

No. 04-480

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

METRO-GOLDWYN-MAYER STUDIOS, INC., *et al.*,

Petitioners,

v.

GROKSTER, LTD., *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE THE CONSUMER ELECTRONICS
ASSOCIATION, THE COMPUTER & COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION, AND THE HOME RECORDING RIGHTS COALITION
IN SUPPORT OF AFFIRMANCE**

BRUCE G. JOSEPH

Counsel of Record

KARYN K. ABLIN

SCOTT E. BAIN

WILEY REIN & FIELDING LLP

1776 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 719-7000

Counsel for Amici Curiae

193015



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Table of Cited Authorities	iv
Interest of the Amici	1
Summary of Argument	2
Argument	5
I. The Only Question Before this Court Is Whether Providing a Technology Capable of Substantial Noninfringing Use Constitutes Infringement.	5
II. The <i>Betamax</i> Doctrine Is the Foundation of this Nation’s Explosive Technological Growth Over the Last Twenty Years and Is Particularly Critical to New Digital Technologies.	7
A. Digital Technology Operates by Making, Manipulating and Moving Copies.	8
B. Without <i>Betamax</i> , Copyright Law Would Create the Risk of Massive Liability for Almost Every Participant in Our Digital Economy.	9
C. Copyright Owners Have a Long History of Exploiting Uncertainties in Copyright Law To Attack New Technologies.	10
D. The <i>Betamax</i> Doctrine Is Essential To Protect Innovation.	12

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
III. The Copyright Act Forecloses Judicial Abrogation of the <i>Betamax</i> Doctrine.	13
A. Copyright Is a Carefully Balanced, Statutory Right Intended To Serve the Public Interest that Should Not Be Judicially Expanded.	13
B. The Copyright Act Does Not Permit Imposition of Liability for Providing Technology that Is Capable of Substantial Noninfringing Use.	15
C. The <i>Betamax</i> Doctrine Applies Regardless of Whether Secondary Copyright Liability Is Labeled “Contributory” or “Vicarious.”	19
IV. Petitioners’ Theories for Imposing Secondary Liability and Limiting <i>Betamax</i> Are an Improper Invitation to Judicial Legislation. . .	20
A. Petitioners’ “Principal Use” Standard and the United States’ “Relative Significance” Test Are Foreclosed by <i>Betamax</i>	21
B. Petitioners Are Incorrect To Focus on Current Uses of a Technology.	23
C. The United States’ Focus on Respondents’ Business and “Commercial Viability” Misconstrues the <i>Betamax</i> Standard. . .	24

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
D. Providing a Technology that Is Capable of Substantial Noninfringing Use Is Not Inducement.	25
E. There Is No Duty To Design Technologies To Minimize the Possibility of Infringement.	26
Conclusion	30

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

	<i>Page</i>
Cases:	
<i>A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2002)	20
<i>In re Aimster</i> , 334 F.3d 643 (7th Cir. 2003)	5, 20, 27
<i>Ashcroft v. ACLU</i> , ___ U.S. ___, 124 S. Ct. 2783 (2004)	21
<i>Central Bank v. First Interstate Bank</i> , 511 U.S. 164 (1994)	15, 16
<i>Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes v. United States</i> , 343 F.3d 1193 (9th Cir. 2003)	17
<i>Correctional Services Corp. v. Molesko</i> , 534 U.S. 61 (2001)	16
<i>County of Washington v. Gunther</i> , 452 U.S. 161 (1981)	3, 17
<i>Ellison v. Robertson</i> , 357 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2004)	12, 19, 25
<i>Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 517 (1994)	3, 9, 14, 20
<i>Fonovisa, Inc. v. Cherry Auction, Inc.</i> , 76 F.3d 259 (9th Cir. 1996)	19

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Gershwin Publishing Corp. v. Columbia Artists Management, Inc.</i> , 443 F.2d 1159 (2d Cir. 1971)	26
<i>International Union v. Westinghouse Electric Corp.</i> , 631 F.2d 1094 (3d Cir. 1980)	17
<i>Kalem Co. v. Harper Bros.</i> , 222 U.S. 55 (1911)	17, 18
<i>Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.</i> , 336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003)	12
<i>MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.</i> , 259 F. Supp. 2d 1029 (C.D. Cal. 2003)	5, 26
<i>MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster Ltd.</i> , 380 F.3d 1154 (9th Cir. 2004)	12
<i>Manville Sales Corp. v. Paramount System Inc.</i> , 917 F.2d 544 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	26
<i>Mertens v. Hewitt Associates</i> , 508 U.S. 248 (1993)	16
<i>Muscarello v. United States</i> , 524 U.S. 125 (1998)	17
<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa International Service Ass'n</i> , No. C-04-0371, 2004 WL 1773349 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 5, 2004)	12

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
<i>RIAA v. Diamond Multimedia System</i> , 180 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 1999)	10, 11
<i>Religious Technology Center. v. Netcom On-Line Communication Services, Inc.</i> , 907 F. Supp. 1361 (N.D. Cal. 1995)	19
<i>Reno v. ACLU</i> , 521 U.S. 844 (1997)	8
<i>Sony Corp. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> , 464 U.S. 417 (1984)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Stewart v. Abend</i> , 495 U.S. 207 (1990)	15
<i>Thompson v. Hubbard</i> , 131 U.S. 123 (1889)	15
<i>Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken</i> , 422 U.S. 151 (1975)	14
<i>UMG Recordings, Inc. v. MP3.com, Inc.</i> , 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1376 (S.D.N.Y. 2000)	9
<i>Universal City Studios, Inc. v. Sony Corp. of Am.</i> , 480 F. Supp. 429 (C.D. Cal. 1979)	27
<i>Wheaton v. Peters</i> , 33 U.S. (8 Pet.) 591 (1834)	3, 13
<i>White-Smith Music Publishing Co. v. Apollo Co.</i> , 209 U.S. 1 (1908)	13-14

Cited Authorities

Page

Constitution, Statutes, and Rules:

U.S. CONST., art. I, § 8, cl. 8	3, 8, 14
17 U.S.C. § 102	22
17 U.S.C. § 106	3, 15, 16
17 U.S.C. § 107	10
17 U.S.C. § 501	15
17 U.S.C. § 501(a)	16
17 U.S.C. § 504(c)	9
17 U.S.C. § 1009	13
17 U.S.C. § 1201(c)(3)	28-29
17 U.S.C. § 1201(k)	29
17 U.S.C. § 1203	13
28 U.S.C. § 1254(l)	6
28 U.S.C. § 1292(b)	5
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)	22
35 U.S.C. § 103	22

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
Audio Home Recording Act, Pub. L. No. 102-563, 106 Stat. 4237 (1992) (codified at 17 U.S.C. §§ 1001-1010).	10-11, 13
Digital Millennium Copyright Act, Pub. L. No. 105- 304, 112 Stat. 2860 (1998) (codified at 17 U.S.C. §§ 1201-1205).	13, 28
Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b)	5
Legislative Materials:	
144 CONG. REC. E2144 (daily ed. Oct. 13, 1998)	29
144 CONG. REC. E2166 (daily ed. Oct. 14, 1998)	29
144 CONG. REC. H10621 (daily ed. Oct. 12, 1998)	29
144 CONG. REC. H7094-95 (daily ed. Aug. 4, 1998)	29
144 CONG. REC. S11887-88 (daily ed. Oct. 8, 1998)	29
151 CONG. REC. S482 (daily ed. Jan. 25, 2005)	18
H.R. REP. NO. 94-1476 (1976)	18
H.R. REP. NO. 102-873 (1992)	10

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
H.R. REP. NO. 106-216 (1999)	9
S. REP. NO. 93-983 (1974)	18
S. REP. NO. 94-473 (1975)	18
Miscellaneous:	
John Perry Barlow, <i>The Next Economy of Ideas</i> , WIRED, Oct. 2000, http://www.wired.com/wired/ archive/8.10/download_pr.html	24
BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY (4th ed. 1968)	17
BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY (5th ed. 1979)	16-17
BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY (6th ed. 1990)	17
BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY (8th ed. 1999)	17
William Bowen, <i>How the Japanese Won the VCR Wars</i> , FORTUNE, June 8, 1987	23
Complaint, <i>Cahn v. Sony Corp.</i> , No. 90 civ. 4537 (S.D.N.Y. July 9, 1990)	10
Complaint, <i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. 04-9484 (C.D. Cal. filed Nov. 19, 2004) ...	12
Jocelyn Dabeau & William Fisher, <i>The DAT Controversy</i> , at http://www.law.harvard.edu/ faculty/tfisher/music/DAT.html (visited Feb. 28, 2005)	10

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
Benny Evangelista, <i>Piracy Suits Chill Valley, Moves Peril Profit, Techies Say</i> , SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, Feb. 20, 2003	11
2 PAUL GOLDSTEIN, COPYRIGHT § 6.1.2 (2d ed. 2003)	20
Marci A. Hamilton, <i>Copyright at the Supreme Court: A Jurisprudence of Deference</i> , 47 J. COPYRIGHT SOCIETY U.S.A. 317 (2000)	14, 15
Jennifer Holt, <i>In Deregulation We Trust: The Synergy of Politics and Industry in Reagan-era Hollywood</i> , FILM QUARTERLY (Winter 2001), http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1070/is_2_55/ai_83477537	23
Brad King, <i>MP3.com Goes Universal</i> , WIRED NEWS (May 25, 2001), http://www.wired.com/news/mp3/0,1285,43972,00.html	9
Jim Krane, <i>FCC's Powell Declares TiVo 'God's Machine'</i> , TULSA WORLD, Jan. 11, 2003	8
JESSICA LITMAN, DIGITAL COPYRIGHT (2001)	15
Peter S. Menell, Symposium, <i>IV. Can Our Current Conception of Copyright Law Survive the Internet Age?</i> , 46 N.Y. L. SCH. L. REV. 63 (2002)	7, 12, 13
MGM Complaint, <i>MGM Studios, Inc. v. ReplayTV, Inc.</i> , No. 01-09801 (C.D. Cal. filed Nov. 14, 2001)	11

