at issue. RT 1782:6-  
26 17 (Bornstein); RT 2183:6-11 (Astrachan); RT 803:9-20 (Bloch). Weighing these facts together,

27 <sup>2</sup> The SSO is not copyrightable, see Part II.D, *infra*, but unless the SSO is copyrightable, there is  
28 no need to reach the issue of fair use.

1 a reasonable jury could reach the same result that was reached in *Sony v. Connectix*—that the first  
2 factor favors a finding of fair use.

3 **2. A reasonable jury could find that the nature of the SSO of the 37 API**  
4 **packages is highly functional, and that this favors a finding of fair use.**

5 The second fair use factor, the nature of the copyrighted work, “reflects the fact that not  
6 all copyrighted works are entitled to the same level of protection.” *Sega Enters. Ltd. v.*  
7 *Accolade, Inc.*, 977 F.2d 1510, 1524 (9th Cir. 1992). Of particular note here, the Copyright Act  
8 does not protect “functional or factual aspects of the work.” *Id.* (citing 17 U.S.C. § 102(b)).  
9 Works having “strong functional elements” are entitled to less protection than, for example,  
10 works of fiction. *Id.* (citing *Baker v. Selden*, 101 U.S. 99, 104 (1879)).

11 The testimony at trial established that the SSO of the 37 API packages is functional. *See,*  
12 *e.g.*, Dkt. 1047, Findings of Fact 8-9, 14-15 (citing RT 772:17-24, 773:14-16 (Bloch), RT 289:8-  
13 9, 290:8-12 (Ellison), RT 364:3-10 (Kurian), RT 1959:12-1960:18 (Schwartz), RT 784:9-21  
14 (Bloch), RT 1304:5-20 (Mitchell, TX 3542, Mitchell Depo. at 120:18-24, 121:1-10), RT 746:24-  
15 747:9, 747:25-748:6 (Bloch)). A reasonable jury would therefore be entitled to find that the SSO  
16 of the 37 API packages is strongly functional, that this fact outweighs any creativity in the  
17 process of designing the APIs, and that the functional nature of the SSO of the APIs therefore  
18 favors a finding of fair use.

19 **3. A reasonable jury could find that Google took only so much of the**  
20 **J2SE API packages as is necessary for compatibility, and that this**  
21 **either favors fair use, or is at least neutral.**

22 The third fair use factor considers the amount and substantiality of the portion used in  
23 relation to the work as a whole. Oracle’s infringement claim is based on the use of the SSO of  
24 only 37 of the 166 API packages in J2SE. RT 597:18-19 (Reinhold) (166 API packages in J2SE  
25 5.0); TX 1072 (37 accused API packages). In addition, the Android *implementing* code for those  
26 API packages is different than the J2SE *implementing* code. RT 2182:25-2183:1 (Astrachan)  
27 (“The implementation code in Android is completely different than the implementation code in  
28 Java.”). Based on these facts, a reasonable jury could find that the third factor favors Google.

Moreover, even if the jury found that the portion of the work that Google used is

1 significant, “[i]f the secondary user only copies as much as is necessary for his or her intended  
 2 use, then this factor will not weigh against him or her.” *Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.*, 336 F.3d 811,  
 3 820-21 (9th Cir. 2003). Here, by using only the SSO and not the implementing code, and by  
 4 limiting its use of the SSO to the API packages that developers are most likely to expect to be  
 5 able to use to write programs in the Java language for a smartphone platform, Google used only  
 6 as much of Oracle’s work as necessary. *See* RT 2196:7-2202:11 (Astrachan) (all 37 API  
 7 packages at issue provide basic functionalities needed to make practical use of the Java language  
 8 and are expected by developers). At a minimum, then, a reasonable jury could find that the third  
 9 factor weighs neither for nor against fair use. *See id.* at 821 (copying of entire copyrighted  
 10 images did not weigh against fair use where “[i]t was necessary for Arriba to copy the entire  
 11 image to allow users to recognize the image and decide whether to pursue more information about  
 12 the image or the originating web site”).