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
Motion Picture Studios Defendants' Statement Clarifying Claims, <i>Huntsman v. Soderbergh</i> , No. 02-M-1662 (D. Colo. Mar. 11, 2003)	11
Order Certifying April 25, 2003 Order for Immediate Appeal, <i>MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.</i> , No. CV 01-08541-SVW (C.D. Cal. filed June 18, 2003)	6
Time Warner Complaint, <i>MGM Studios, Inc. v. ReplayTV, Inc.</i> , No. 01-09801 (C.D. Cal. filed Nov. 9, 2001)	11

INTEREST OF THE *AMICI*¹

In this brief, *amici curiae* the Consumer Electronics Association (“CEA”), the Computer & Communications Industry Association (“CCIA”) and the Home Recording Rights Coalition (“HRRC”) offer a critical perspective on the “capable of substantial noninfringing use” doctrine (the “*Betamax* doctrine”) enunciated in *Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc.*, 464 U.S. 417 (1984) (“*Betamax*”). The *Betamax* doctrine stands as the Magna Carta of the Digital Age. It has permitted the development of manifold technologies and devices ranging from VCRs to personal video recorders such as TiVo to computers to digital television and radio to the Internet itself, all of which operate by making multiple copies of information.

CEA is the principal U.S. trade association of the consumer electronics industry, the industry that gave rise to the VCR at issue in *Betamax* and myriad other digital technologies that enrich peoples’ lives. CEA represents more than 2,000 manufacturers of consumer electronics devices, computers, and other technologies. CEA members range from some of the largest information technology companies in the world to family-owned, entrepreneurial businesses that design, manufacture and sell a wide variety of innovative digital and analog consumer electronics equipment.

CCIA members come from all sectors of the computer and communications industry. Ranging in size from small entrepreneurial firms to some of the largest companies in the industry, CCIA members employ over half a million workers and generate over \$200 billion in annual sales. For 33 years, CCIA has been dedicated to promoting open markets, open systems, open networks and full, fair and open competition. CCIA members believe that intellectual property protection is a

1. The parties have filed letters with the Court consenting to all *amicus* briefs. No counsel for a party has written this brief in whole or in part, and no person or entity, other than *amici*, their members, or their counsel, has made a monetary contribution to the preparation or submission of this brief.

vital component of the innovation dynamic, but that excessive protection can be as harmful as too little. The vigorous competition and interactive dynamic nature of innovation, which are the keys to the success of all technology industries, require a well-balanced system.

The HRRC was founded in 1981, shortly after the Ninth Circuit announced the decision ultimately reversed by this Court in *Betamax*. It is a leading advocacy group dedicated to preserving consumers' rights to use home electronics products for private, noncommercial purposes, including the right to use these products to make lawful fair uses of copyrighted works. The members and supporters of HRRC include consumers, retailers, manufacturers, and professional servicers of consumer electronics products.

Amici believe in strong copyright protection and recognize the important relationship between electronics devices and the commercial content available for use on those devices.² At the same time, *amici* are steadfast in their conviction that strong copyright protection does not require the adoption of broad rules, such as those advocated by petitioners, that will suffocate the invention and introduction of new technology. Neither the Copyright Act nor precedent permits such rules. Nothing in this case requires such a rule.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This case comes to this Court on an interlocutory appeal sought by petitioners and certified by the court below as to only one narrow issue—whether respondents' distribution of the *current* versions of their software constitutes copyright infringement, *vel non*. Notwithstanding petitioners' overstated "question presented" and rhetoric, respondents' alleged past bad

2. Thus, *amici* neither condone nor support any business built "with the specific intent of inducing infringement," to profit from that infringement, Mot. Picture Studio & Recording Co. Pet'rs ("MPRC") Br. 26, by providing technology "knowing full well [it is] used for massive infringement and little or nothing else." *Id.* at 25.

conduct, intent and means of building their businesses are still before the district court, and not before this Court. *Infra*, Part I.

This Court has consistently held that copyright is solely a creature of statute, not the common law, and that the scope of the right, and the available remedies, must be strictly construed. *E.g.*, *Wheaton v. Peters*, 33 U.S. (8 Pet.) 591, 659-64, 667-68 (1834); *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 430. The need for strict construction is heightened by the fact that the ultimate goal of copyright is to serve the public interest, not the author's private interest, *see, e.g.*, U.S. CONST., art. I, § 8, cl. 8; *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 429; *Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 517, 527 (1994). Achieving that goal requires a delicate and "difficult balance between the interests of authors . . . and society's competing interest in the free flow of ideas, information, and commerce." *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 429. The task of balancing falls to Congress, for only "Congress has the . . . institutional ability to accommodate fully the varied permutations of competing interests." *Id.* at 431. Congress can effect this balance only if courts hew closely to the statute as written. *Infra*, Part III.A.

There is no basis in the Copyright Act to impose liability on one who provides a technology that is capable of substantial noninfringing use. The Copyright Act imposes liability only on those who "do" or "authorize" the violation of one of six specified "exclusive rights" with respect to a copyrighted work. 17 U.S.C. § 106. Petitioners do not contend that respondents "do" any act invading any of these exclusive rights. Nor can they credibly maintain that respondents improperly "authorize" such acts by providing software. *County of Washington v. Gunther*, 452 U.S. 161, 168-69 (1981) ("authorize" means to "empower, to give a right or authority to act" (citation omitted)). Any other result would run counter to the Copyright Act and to this Court's admonitions that secondary liability under statutory causes of action must be narrowly construed. *Infra* Part III.B.

Moreover, the *Betamax* doctrine has served this nation well. The Digital Age, which has revolutionized the way Americans

express themselves, do business, communicate and even engage in political speech and action, owes its existence to the principle that the copyright monopoly does not control technologies capable of substantial noninfringing use. All digital technologies operate by making copies of millions upon millions of bits. Without *Betamax*, technology inventors and investors would be subject to claims that they are liable for infringement by others and would face potentially ruinous statutory damages. *Infra* Part II.A & B.

These risks are exacerbated because the precise scope of copyrights in the Digital Age remains controversial. Copyright owners of all types and sizes have been quick to challenge any new technology they believe threatens existing business models. This has included efforts to stop the sale of hugely popular products such as digital video recorders and MP3 players, and software that empowers families to skip offensive material in motion pictures, as well as efforts by pornographers to hold Internet search engines and even credit card companies responsible for infringement of their pornography. *Infra* Parts II.C & D.

Petitioners and their supporting *amici* ask this Court to legislate expansive new “federal common law” theories of secondary copyright liability that have no basis in the Copyright Act or *Betamax*. These theories would chill innovation and stifle growth. Conversely, none would serve petitioners’ purpose, for any software found to be infringing under petitioners’ theories would remain freely available from overseas websites.

Petitioners’ “principal use” test and the government’s “relative significance” and “commercial viability” tests contravene *Betamax*. That case specifically found that authorized time shifting, a fractional minority use, sufficed to justify the sale of VCRs, without regard to commercial viability. 464 U.S. at 444-47. *Betamax* also makes clear that petitioners’ focus on current use is misplaced. History shows that technologies and their uses can change dramatically over time. Nor is there any

precedent or basis for petitioners' proposed, unbounded cause of action for inducement.

Petitioners request that this Court follow the Seventh Circuit's creative enterprise in *In re Aimster*, 334 F.3d 643 (7th Cir. 2003), and require a post hoc analysis of the steps a technology designer *might* have taken to limit infringement. This would create a nightmare for innovators and courts alike. As the government recognizes, the "rule is neither desirable nor supported by precedent." U.S. Br. 19-20 n.3. Moreover, it is flatly inconsistent with the policy expressly adopted by Congress when it considered this very issue in the 1998 Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA").

The liability that petitioners seek to impose inexorably would eviscerate the *Betamax* doctrine, extend the copyright monopoly beyond protected expression to include control over technology, obligate manufacturers and technology providers to restrict designs of products and services capable of lawful and valuable uses, and chill development of exciting new technologies. If adopted, petitioners' brand of copyright law would yield exactly the opposite result from that mandated by the Constitution—it would *stifle* rather than "promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts."

ARGUMENT

I. THE ONLY QUESTION BEFORE THIS COURT IS WHETHER PROVIDING A TECHNOLOGY CAPABLE OF SUBSTANTIAL NONINFRINGEMENT USE CONSTITUTES INFRINGEMENT.

This case comes to this Court on petitioners' appeal of an interlocutory order directing entry of partial final judgment under FED. R. CIV. P. 54(b) and a certification under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) on only one narrow issue—whether the distribution of respondents' current versions of their software constitutes copyright infringement. *MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 259 F. Supp. 2d 1029, 1033 (C.D. Cal. 2003) ("the Court at this time considers only whether the *current versions* of Grokster's and StreamCast's products and services subject either party to

liability”); Order Certifying Apr. 25, 2003 Order for Immediate Appeal, at 3, *MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, No. CV 01-08541-SVW (C.D. Cal. filed June 18, 2003) (“Plaintiffs’ copyright claims as they apply to present versus past conduct are factually (and, potentially, legally) distinct”); *id.* at 8-9 (Apr. 25 Order did not reach liability issues “arising from *past* versions of their software, or from other past activities”). Further, petitioners have cited little, if any, bad conduct tied to distribution of the current software. Thus, all that is at issue is the distribution of the current software.

Despite their strategic decision to pursue this limited interlocutory appeal, petitioners now urge this Court to consider respondents’ alleged *past* bad conduct, bad intent and their unlawful building of businesses based on infringement. Those issues are pending in the district court and *are not before this Court*.³ The district court retains jurisdiction to determine the appropriate scope of forward-looking equitable relief if past wrongful conduct is shown.

Petitioners have grossly overstated the question presented in their Petition for Certiorari and opening briefs. Nothing in the Ninth Circuit’s decision purports to “immunize[] [respondents] from copyright liability.” MPRC Br. i. This Court should not change settled law, create a cause of action not recognized by Congress, and place the growth of the entire digital economy at risk on the basis of an undeveloped record and overstated and erroneous concerns—not properly before this Court—that bad actors may escape liability.

3. *Cf.* 28 U.S.C. § 1254(l) (permitting extraordinary grant of cert. petition before judgment only as to cases pending in the *courts of appeals*).

II. THE *BETAMAX* DOCTRINE IS THE FOUNDATION OF THIS NATION'S EXPLOSIVE TECHNOLOGICAL GROWTH OVER THE LAST TWENTY YEARS AND IS PARTICULARLY CRITICAL TO NEW DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES.

Since the *Betamax* decision, this nation has experienced a transformation in the way its citizens express themselves, do business, communicate, experience the world and preserve their memories. That transformation is a direct result of huge investments in resources, energy and creativity in digital technology. No success story has been more important to the public or the economy in the past twenty years.⁴

It is no overstatement to say that the Digital Age owes its existence to the *Betamax* doctrine. Thus, while the technology sector is speaking before this Court with numerous voices that have filed *amicus* briefs with various captions, *the message across the entire sector is the same*: The technology industries are united in their views that the *Betamax* doctrine must be upheld and not weakened.⁵

4. The U.S. information technology sector accounts for more than \$500 billion in domestic sales (more than \$1 trillion worldwide) and generates a huge portion of the nation's GDP growth. Business Software Alliance ("BSA") Br. 4 & n.5. "The economic significance of the technology sector to the United States economy vastly exceeds the contributions of the content industries." Peter S. Menell, Symposium, *IV. Can Our Current Conception of Copyright Law Survive the Internet Age?*, 46 N.Y.L. SCH. L. REV. 63, 168 & n.368 (2002) (The consumer electronics industry alone "is several times larger than the music and film industries combined.").

5. Tech sector briefs in support of *Betamax* have been filed "in support of petitioners," BSA Br., and "in support of neither party," Digital Media Ass'n *et al.* ("DiMa") Br.; IEEE-USA Br. Numerous briefs, in addition to this one, are being filed "in support of affirmance," *e.g.*, Internet *Amici* Br. All of these parties also agree that (i) "capable of substantial noninfringing use" does not mean "primary use," *infra* Part IV.A, and (ii) requiring a post-hoc analysis of steps that the technology provider might have taken to minimize infringement would destroy innovation and is contrary to law, *infra* Part IV.D.

A. Digital Technology Operates by Making, Manipulating and Moving Copies.

All digital technologies operate by making copies of millions of digital bits of information. This is obvious in the case of devices such as digital cameras, digital video recorders,⁶ portable MP3 players, like the Rio and iPod, and digital audio recording media such as recordable compact discs. Personal computers are, similarly, enormous copying machines with immense storage capacity. Nearly every major institution and enterprise depends upon digital infrastructures and computer networks that copy and store information. Other digital products and services, including digital television and satellite radio, rely upon copying less obviously but just as extensively, through buffering and other routine operations.

The Internet itself also operates by copying undifferentiated and often unidentified binary data. Every piece of information that a person encounters while browsing the Internet is copied both in the random access memory and on the hard drive of that person's computer. The bits are moved using "store and forward" technology that literally copies them in multiple servers and routers in the course of transmission. In other words, digital copying technology is responsible for what this Court described as "a unique and wholly new medium of worldwide human communication," and a "new marketplace of ideas" containing "vast democratic forums," from which "any person with a phone line can become a town crier with a voice that resonates farther than it could from any soapbox." *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844, 850, 868, 870, 885 (1997).

Each of these technologies promotes "the Progress of Science." U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8, cl. 8. Indeed, they most directly serve a core interest of copyright—the "interest in the free flow of ideas, information, and commerce," *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 429,

6. The digital video recorder has so changed how the public experiences television that the Chairman of the FCC described the pioneering TiVo as "God's Machine." Jim Krane, *FCC's Powell Declares TiVo 'God's Machine,'* TULSA WORLD, Jan. 11, 2003, at E3.

and “the purpose of enriching the general public through access to creative works,” *Fogerty*, 510 U.S. at 527—providing the very means by which information flow and access are provided.

B. Without *Betamax*, Copyright Law Would Create the Risk of Massive Liability for Almost Every Participant in Our Digital Economy.

Without the *Betamax* doctrine, each of these technologies would be subject to claims that it “promotes,” “contributes to,” “benefits from” or even “induces” infringement. Technology developers would face massive liability should any such claim succeed. The Copyright Act provides for statutory damages of up to \$30,000 *per infringed work* with a mandatory minimum of \$750 per work for even ordinary, non-willful infringement.⁷ When technologies are capable of handling thousands or tens of thousands of separate works, even the mandatory minimum can quickly become ruinous.⁸ Congress carefully calibrated the unique remedies available in copyright law to deter direct infringement; they are not designed to penalize legitimate technological innovation.⁹

7. 17 U.S.C. § 504(c). The per-work maximum for willful infringement is \$150,000. *Id.* This discussion highlights two of many fundamental errors in the brief of the economics professors. Kenneth J. Arrow *et al.* (“Economists”) Br. They acknowledge that where “penalties can be raised such that the low likelihood of prosecution can be offset by high penalties[,] . . . direct deterrence will work and indirect liability is therefore unnecessary and likely unwise.” *Id.* at 5. But that is precisely the basis of copyright statutory damages. Second, there is no legal ground for their suggestion, *id.* at 10, that a court can, in cases of secondary liability, award only injunctive relief and not statutory damages.

8. *See, e.g., UMG Recordings, Inc. v. MP3.com, Inc.*, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1376, 1381 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (awarding \$25,000 per work for thousands of works “copied” in connection with service, without demonstration of injury). These damages forced MP3.com to sell itself to one of the plaintiffs. Brad King, *MP3.com Goes Universal*, WIRED NEWS (May 25, 2001), <http://www.wired.com/news/mp3/0,1285,43972,00.html>.

9. *See, e.g., H.R. REP. NO. 106-216*, at 3 (1999) (statutory damages increased to deter “computer users” who “believe that they will not be
(Cont’d)

C. Copyright Owners Have a Long History of Exploiting Uncertainties in Copyright Law To Attack New Technologies.

Worse yet, the precise scope of copyright rights vis-à-vis the innovative products and services of the Digital Age remains subject to uncertainty and controversy. Copyright owners have been quick to challenge digital technologies that facilitate arguably lawful uses they dislike. The fair use doctrine, 17 U.S.C. § 107, has been under constant attack. Moreover, these challenges have not been limited to distribution technologies; they include attacks on technologies that facilitate private conduct relating to lawfully acquired content.

Starting in the mid-eighties, copyright owners delayed for years the introduction of digital audio tape technology using lobbying and lawsuits.¹⁰ The impasse was broken only after lengthy negotiations among electronics manufacturers and copyright owners resulted in the Audio Home Recording Act of 1992 (“AHRA”), which immunized from suit the sale and use of digital audio recording devices and separately imposed a duty to use a specific copy limitation technology.

In 1999, copyright owners tried to enjoin the manufacture and sale of MP3 players, now among the most popular new consumer electronics devices on the market. The recording industry’s trade association (RIAA) sued Diamond Multimedia over the company’s Rio product, an early portable MP3 player. *RIAA v. Diamond Multimedia Sys.*, 180 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 1999). RIAA asserted that demand for these devices would be non-existent without infringement and maintained that the

(Cont’d)

caught or prosecuted” and “individuals” who use “new technology” to store massive amounts of material and create perfect copies).

10. See Jocelyn Dabeau & William Fisher, *The DAT Controversy*, at <http://www.law.harvard.edu/faculty/tfisher/musicDAT.html> (visited Feb. 28, 2005); H.R. REP. NO. 102-873, at 9-10 (1992); Complaint, *Cahn v. Sony Corp. of Am.*, No. 90 civ. 4537 (S.D.N.Y. filed July 9, 1990).

devices had to be redesigned to comply with the AHRA. *Id.* at 1075. The Ninth Circuit disagreed, holding that MP3 players were not subject to the AHRA and noting with foresight that the popularity of the devices was driven in part by a “burgeoning” legitimate trade in Internet music. *Id.* at 1074, 1081.