13 **4. A reasonable jury could find that there has been no adverse impact on**  
 14 **the actual or potential market for Oracle’s work, and that the fourth**  
 15 **factor thus favors fair use.**

16 “Whereas a work that merely supplants or supersedes another is likely to cause a  
 17 substantially adverse impact on the potential market of the original, *a transformative work is less*  
 18 *likely to do so.*” *Sony v. Connectix*, 203 F.3d at 607 (citing *Campbell*, 510 U.S. at 591) (emphasis  
 19 added). “No ‘presumption’ or inference of market harm that might find support in *Sony [Corp. of*  
 20 *Am. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.*, 464 U.S. 417 (1984),] is applicable to a case involving  
 21 something beyond mere duplication for commercial purposes.” *Campbell*, 510 U.S. at 591. At  
 22 most, such a presumption applies to “verbatim copying of the original in its entirety for  
 23 commercial purposes . . . .” *Id.* But where the defendant’s “use is transformative, market  
 24 substitution is at least less certain, and market harm may not be so readily inferred.” *Id.* The  
 25 Ninth Circuit’s analysis in *Sony v. Connectix* is instructive:

26 The district court found that “[t]o the extent that such a substitution [of  
 27 Connectix’s Virtual Game Station for Sony PlayStation console] occurs, Sony will  
 28 lose console sales and profits.” Order at 19. We recognize that this may be so.  
**But because the Virtual Game Station is transformative, and does not merely**  
**supplant the PlayStation console, the Virtual Game Station is a legitimate**  
**competitor in the market for platforms on which Sony and Sony-licensed**  
**games can be played.** *See Sega*, 977 F.2d at 1522-23. For this reason, some

1 economic loss by Sony as a result of this competition does not compel a finding of  
2 no fair use. **Sony understandably seeks control over the market for devices**  
3 **that play games Sony produces or licenses. The copyright law, however, does**  
4 **not confer such a monopoly.** *See id.* at 1523-24 (“[A]n attempt to monopolize  
5 the market by making it impossible for others to compete runs counter to the  
6 statutory purpose of promoting creative expression and cannot constitute a strong  
7 equitable basis for resisting the invocation of the fair use doctrine.”). **This factor**  
8 **favours Connectix.**

9 203 F.3d at 607-08 (emphasis added). As discussed above, a reasonable jury could conclude that  
10 Google’s use is at least modestly transformative, and that Android is a “legitimate competitor” in  
11 the market for platforms that implement the 37 API packages, not just the manufacturer of a  
12 product that supplants those APIs. The record suggests that Oracle seeks to control the market for  
13 software implementing the API packages at issue, just as Sony sought to control the market for  
14 devices that play Playstation games. *See, e.g.,* RT 374:21-375:5 (Kurian). However, just as  
15 copyright law does not give Sony a monopoly over the market for devices that play games Sony  
16 produces or licenses, copyright law does not give Oracle a monopoly over the market for software  
17 that implements the 37 API packages. Because Google’s use is transformative, the fourth factor  
18 favors Google, just as the fourth factor favored Connectix in *Sony v. Connectix*.

19 Moreover, a reasonable jury could reject Oracle’s evidence of market harm based on  
20 alleged fragmentation. First, according to a report Oracle Corporation prepared and submitted to  
21 the European Community in connection with its acquisition of Sun, in 2009 vendors already had  
22 and would continue to “‘fragment’ Java as a programming language and environment for  
23 developers.” TX 2237 at 13 (¶ 15); RT 572:6-20 (Screven). Indeed, Oracle maintains numerous  
24 different versions and profiles of the Java platform, with different sets of APIs for each, and code  
25 written for one version or profile will not necessarily run on a different version or profile of the  
26 Java platform. *See* RT 719:12-725:6 (Reinhold); *see also* TX 3508 at 2 (“Fragmented between  
27 Java SE and Java ME, and between Java ME mobile and TV and within mobile and TV.”). Dr.  
28 Reinhold testified, however, that the different sets of APIs available on different versions of the  
Java platform are not a problem:

Write once, run anywhere was never a promise that if you wrote code for  
one Java platform that it would automatically/magically work on another.

1           **The write once, run anywhere promise is relative to a specific one of**  
2           **the Java platforms.** If you write an application that uses Java SE 5, then you can  
3           run it on Sun’s implementation, on Oracle’s implementation, on IBM’s  
4           implementation, and on others.

5           Will that same code run on a particular configuration of Java ME? Well, it  
6           depends. It might. It might not. It depends which APIs it uses.

7           RT 725:10-20 (emphasis added); *see also* RT 563:10-564:1 (Screven) (different version of Java  
8           are not “forks” of each other because they are “each editions of Java specifically designed for a  
9           particular purpose”). That is, Oracle witnesses testified that “fragmentation” is harmful only if it  
10          occurs *within* a platform. Indeed, Oracle’s counsel specifically argued to the jury that differences  
11          *between* platforms are not harmful. RT 930:13-19 (summary by Jacobs). A reasonable jury could  
12          find that Android could not “fragment” J2SE, because it is a separate platform that was designed  
13          for a particular purpose distinct from the purpose for which J2SE was designed.

14          Finally, the jury is entitled to rely on evidence at trial that supports a finding that Android  
15          *helped* Oracle’s Java business rather than harming it. The evidence shows that Oracle’s Java  
16          business continues to grow at a double-digit rate. TX 573 at 5; RT 1925:23-1927:6 (Java  
17          platforms business was growing 13% year over year as of 2010); TX 3532 (Rizvi Depo. at  
18          229:13-229:21) (played at RT 1927:14-18) (Java platforms business continues to grow at a rate of  
19          approximately 10%). Jonathan Schwartz testified that Android was helping Sun’s Java business.  
20          RT 1992:2-19. Had Google taken a *different* route and *not* implemented the Java language and  
21          APIs, Mr. Schwartz testified that this “would have been horrible for Sun’s business.” RT  
22          1992:16-19.

23          Thus, on the trial record, a reasonable jury could find that Android is transformative, that  
24          Oracle’s evidence of fragmentation harm is contradicted by the testimony of its own witnesses,  
25          and that far from harming the market for Oracle’s Java platforms, Android helped that market.  
26          Based on the record, a reasonable jury could find, as the Ninth Circuit did in *Sony v. Connectix*,  
27          that the fourth factor favors fair use.

28           **D. Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the SSO of the 37 API**  
          **packages is not copyrightable.**

          Google has addressed the lack of copyrightability of the SSO of the 37 API packages in



1 prior briefs at great length. *See* Dkts. 260, 368, 562, 601, 778, 823, 831, 852, 860, 897, 898, 955,  
2 993. The SSO of the 37 API packages is not copyrightable by virtue of the express terms of 17  
3 U.S.C. § 102(b) (systems and methods of operation not protected), the Ninth Circuit’s  
4 interpretation of section 102(b) in *Sega*, 977 F.2d at 1522 (“functional requirements for  
5 compatibility” not protected), and the doctrines of merger and *scenes a faire*. For these reasons,  
6 and based on Google’s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, Google is entitled to  
7 judgment that the SSO of the 37 API packages is not copyrightable. *See* Dkt. 1047, Findings of  
8 Fact 1-36, Conclusions of Law 1-20. Oracle therefore is not entitled to judgment as a matter of  
9 law on that the SSO of the 37 API packages is copyrightable.

10 **E. Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s SSO derivative**  
11 **work claim.**

12 Google, not Oracle, is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s claim that  
13 Google’s implementation of the 37 API packages is an unlawful derivative work of the English  
14 language *descriptions* of those packages in Oracle’s specifications. As the Court has recognized,  
15 Oracle’s derivative work claim is a “classic case of trying to lay claim to the ownership of an  
16 idea.” RT 1869:15-16; *see also* RT 1368:25-1369:1 (Oracle’s derivative work argument “just  
17 seems to me to be invalid under the basic tenets of copyright law”); RT 1375:22-24 (Oracle’s  
18 derivative work claim doesn’t “add[] anything, except violating the principle of you can’t get a  
19 monopoly and ownership over an idea”).

20 The Court has already rejected Oracle’s derivative work theory. *See* RT 2434:13-  
21 2435:16. The Court’s conclusion is sound, because Oracle’s derivative work claim is contrary to  
22 the idea/expression dichotomy that is codified in section 102(b) of the Copyright Act. It also is  
23 contrary to the statutory definition of a derivative work, which is a work based on “one or more  
24 preexisting works,” 17 U.S.C. § 101, not a work based on preexisting *ideas*.

25 Oracle’s approach is barred by *Baker v. Selden*:

26 To give to the author of the book an exclusive property in the art described therein,  
27 when no examination of its novelty has ever been officially made, would be a  
28 surprise and a fraud upon the public. That is the province of letters-patent, not of  
copyright. The claim to an invention or discovery of an art or manufacture must  
be subjected to the examination of the Patent Office before an exclusive right

1           therein can be obtained; and it can only be secured by a patent from the  
2           government.

3           101 U.S. 99, 102 (1879). It is also barred by *Mazer v. Stein*: “Unlike a patent, a copyright gives  
4           no exclusive right to the art disclosed; protection is given only to the expression of the idea—not  
5           the idea itself.” 347 U.S. 201, 217 (1954). And it is barred by *Sega*, under which “functional  
6           requirements for compatibility” with a system described by or implemented in a copyrighted  
7           work cannot be protected by copyright law. 977 F.2d at 1522.