In 2001, seeking to narrow *Betamax*, the movie industry attacked DVRs, separately challenging both their consumer-friendly storage and indexing capabilities as well as features facilitating the skipping of material and permitting remote access.¹¹ The defendants, ReplayTV and its parent, could not afford to defend themselves and were forced into bankruptcy.¹²

The movie industry more recently has targeted Clearplay, which provides software that allows viewers to skip violent or sexual content when watching DVDs at home. Even though Clearplay’s software resides on the playback device, is entirely user-driven and does not copy or alter the underlying DVD in any way, the industry has asserted various infringement theories. Mot. Picture Studio Defs. Stmts. Clarifying Claims, *Huntsman v. Soderbergh*, No. 02-M-1662 (D. Colo. Mar. 11, 2003). Similar content provider efforts to block and force modifications to new technologies, such as the TiVo and Digital Audio Broadcasting, are well documented. *See Internet Amici Br. Part II.*

Attacks on technology are not limited to the major record or movie companies. Non-mainstream copyright owners and

11. MGM Compl. ¶¶ 24-25, *MGM Studios, Inc. v. ReplayTV, Inc.*, No. 01-09801 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2001) (including separate allegations related to seeking, recording, sorting, and storage as “inducement” to infringement); Time Warner Compl., *id.* (Nov. 9, 2001).

12. *See* Benny Evangelista, *Piracy Suits Chill Valley, Moves Peril Profit, Techies Say*, SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, Feb. 20, 2003 (“Sonicblue Chief Executive Officer Greg Ballard said his company is spending \$3 million per quarter on legal fees to defend itself [in the ReplayTV case]. Ballard said the legal costs are in turn preventing Sonicblue from hiring about 120 employees who could drive future innovations for the company.”).

individuals also push to expand the limits of copyright protection at the expense of innovation.¹³

These challenges are only the latest in a long history of misguided attempts by copyright owners to stifle or control new technology. *See MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster Ltd.*, 380 F.3d 1154, 1167 (9th Cir. 2004) (referencing history of attacks on the player piano, photocopier, tape recorder, etc.). In most cases, the federal courts have rejected these requests for judicial legislation.

D. The *Betamax* Doctrine Is Essential To Protect Innovation.

Innovation is inherently risky and requires substantial capital investment. Such risks will not be taken in an environment where market uncertainties are compounded by the threat of suit and possible massive statutory liability even if the innovation is successful, and even if the use that is fostered is lawful. *See Menell, supra* note 4, at 160-61 (recounting how after Napster, “venture capitalists became increasingly wary of the legal costs, economic risk, and potential vicarious liability associated with investing in these ventures”).¹⁴ Investment has

13. *See, e.g., Compl., Perfect 10, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, No. 04-9484 (C.D. Cal. filed Nov. 19, 2004) (pornography copyright owner suing Internet search engine for providing links to allegedly infringing works); *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa Int’l Serv. Ass’n*, No. C-04-0371, 2004 WL 1773349 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 5) (suit against credit card companies used by allegedly infringing website operators); *Ellison v. Robertson*, 357 F.3d 1072, 1074 (9th Cir. 2004) (author suit against AOL for copies of works stored by third-party user); *Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.*, 336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003) (photographer suit against search engine for display of search results).

14. Ironically, Professor Menell seeks to increase the chilling effect he recognizes in his academic writing by advocating an unpredictable “comprehensive balancing test” that would expand secondary liability. Professors Peter S. Menell *et al.* Br. This test proceeds from two false premises. First, the professors posit separate worlds of “patented” and “copyrighted” goods, as if the two were unrelated. Menell himself recognizes an “inherent conflict” as “regulating digital devices in the
(Cont’d)

been further chilled by some copyright owners' attacks on not only the innovators, but also the investors, advisors, and even attorneys associated with the new technology. *See id.* at 160-61 (citing suits against officers, directors, and venture capitalists involved in Napster and MP3.com's attorneys).

The *Betamax* doctrine fulfills this Court's admonition that for copyright to enrich the public through access to creativity, it must achieve a delicate and "difficult balance between the interests of authors . . . and society's competing interest in the free flow of ideas, information and commerce." *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 427. As a result, it has permitted the most creative minds to innovate, contributing billions of dollars to the economy, and enormous benefits to society. The *Betamax* doctrine should not be altered.

III. THE COPYRIGHT ACT FORECLOSES JUDICIAL ABROGATION OF THE *BETAMAX* DOCTRINE.

A. Copyright Is a Carefully Balanced, Statutory Right Intended To Serve the Public Interest that Should Not Be Judicially Expanded.

From the very first, this Court has consistently held that a copyright is solely a creature of statute, not the common law or any theory of natural or moral right, and that the scope of the right is strictly limited by the statutory grant. *Wheaton v. Peters*, 33 U.S. (8 Pet.) 591, 659-64, 667-68 (1834) (holding that the right "does not exist at common law—it originated, if at all, under the acts of congress" and remanding for determination of whether all statutory conditions were satisfied); *White-Smith*

(Cont'd)

name of content protection hinders progress of digital technology." Menell, *supra* note 4, at 197. Second, they posit that the AHRA, Pub. L. No. 102-563, 106 Stat. 4237 (1992) (codified at 17 U.S.C. §§ 1001-1010), and Title I of the DMCA, Pub. L. No. 105-304, 112 Stat. 2860 (1998) (codified at 17 U.S.C. §§ 1201-1205), were congressional elaborations of copyright liability, which they emphatically are not. Rather, both create separate causes of action, 17 U.S.C. §§ 1009 & 1203, further demonstrating that when Congress seeks to limit the sale of "dual use" technology, it does so explicitly and narrowly. *See infra* Part IV.E.

Music Publ'g Co. v. Apollo Co., 209 U.S. 1, 15 (1908) (“it is perfectly well settled that the protection given to copyrights in this country is wholly statutory”); *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 429 n.10 (noting that copyright law “is not based upon any natural right that the author has,” and describing the balance between stimulating the producer and “the evils of the temporary monopoly” (quoting H.R. REP. NO. 2222, 60th Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (1909))); see Marci A. Hamilton, *Copyright at the Supreme Court: A Jurisprudence of Deference*, 47 J. COPYRIGHT SOC'Y U.S.A. 317, 320-21 (2000) (“From the first case, through the present, the Court has treated copyright law as positive law, the parameters of which are determined by the Congress.”).¹⁵

Moreover, the Court has consistently emphasized that the ultimate goal of copyright is to serve the public interest, not authors' private interests, see U.S. CONST., art. I, § 8, cl. 8:

The monopoly privileges that Congress may authorize are neither unlimited nor primarily designed to provide a special private benefit. Rather, the limited grant is a means by which an important public purpose may be achieved.

Betamax, 464 U.S. at 429; accord *Twentieth Century Music Corp. v. Aiken*, 422 U.S. 151, 156 (1975) (“[T]he ultimate aim is, by this incentive, to stimulate artistic creativity for the general public good.”); *Fogerty*, 510 U.S. at 526 (“[T]he policies served by the Copyright Act are more complex, more measured, than simply maximizing the number of meritorious suits for copyright infringement.”); *id.* at 527 (“Copyright law ultimately serves the purpose of enriching the general public.”).

For copyright to enrich the public through access to creative works, “it is peculiarly important that the boundaries of copyright law be demarcated as clearly as possible.” *Id.* This task

15. Accordingly, the efforts of petitioners and their amici to rely on common law principles are misplaced. *E.g.*, Songwriter & Music Publisher Petrs. (“SW”) Br. 10 (relying on common law); *id.* at 14 (secondary copyright liability based on “judicial efforts”); Defenders of Property Rights Br. 7-15 (relying entirely on “common law principles”).

is constitutionally assigned to Congress, for only “Congress has the . . . institutional ability to accommodate fully the varied permutations of competing interests.” *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 431.¹⁶ This Court has no mandate to alter that balance. *Cf. Stewart v. Abend*, 495 U.S. 207, 230 (1990) (“[I]t is not our role to alter the delicate balance Congress has labored to achieve.”).

B. The Copyright Act Does Not Permit Imposition of Liability for Providing Technology that Is Capable of Substantial Noninfringing Use.

There is no basis in the Copyright Act to impose liability for providing a technology that, though capable of substantial noninfringing use, is used for infringement. Providing such a technology neither “does” nor “authorizes” any of the acts constituting infringement. *See* 17 U.S.C. §§ 106, 501.

The remedies for infringement and the parties liable for infringement are part and parcel of the scope of the copyright itself. As statutory creations defined by Congress, they must be strictly construed. *Thompson v. Hubbard*, 131 U.S. 123, 151 (1889) (rejecting a copyright cause of action that did not strictly meet statutory requirements because “[t]his right of action, as well as the copyright itself, is wholly statutory, and the means of securing any right of action in Hubbard are only those prescribed by Congress”); *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 431 (“The remedies for infringement ‘are only those prescribed by Congress.’” (quoting *Thompson*, 131 U.S. at 151)).

Recent cases confirm that the availability of secondary liability under statutory causes of action must be narrowly construed. In *Central Bank v. First Interstate Bank*, 511 U.S. 164 (1994), this Court rejected aiding and abetting liability under section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, stating that it has “refused to allow 10b-5 challenges to conduct not

16. *See* Hamilton, at 325 (Congress filters views “to arrive at determinations that are supposed to be in the best interest of the polity as a whole” through a process of “compromise and debate”); JESSICA LITMAN, *DIGITAL COPYRIGHT* 61 (2001) (describing legislative process as accommodation of complex competing interests).

prohibited by the text of the statute.” *Id.* at 173. The Court reasoned that “Congress knew how to impose aiding and abetting liability when it chose to do so” and that “[t]he issue . . . is not whether imposing private civil liability on aiders and abettors is good policy but whether aiding and abetting is covered by the statute.” *Id.* at 176-77; *see Mertens v. Hewitt Assocs.*, 508 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1993) (rejecting non-fiduciary liability under ERISA because, despite common law duty, no statutory provision imposed obligations on non-fiduciaries).¹⁷

The Copyright Act expressly defines an “infringer” of copyright as one “who violates any of the exclusive rights of the copyright owner.” 17 U.S.C. § 501(a). The exclusive rights are defined as the rights “to do or to authorize” six specific activities with respect to a copyrighted work, the most relevant here being reproduction and distribution to the public. *Id.* § 106.

Respondents do not themselves actually “do” the acts of reproduction or distribution to the public of petitioners’ works. Indeed, no petitioner here advances a claim that respondents are liable as direct infringers. MPRC Br. 23, 42 (asserting claims of contributory and vicarious liability); SW Br. 10 (asserting secondary liability).

Nor can it reasonably be argued that providing a technology that is capable of substantial noninfringing use “authorizes” infringement. The plain meaning of the term denotes an intentional action to communicate approval for an act under color of right. From 1968 through 1990, including 1976, when the Copyright Act was passed, Black’s Law Dictionary defined “authorize” as “[t]o empower, to give a right or authority to act,” commenting that “it has a mandatory effect or meaning

17. This narrow view of secondary liability is consistent with the Court’s general hostility toward implying congressional action where the statute is silent. *See Corr. Servs. Corp. v. Molesko*, 534 U.S. 61, 67 n. 3 (2001) (Court has “retreated from [its] previous willingness to imply a cause of action where Congress has not provided one” (citing cases)).

implying a direction to act.”¹⁸ This Court has agreed, relying on Black’s to hold, under Title VII, that “authorize” requires an affirmative grant of right. *Gunther*, 452 U.S. at 168-69 (quoting Black’s Law Dictionary (5th ed. 1979)); accord *Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes v. United States*, 343 F.3d 1193, 1196 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[A]uthorize” means “to endow with authority or effective legal power, warrant, or right”); *Int’l Union v. Westinghouse Elec. Corp.*, 631 F.2d 1094, 1100 (3d Cir. 1980) (relying on dictionary definitions to ascertain the “plain language” of the statutory term and explaining that “[n]ormally the term ‘authorized’ is used to describe something that is endorsed or expressly permitted and not . . . something which is merely not prohibited”).

This Court in *Betamax* faithfully adhered to this statutory limitation on infringement liability, observing that secondary liability exists where “the ‘contributory’ infringer was in a position to control the use of copyrighted works by others *and had authorized the use* without permission from the copyright owner.” *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 437 (emphasis added); *id.* at 435 n.17 (noting liability for one who “authorizes the use of a copyrighted work”). The Court analyzed the only case in which it has upheld the imposition of secondary copyright liability, *Kalem Co. v. Harper Bros.*, 222 U.S. 55 (1911),¹⁹ emphasizing

18. Black’s Law Dict. 133-34 (6th ed. 1990); Black’s Law Dict. 122 (5th ed. 1979); Black’s Law Dict. 169 (4th ed. 1968). The definitions also say, in the same vein, “[t]o clothe with authority, warrant, or legal power. . . . To permit a thing to be done in the future.” *E.g.*, Black’s Law Dict. 169 (4th ed. 1968). The current definition is to the same effect, but shorter: “to give legal authority; to empower” and “to formally approve; to sanction.” Black’s Law Dict. 143 (8th ed. 1999). This Court considers ordinary dictionary definitions in statutory construction. *See, e.g., County of Washington v. Gunther*, 452 U.S. 161, 168-69 (1981) (citing Black’s Law Dict.); *Muscarello v. United States*, 524 U.S. 125, 127-31 (1998) (citing dictionaries and other sources).

19. The fact pattern of *Kalem* also is the only example provided in the only passage in the Committee Reports of the 1976 Copyright Act explaining the meaning of “to authorize”:

(Cont’d)

that the producer “*had authorized* [the infringing] *use* by his sale of the film to jobbers” where that use “was not his to authorize.” *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 436 (emphasis added). In fact, the producer created the film and distributed it with the express, advertised purpose that it be used for infringing performances. *Id.* at 435-36.

The authorization found in *Kalem* bears no resemblance to the provision of a technology capable of substantial noninfringing use, as the Court made clear in *Betamax*. *Id.* at 437 (describing the theory of liability asserted against the *Betamax* as “novel”); *id.* at 436 (attempt to equate two circumstances is “a gross generalization that cannot withstand

(Cont’d)

Use of the phrase “to authorize” is intended to avoid any questions as to the liability of contributory infringers. For example, a person who lawfully acquires an authorized copy of a motion picture would be an infringer if he or she engages in the business of renting it to others for purposes of unauthorized public performance.

H.R. REP. NO. 94-1476, at 61 (1976); S. REP. NO. 94-473, at 57 (1975) (quoting same language); S. REP. NO. 93-983, at 111 (1974) (quoting essentially same language). The addition of the words “to authorize” and this explanation were new to the 1976 Act. Contrary to petitioners’ claim (MPRC Br. 21 n.15), they thus provide no evidence of broad ratification of particular doctrines of secondary liability, and certainly do not evidence expansion of those doctrines or its application to the provision of technology. The 1998 DMCA could not ratify broad doctrines of secondary liability, as it did not reenact copyright liability. Petitioners cite section 1201(c)(2), which simply says that section 1201, in defining a new non-infringement cause of action, should not be construed to affect copyright infringement liability related to technology. If it ratifies anything, it ratifies the *Betamax* doctrine. The various defenses and exceptions cited by petitioners similarly do not evidence the existence of liability. As Senator Hatch recently stated, “[I]ndeed, the Copyright Act contains literally scores of similar exemptions, and none of those exemptions have been or should be construed to imply anything about the legality of conduct falling outside their scope.” 151 CONG. REC. S482 (daily ed. Jan. 25, 2005).

scrutiny”). As this Court found in *Betamax*, providing a technology does not “authorize” the use of that technology to violate any right of a copyright owner.²⁰ It is not infringement.

C. The *Betamax* Doctrine Applies Regardless of Whether Secondary Copyright Liability Is Labeled “Contributory” or “Vicarious.”

From the foregoing, it is clear that the *Betamax* doctrine applies regardless of whether secondary liability is labeled “contributory” or “vicarious,” even assuming that vicarious liability extends beyond its only doctrinal underpinnings in the concept of *respondeat superior*. Copyright liability simply does not, by statute, extend to the situation at issue in *Betamax*—regardless of the label applied. As this Court recognized in *Betamax*, distinctions between “contributory” and “vicarious” liability “are not clearly drawn” and “analysis of respondents’ unprecedented contributory infringement claim necessarily entails consideration of arguments and case law which may also be forwarded under the other labels.” 464 U.S. at 435 n.17.

Similarly, the Ninth Circuit’s view that the *Betamax* doctrine is limited to the issue of whether a defendant has constructive

20. In the years since *Betamax*, some lower federal courts have strayed far from the statutory mandate in construing the scope of secondary copyright liability. See *Fonovisa, Inc. v. Cherry Auction, Inc.*, 76 F.3d 259, 264 (9th Cir. 1996) (“support services” such as parking and utilities distinguish swap meet operator from landlord and are “material contribution”); *Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Netcom On-Line Communication Servs., Inc.*, 907 F. Supp. 1361, 1375, 1376 (N.D. Cal. 1995) (providing access to computer system used to infringe is material contribution; control for vicarious liability can be theoretical and indirect, based on contractual relationship with BBS operator rather than direct infringer); *Ellison*, 357 F.3d at 1078 (AOL’s “knowledge” imputed from one email it never received, and “material contribution” was automated copying incidental to Usenet access); *id.* at 1078-79 (For vicarious liability, there is “no requirement that the draw be ‘substantial.’ . . . The essential aspect . . . is whether there is a causal relationship between the [infringement] and any financial benefit.”). Far from adopting petitioners’ broad and untested “common law” tests, this Court should rein in concepts of secondary liability to accord more directly with the statutory language.

knowledge, *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1004, 1020 (9th Cir. 2002), is incorrect. The *Betamax* doctrine is not tied to the state of defendants' knowledge; rather, it is based on the public's interest in access to technology. 464 U.S. at 440-42. The Ninth Circuit stands alone in this erroneous view. *E.g.*, *Aimster*, 334 F.3d at 649 (rejecting Ninth Circuit view); 2 PAUL GOLDSTEIN, COPYRIGHT § 6.1.2, at 6:12-1 (2d ed. 2003) ("The substantial noninfringing use doctrine serves a purpose entirely separate from the knowledge requirement."). Thus, petitioners' attack on the knowledge standard applied by the Ninth Circuit, MPRC Br. 38-41, is pointless. The *Betamax* doctrine does not depend on lack of knowledge.

IV. PETITIONERS' THEORIES FOR IMPOSING SECONDARY LIABILITY AND LIMITING *BETAMAX* ARE AN IMPROPER INVITATION TO JUDICIAL LEGISLATION.