8           For these reasons, and those expressed in Google’s brief in support of its second motion  
9           for judgment as a matter of law (*see* Dkt. 1043 at 7:4-8:12), Oracle is not entitled to judgment as a  
10          matter of law on its derivative work claim.

11           **F.       Google is entitled to judgment in its favor on its equitable defenses.**

12          For the reasons given in Google’s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law  
13          regarding its equitable defenses, Google, not Oracle, is entitled to judgment on those defenses.  
14          Sun knew about and approved unlicensed, open source implementations of the Java API packages  
15          as long as the implementation did not use the Java brand. *See* Dkt. 1047, Findings of Fact 37-52.  
16          As early as 2005, Sun knew Google intended to implement Java API packages in Android, and  
17          Sun never told Google it needed a license to do so. *See id.*, Findings of Fact 53-61. After Google  
18          publicly announced Android, Sun congratulated Google and welcomed Google to the Java  
19          community. *See id.*, Findings of Fact 62-72 After Google’s announcement of Android and  
20          release of the Android SDK, Sun continued to talk with Google and publicly support Android.  
21          *See id.*, Findings of Fact 73-81. Google was aware of and relied on Sun’s public statements of  
22          approval and acts of support for the Android platform. *See id.*, Findings of Fact 82-87. Oracle  
23          initially encouraged Android and tried to partner with Google. *See id.*, Findings of Fact 88-92.

24          Based on these facts, Oracle’s copyright claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.  
25          *Danjaq LLC v. Sony Corp.*, 263 F.3d 942, 951-52, 956 (9th Cir. 2001); *Collegenet, Inc. v. XAP Corp.*,  
26          483 F. Supp. 2d 1058, 1061 (D. Or. 2007); *Haas v. Leo Feist, Inc.*, 234 F. 105, 108 (S.D.N.Y. 1916  
27          (L. Hand, J.); Dkt. 1047, Conclusions of Law 24-26.

28          These facts also establish that Oracle’s copyright claims are barred by equitable estoppel.

1 *Hampton v. Paramount Pictures Corp.*, 279 F.2d 100, 104 (9th Cir. 1960); *United States v. King*  
 2 *Features Ent., Inc.*, 843 F.2d 394, 399-400 (9th Cir. 1988); *Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*,  
 3 609 F. Supp. 2d 988, 1025 (N.D. Cal. 2009) *aff'd*, 645 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2011); *A.C. Aukerman*  
 4 *Co. v. R.L. Chaides Const. Co.*, 960 F.2d 1020, 1042 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *Carmichael Lodge No. 2103 v.*  
 5 *Leonard*, CIV S-07-2665 LKK/GGH, 2009 WL 2985476 at \*15 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2009); Dkt.  
 6 1047, Conclusions of Law 27-34.

7 In addition, the equitable doctrine of implied license bars Oracle's copyright claims.  
 8 *Lulirama Ltd., Inc. v. Axxess Broad. Services, Inc.*, 128 F.3d 872, 879 (5th Cir. 1997); *Wang*  
 9 *Laboratories, Inc. v. Mitsubishi Electronics America, Inc.*, 103 F.3d 1571, 1576, 1580, 1581-82  
 10 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Effects Associates, Inc. v. Cohen*, 908 F.2d 555, 558-59 (9th Cir. 1990); *McCoy*  
 11 *v. Mitsuboshi Cutlery, Inc.*, 67 F.3d 917, 920 (Fed. Cir. 1995); Dkt. 1047, Conclusions of Law  
 12 24-25, 29-32, 38-39.

13 Finally, the doctrine of waiver bars Oracle's copyright claims. *United States v. King*  
 14 *Features Entm't, Inc.*, 843 F.2d 394, 399 (9th Cir. 1988); *Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*,  
 15 645 F.3d 1336, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2011), *cert. denied*, 132 S. Ct. 1540 (2012); *Qualcomm Inc. v.*  
 16 *Broadcom Corp.*, 548 F.3d 1004, 1019-20 (Fed. Cir. 2008); Dkt. 1047, Conclusions of Law 42-44.

17 Because the record supports each of Google's equitable defenses, Oracle is not entitled to  
 18 judgment on those defenses.

### 19 **III. CONCLUSION**

20 For the foregoing reasons, Google respectfully requests that the Court deny Oracle's  
 21 motion.

22 Dated: May 7, 2012

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

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

25 Attorneys for Defendant  
 26 GOOGLE INC.