Although the question presented is narrow, the relief sought by petitioners reaches far beyond whether distribution of a particular version of software constitutes infringement. Petitioners propose numerous wide-ranging expansions of secondary liability and weakening of the *Betamax* standard. Any such change will have adverse effects throughout the economy.

The short answer to petitioners' proposals is that each would create a cause of action for copyright infringement that simply is not found in the Copyright Act. *See supra* Part III. Petitioners' request for judicial legislation should be rejected.

Petitioners' proposed causes of action inevitably also would destroy any demarcation of the boundaries between lawful and unlawful conduct that this Court found "peculiarly important." *Fogerty*, 510 U.S. at 527. They would give a multitude of copyright owners "effective control over" digital technology and "block the wheels of commerce." *Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 441.

Nor would these free-floating doctrines of secondary liability have the beneficial effect petitioners seek. Peer-to-peer software would remain freely available to would-be infringers through off-shore websites beyond the reach of U.S. copyright

law. As this Court recognized last term, laws regulating conduct on the Internet tend to be ineffective “because providers of the materials covered by the statute can simply move their operations overseas.” *Ashcroft v. ACLU*, ___ U.S. ___, 124 S. Ct. 2783, 2786 (2004). The predictable effect of weakening the *Betamax* doctrine will be that those who wish to defy the Court’s ruling will simply move offshore, while legitimate U.S. technology companies, with millions of employees in the United States, who wish to comply with the law, will be burdened with enormous new litigation risks.

A. Petitioners’ “Principal Use” Standard and the United States’ “Relative Significance” Test Are Foreclosed by *Betamax*.

Petitioners ask this Court to rewrite the *Betamax* doctrine so that it would “not apply when the primary or principal use of a product or service is infringing.” MPRC Br. 31. Petitioners argue that where the primary current use of a technology is infringement, the provider of that technology is not “engaged in ‘substantially unrelated’ commerce,” *id.*, and invoke the “economic philosophy behind the [copyright] clause,” *id.* Economic philosophy notwithstanding, neither *Betamax*, nor the patent law doctrine on which the *Betamax* doctrine was based, supports such a construction.

Betamax made crystal clear that a technology provider cannot be secondarily liable for infringement based on others’ infringing uses so long as the technology is “merely . . . capable of substantial noninfringing uses.” 464 U.S. at 442. The Court described the doctrine’s patent law roots, observing that in that context, the rule properly causes courts to “deny the patentee any right to control the distribution of unpatented articles unless they are *unsuited for any commercial noninfringing use*” and that “the *item must almost be uniquely suited as a component of the patented invention.*” *Id.* at 441 (emphasis added). The Court further recognized that the doctrine reflects “the critical importance of not allowing the patentee to extend his monopoly beyond the limits of his specific grant.” *Id.* This has even greater

force in copyright, where the standard of protection is simple originality and not novelty and nonobviousness, *compare* 17 U.S.C. § 102, *with* 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), 103, and rights exist automatically in a vast array of works, with no examination by the government, *see* 17 U.S.C. § 102.

The United States similarly ignores the plain language of *Betamax* and the genesis of the “capable of substantial noninfringing use” standard. Instead, the government concocts a novel, multi-factor test, nowhere found in *Betamax*, that depends upon the “Relative Significance of the Infringing and Noninfringing Uses.” U.S. Br. 14-17.

The United States starts from the erroneous premise that *Betamax* implicitly found that authorized time shifting was not “substantial noninfringing use” and thus found it “necessary” to consider whether unauthorized time shifting was fair use. *Id.* at 12. In fact, the Court’s opinion belies this argument. The Court credited the district court’s finding that “the evidence concerning ‘sports, religious, educational, and other programming’ was sufficient to establish a significant quantity of broadcast programming whose copying is now authorized, and a significant potential for future authorized copying.” 464 U.S. at 444. After discussing the evidence on authorized time shifting, the Court concluded:

If there are millions of owners of VTR’s who make copies of televised sports events, religious broadcasts, and educational programs such as *Mister Rogers’ Neighborhood*, and if the proprietors of those programs welcome the practice, the business of supplying the equipment that makes such copying feasible should not be stifled simply because the equipment is used by some individuals to make unauthorized reproductions of respondents’ works.

Id. at 446-47 (concluding that seller of equipment “cannot be a contributory infringer”). This language can only be read as an unqualified conclusion that the Court deemed authorized time

shifting to be a sufficient “substantial noninfringing use.”²¹ *See also id.* at 444 (it would be “extremely harsh” to deprive the public of a tool “capable of some noninfringing use” (quoting 480 F. Supp. at 468)).

B. Petitioners Are Incorrect To Focus on Current Uses of a Technology.

Petitioners also are incorrect in their focus on current uses. *Betamax* makes clear that a technology need not *currently* be used for legitimate purposes, but must simply be “capable” of legitimate uses, necessarily including uses that may only be future or potential uses. 464 U.S. at 442.

The uses of technology change over time, as the VCR example vividly demonstrates. Despite the cries of the movie industry when the VCR was introduced, the technology proved to be very lucrative for the studios as more and more people used the devices to watch rented and purchased videotapes.²² Only three years after the *Betamax* decision, “home video had become the industry’s chief revenue source. This market was . . . providing distributors with about \$2 billion and outstripping theatrical revenues (\$1.6 billion).”²³

21. This conclusion similarly dooms the argument of the United States (at 17-21) that, if the principal use of a technology is infringement, courts must look to “subsidiary indicia.” *See also infra* Part VI.E, discussing the error of the “steps taken to discourage infringing uses” indicium.

22. The product likely would not have had the same success in the marketplace without the record function. *See, e.g.,* William Bowen, *How the Japanese Won the VCR Wars*, FORTUNE, June 8, 1987, at 163 (describing how VCR prevailed over laser discs because it could both play pre-recorded material and record).

23. Jennifor Holt, *In Deregulation We Trust: The Synergy of Politics and Industry in Reagan-era Hollywood*, FILM QUARTERLY (Winter 2001) (citation omitted), http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1070/is_2_55/ai_83477537. Fourteen years later, one author noted that “[d]espite the ubiquity of VCRs, more people go to the movies than ever, and videocassette rentals and sales account for more than half of

(Cont’d)

The tremendous windfall that the VCR provided to the movie industry demonstrates the folly banning or restricting the use of new technologies based on early usage patterns. As technologies evolve, and as content providers find new ways to work with them, it is inevitable that the public's use of the technologies also will change. The recent success of iTunes and other legitimate music sites shows that even in the context of digital distribution, uses evolve as content providers, manufacturers, and distributors probe the best ways to exploit new technologies and markets. Giving copyright owners a veto over the development of technology early in its evolution, based on early misuse, would cause untold harm to the development of new arts and sciences, and would ultimately damage both the public and the copyright owners themselves.

C. The United States' Focus on Respondents' Business and "Commercial Viability" Misconstrues the *Betamax* Standard.

The United States argues (at 13) that the "capable of substantial noninfringing use" standard must be considered in light of the "defendant's particular business." It also argues (at 11) that the proper test is "commercial viability." Like the government's "relative significance" test, these arguments cannot survive an examination of *Betamax*'s discussion of authorized time shifting. Nowhere in *Betamax* does the Court consider whether consumers would have purchased the *Betamax* in order to record sports or *Mister Rogers' Neighborhood* or, for that matter, whether the product would have been viable based on noninfringing uses.²⁴

(Cont'd)

Hollywood's revenues." John Perry Barlow, *The Next Economy of Ideas*, WIRED, Oct. 2000, http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/8.10/download_pr.html.

24. Curiously, the United States relies on the *Betamax* dissent to create its "commercial viability" standard. U.S. Br. 11. Of course, the dissent was not the majority. But the United States even misreads the dissent. The full passage cited by the United States states that "[i]f virtually

(Cont'd)

Moreover, a standard based on commercial viability is neither administrable nor consistent with the United States' concession that "where noninfringing uses predominate, plaintiffs will not prevail." U.S. Br. 17. Viability of a product will depend on complex analysis of diverse economic factors, including costs, revenues, and returns on investment, an analysis that can change significantly and unpredictably over the lifetime of a product. Nothing in *Betamax* suggests that courts are required to make (let alone institutionally capable of making) that analysis. Attempting to predict a product's future markets, assigning an internal rate of return, and predicting future profitability are not normal enterprises for Article III judges.

The standard also would turn *Betamax* on its head. It may well be, for example, that a technology with overwhelmingly noninfringing use is only marginally profitable, and that some incidental infringing use is enough to sustain the product. Such a product would fail the United States' viability test, depriving the technology to the vast majority of noninfringing users.²⁵

D. Providing a Technology that Is Capable of Substantial Noninfringing Use Is Not Inducement.

In their effort to avoid the *Betamax* doctrine, petitioners argue that it does not apply where defendants have "intentionally facilitated and actively encouraged and assisted infringement." MPRC Br. 27. This argument fails for two reasons. First, the lower courts found no such conduct in connection with the

(Cont'd)

all of the product's use, however, is to infringe, contributory liability may be imposed; if no one would buy the product for noninfringing purposes alone, it is clear that the manufacturer is purposely profiting from the infringement, and that liability is appropriately imposed." 464 U.S. at 491 (Blackmun, J., dissenting). A requirement that "*no one would buy the product* for noninfringing purposes alone" is very different from a standard of "commercial viability."

25. Similarly, the United States' repeated references (at 8, 14, 17) to whether the "draw" of a product is infringement does not advance the analysis, as it says nothing about how much of a "draw" is required. In *Ellison*, 357 F.3d at 1079, the Ninth Circuit found even an insubstantial draw to give rise to vicarious liability. *See supra* note 20.

distribution of the current version of the respondents' software. *See, e.g., MGM Studios*, 259 F. Supp. 2d at 1041-43. Thus, either petitioners are relying on conduct related to prior versions of the software, or they are relying on the distribution of the software itself. As discussed in Part I, *supra*, conduct related to prior versions of the software is not the subject of this appeal. If petitioners are relying on the distribution of the software itself, there is no way to distinguish this case from *Betamax*. Petitioners' exception would swallow the rule.

Second, despite dicta in one copyright case that has been formulaically restated in later decisions, *see Gershwin Publ'g Corp. v. Columbia Artists Mgmt., Inc.*, 443 F.2d 1159 (2d Cir. 1971), petitioners have not cited to any case in which infringement liability has been imposed on the basis of "inducement." In other words, there is no such doctrine, which is why Congress has been working on creating one. *See Internet Amici Br.* Part III.

Nor should this Court create it. Even if this were an appropriate case to opine about inducement (which it is not), petitioners' proposed doctrine has no practical bounds. Petitioners cite the patent law doctrine of inducement, describing it as "encompass[ing] a wide range of conduct. . . including licensing, repair and maintenance, design, instruction and advertising." MPRC Br. 28-29 n.18. Maintenance, design, repair and instruction are normal incidents of providing technology. Moreover, inducement under the patent law requires a specific intent to cause the infringement of a particular known patent. *Manville Sales Corp. v. Paramount Sys. Inc.*, 917 F.2d 544, 553 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Petitioners can show no such intent here on the limited record before this Court.

E. There Is No Duty To Design Technologies To Minimize the Possibility of Infringement.

Petitioners ask this Court to turn the law of secondary copyright liability into a more generalized duty on the part of respondents—and all consumer electronics, information technology, and telecommunications companies as well—to

have the interests of copyright owners rather than consumers uppermost in their minds when making design decisions. See MPRC Br. 33-34, 38-41. This is not a novel demand. The movie companies made the same demand in their challenge to the Betamax more than 25 years ago and were rebuffed by the district court. See *Universal City Studios, Inc. v. Sony Corp. of Am.*, 480 F. Supp. 429, 462-69 (C.D. Cal. 1979) (rejecting demand that the Betamax's television tuner be eliminated to preclude recording of programs); see also 464 U.S. at 494 (Blackmun, J., dissenting) (arguing that Sony "may be able, for example, to build a VTR that enables broadcasters to scramble the signals of individual programs and 'jam' the unauthorized recording of them").²⁶

Amici are aware of no case, other than *Aimster*, that has recognized such a theory. In *Aimster*, Judge Posner stated:

Even when there are noninfringing uses of an Internet file-sharing service . . . if the infringing uses are substantial then to avoid liability as a contributory infringer the provider of the service must show that it would have been disproportionately costly for him to eliminate or at least reduce substantially the infringing uses.

334 F.3d at 653.

Betamax does not permit such a conclusion, as this Court gave no weight to the studios' arguments that Sony could have redesigned its product to avoid or decrease infringing uses. The United States, for its part, agrees that "such a rule is neither desirable nor supported by precedent," noting that such a rule "would have the undesirable effect of chilling technological innovation and constraining the product development options of developers of software and other digital technologies." U.S. Br. 19-20 n.3. Incongruously, however, and with no more precedent or greater desirability, the United States attempts to

26. In other words, contrary to petitioners' assertion, MPRC Br. 33-34, the *Betamax* Court did not face an "all-or-nothing" choice.

backdoor the same approach, arguing that steps taken (or not taken) by the technology provider to prevent infringement should be one of three “subsidiary indicia” of whether a technology provider should be liable. *Id.* at 17, 19-21.

Either *Aimster* or the United States’ standard would create a nightmare for courts and for inventors and their investors. If technologies reached consumers’ hands in such a world, courts would be required to second-guess each design decision. Any copyright owner could present its favorite content protection system and argue that it would have been relatively inexpensive for the technology’s creator to adopt it. Courts would be required to perform technical and economic analyses of myriad protection technologies, including various forms of encryption, watermarking, fingerprinting, signaling, digital rights management, and others not yet invented. They also would be required to determine which technologies would be “disproportionately costly” and to consider whether other, less costly means could be employed by either the technology provider or copyright owner. Such a rule would require a court-ordered allocation of resources in every case.

Congress consistently has rejected such efforts by copyright owners to force manufacturers to redesign their technology to implement undefined content protection systems. In fact, the last time Congress passed major legislation relating to copyright, the DMCA, it relieved manufacturers of any burden to design their products to respond to copyright protection schemes that copyright owners might employ. The “no mandate” provision says:

(3) Nothing in this section shall require that the design of, or design and selection of parts and components for, a consumer electronics, telecommunications, or computing product provide for a response to any particular technological measure, so long as such part or component, or the product in which such part or component is integrated, does not otherwise fall within

the prohibitions of [17 U.S.C. § 1201] (a)(2) or (b)(1).
17 U.S.C. § 1201(c)(3).²⁷ This legislation was passed with the support of respondents and other copyright owners.

As the legislative history makes clear, Congress intended to ensure that manufacturers of technology products would not be under any obligation to design their devices in any particular way. Then-Senator and former Attorney General John Ashcroft, a leader in the development of Section 1201(c)(3), after citing “the reasonable and accustomed home taping practices of consumers recognized in the Supreme Court’s [*Betamax*] decision,” said:

It thus should be about as clear as can be to a judge or jury that, unless otherwise specified, nothing in this legislation should be interpreted to limit manufacturers of legitimate products with substantial noninfringing uses – such as VCRs and personal computers – in making fundamental design decision or revisions.

144 CONG. REC. S11887-88 (daily ed. Oct. 8, 1998).²⁸

If petitioners’ theories are adopted, virtually all digital technologies will be subject both to advance clearance by a small group of content conglomerates and to after-the-fact second guessing by virtually any copyright owner about how the technology was designed and how it is being used.²⁹ If a

27. The only exception to this rule was a very narrow, specific mandate applicable to analog videocassette recorders. 17 U.S.C. § 1201(k). That provision contains balanced “encoding rules” that prohibit copyright owners from applying the technology to prevent the recording of certain copyrighted content, including broadcast television and subscription pay satellite and cable channels.

28. These sentiments were also repeatedly expressed in the House of Representatives. *See, e.g.*, 144 CONG. REC. H10621 (daily ed. Oct. 12, 1998) (statement of Rep. Klug); *see also* 144 CONG. REC. E2166 (daily ed. Oct. 14, 1998) (statement of Rep. Boucher); 144 CONG. REC. E2144 (daily ed. Oct 13, 1998) (statement of Rep. Tauzin); 144 CONG. REC. H7094-95 (daily ed. Aug. 4, 1998) (statement of Rep. Bliley).

29. Even under the current law, copyright owners continue to press
(Cont’d)

technology provider guesses wrong, it will be subject to potentially ruinous statutory damages. Innovation and investment cannot survive in such an environment.

This Court should reject petitioners' request that it adopt the *Aimster* standard and the United States' suggestion that failure to design technology in the manner sought by content providers is indicative of infringement.

CONCLUSION

The judgment of the court of appeals should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE G. JOSEPH
Counsel of Record
KARYN K. ABLIN
SCOTT E. BAIN
WILEY REIN & FIELDING LLP
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 719-7000
Counsel for Amici Curiae

March 1, 2005

(Cont'd)

claims based on the failure of innovators to apply favored content protection technology, often trying to prevent lawful uses of content. *See Internet Amici* Br. Part II.2 (discussing RIAA's reasons for attacking Diamond's Rio, MPAA's challenge to TiVo's content protection technology, and RIAA's request to the FCC for broad limitations on digital radio).

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

METRO-GOLDWYN-MAYER STUDIOS INC., *et al.*,
Petitioners,

v.

GROKSTER, LTD., *et al.*,
Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**BRIEF OF INTERNET *AMICI*: CELLULAR TELECOMMUNICATIONS &
INTERNET ASSOCIATION, UNITED STATES TELECOM ASSOCIATION,
US INTERNET INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, AT&T CORP., BELL SOUTH
CORPORATION, MCI, INC., SAVVIS COMMUNICATIONS
CORPORATION, SBC INTERNET SERVICES, INC., SUN MICROSYSTEMS,
INC., AND VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC.
IN SUPPORT OF AFFIRMANCE**

ANDREW G. McBRIDE
Counsel of Record
KATHRYN COMERFORD TODD
JOSHUA S. TURNER
WILEY REIN & FIELDING LLP
1776 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
(202) 719-7000
Counsel for Amici Curiae

(Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Pages)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES	ii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT	6
I. Petitioners’ New Multi-Factor “Common Law” Tests Would Eviscerate <i>Sony’s</i> Bright- Line Rule	6
II. Fearing Innovation, Copyright Owners Have a Long and Unsuccessful History of Trying To Use the Courts To Halt New Technologies, Including Distribution Technologies	10
III. Recent Multi-Industry Negotiations over Legislative Solutions Exemplify the Constitutionally Mandated Process for any Expansion of Petitioners’ Copyrights	17
IV. The Expansive Secondary Liability Sought by Petitioners Is Inconsistent with Federal Law and Policy Regarding the Internet and Broadband Internet Access	24
CONCLUSION	28

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

	<i>Page</i>
Cases:	
<i>In re Aimster Copyright Litigation</i> , 334 F.3d 643 (7th Cir. 2003)	10
<i>Ashcroft v. ACLU</i> , ___ U.S. ___, 124 S. Ct. 2783 (2004)	26
<i>Broadcast Music, Inc. v. CBS</i> , 441 U.S. 1 (1979)	7
<i>City of Milwaukee v. Illinois & Michigan</i> , 451 U.S. 304 (1981)	27
<i>Fortnightly Corp. v. United Artists Television, Inc.</i> , 392 U.S. 390 (1968)	8
<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa International Service Association, et al.</i> , No. C-04-0371, 2004 WL 1773349 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 5, 2004)	16
<i>Playboy Enterprises v. Frena</i> , 839 F. Supp. 1552 (M.D. Fla. 1993)	25
<i>RIAA v. Diamond Multimedia Systems, Inc.</i> , 180 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 1999)	13
<i>Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios</i> , 464 U.S. 417 (1984)	<i>passim</i>

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
<i>United States v. Am. Soc’y of Composers, Authors & Publishers (“ASCAP”),</i> No. 41-1395, 2001 WL 1589999 (S.D.N.Y. June 11, 2001),	7
<i>White-Smith Music Publishing v. Apollo Co.,</i> 209 U.S. 1 (1908)	11
Statutes:	
17 U.S.C. § 111	7
17 U.S.C. § 512(a)-(d)	25
17 U.S.C. § 512(i)	25
17 U.S.C. § 512(i)(2)(A)	26
17 U.S.C. § 512(m)	26
18 U.S.C. § 2318	26
18 U.S.C. §§ 2701, <i>et seq</i>	25-26
47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1)	26
47 U.S.C. § 231(b)	26
47 U.S.C. § 548	7
Telecommunications Act of 1996, § 706, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 153 (1996)	24

Cited Authorities

Page

Legislative Materials:

150 CONG. REC. S7189-S7193 (daily ed. June 22, 2004)	17, 18, 19
H.R. 3632, 108th Cong. (2002)	26
H.R. CONF. REP. NO. 104-458 (1996)	24
H.R. REP. NO. 105-551 (1998)	25, 26
H.R. REP. NO. 108-600 (2002)	26
S. 2395, 107th Cong. (2004)	26
S. CONF. REP. NO. 104-230 (1996)	24
S. REP. NO. 105-190 (1998)	24, 25, 27
Artists' Rights and Theft Prevention (ART) Act, S. 1932, 108th Cong. (2004)	17
Consumer Broadband and Digital Television Promotion Act, S. 2048, 107th Cong. (2002) ...	17
Family Entertainment and Copyright Act of 2005, S. 167, 109th Cong. (2005)	17
Piracy Deterrence and Education Act of 2004, H.R. 4077, 108th Cong. (2004)	17
Protecting Children from Peer-to-Peer Pornography Act, H.R. 2885, 108th Cong. (2003)	17

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Consumer Privacy and Government Technology Mandates in the Digital Media Marketplace, Hearing before the Senate Commerce Committee (Sept. 17, 2003), http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/testimony.cfm?id=919&wit_id=2584 ..</i>	15
<i>Home Recording of Copyrighted Works, Hearings on H.R. 4783 et al. before the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 97th Cong. (1982)</i>	11, 12
<i>Privacy of Intellectual Property on Peer-to-Peer Networks: Hearing before Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property of House Committee on the Judiciary, 107th Cong. (Sept. 26, 2002)</i>	17
<i>Protecting Innovation and Art while Preventing Piracy, Hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (July 22, 2004), at http://judiciary.senate.gov/hearing.cfm?id=1276</i>	18
Administrative Materials:	
<i>Comments of RIAA, Digital Audio Broadcasting Systems & Their Impact on the Terrestrial Radio Broadcast Service, FCC MM Docket. No. 99-325 (June 16, 2004)</i>	13
<i>Digital Output Protection Technology and Recording Method Certifications, 19 F.C.C.R. 15,876 (2004)</i>	14

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
Miscellaneous:	
<i>2004 Transcript of Q&A with RIAA President Cary Sherman</i> , THE DAILY TEXAN, Mar. 25, 2004, http://www.dailytexanonline.com/news/2004/03/25/Focus_Transcript.Of.Qa.With.Riaa.President.CarySherman641217.shtml	3
Amended Complaint, <i>Paramount Pictures Corp. v. ReplayTV, Inc.</i> , 298 F. Supp. 2d 921 (C.D. Cal. 2004)	14
Brooks Boliek, <i>Induce Act Stalls as Compromise Talks Break Down</i> , THE HOLLYWOOD REPORTER, Oct. 8, 2004, at http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/thr/article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1000661869	15
Brooks Boliek, <i>Mouse Grouse: Dis Boss Lays into Computer Biz</i> , THE HOLLYWOOD REPORTER, Mar. 1, 2002, at http://www.larta.org/pl/NewsArticles/02Marc01_HR_Eisner.htm	15
Ted Bridis, <i>Senate Talks Fail on File-Sharing Software</i> , MSNBC NEWS, Oct. 7, 2004, at http://msnbc.msn.com/id/6200562/	21
Complaint, <i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. 2:04-cv-09484 (C.D. Cal. filed Nov. 19, 2004)	16
Conference: <i>Digital Technology and Copyright: A Threat or a Promise?</i> , 39 IDEA 291 (1999) (remarks of Dean Marks)	12

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Copyright Office Draft of INDUCE Fails To Inspire Industry Insiders</i> , COMM. DAILY, Sept. 7, 2004 . . .	21
Copyright Owners' Tentative Proposal (Oct. 5, 2004), at http://www.corante.com/importance/archives/induce_copyright_owner_tentative_proposal_10-5-04.pdf	21
Sean Daly, <i>10 Million iPods, Previewing the CD's End</i> , WASH. POST, Feb. 13, 2005, at A01.	3
FTC Press Release, <i>Record Companies Settle FTC Charges of Restraining Competition in CD Music Market</i> , May 10, 2000, at http://www.ftc.gov/opa/2000/05/cdpres.htm	7
Orrin Hatch, <i>Antitrust in the Digital Age</i> , Address before The Progress & Freedom Foundation, Feb. 1998, http://www.pff.org/issues-pub/futureinsights/fi5.1antitrustdigitalage.html	18
<i>Hatch Puts Off Induce Act for One Week</i> , COMM. DAILY, Oct. 1, 2004	21
Letter from Association of American University <i>et al.</i> to Senators Hatch and Leahy, Sept. 17, 2004, at http://www.publicknowledge.org/news/-letters/inducegroup	21
Letter from Co-Sponsors of Induce Act to Marybeth Peters, Register of Copyrights, Aug. 13, 2004, at http://leahy.senate.gov/press/200408/081704.html	20

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
David Lieberman, <i>States Settle CD Price-Fixing Case</i> , USA TODAY, Sept. 30, 2002, http://www.usatoday.com/life/music/news/2002-09-30-cd-settlement_x.htm	7
JESSICA LITMAN, <i>DIGITAL COPYRIGHT</i> (2001)	19
MPAA Press Release, <i>Valenti Testifies Piracy Threatens To Destroy Movie Industry and U.S. Economy</i> , Feb. 12, 2000, at http://www.mpaa.org/jack/2002/2002_02_12a.htm	15
Mark S. Nadel, <i>How Current Copyright Law Discourages Creative Output: The Overlooked Impact of Marketing</i> , 19 BERKELEY TECH. L.J. 785, 823 (2004)	12
Recommendation and Explanatory Memorandum, at http://www.copyright.gov/docs/S2560.pdf (visited Feb. 10, 2005)	20
RIAA Press Release, <i>RIAA Takes Stand to Protect Legitimate ONLINE Marketplace</i> , Oct. 9, 1998, at http://www.riaa.com/news/newsletter/press1998/100998.asp	13
Timothy Wu, <i>Copyright's Communications Policy</i> , 103 MICH. L. REV. 278 (2004)	12

STATEMENT OF INTEREST¹

Amici curiae are enterprises that, collectively, provide the digital transmission facilities, routers, modems, Internet connectivity, and content and services that constitute the Internet (“Internet *amici*”). Internet *amici* have invested and will invest tens of billions of dollars in the hardware and software that makes the Internet so valuable.

Many Internet *amici* create and distribute copyrighted works, including web pages, copyrighted software, cell phone “ring tones,” and other protected material. None of the Internet *amici* condones copyright infringement and none endorses respondents’ particular business model. On this point, Internet *amici* agree with petitioners that a business model consciously built to exploit past infringing activity (such as the capture of the Napster customer base), that subsists almost exclusively upon infringement, and that appears to involve a corporate decision at the highest levels both to promote infringement and to create “plausible deniability,” *should* be subject to some form of legal sanction and redress.²

At the same time, Internet *amici* disagree with petitioners as to the scope and urgency of the problem at hand and the appropriate forum and means for its solution. Petitioners and their *amici* (including the United States) ask this Court to erase the clear line between the copyright monopoly, which attaches only to *forms of expression*, and the freedom and incentive to innovate in the technologies and services that are the *means for dissemination* of copyrighted content.

The bright-line rule adopted in *Sony Corp. v. Universal City*

1. Pursuant to Rule 37.3, the parties have consented to filing of this brief and their consent letters have been lodged with the Clerk of the Court. Pursuant to Rule 37.6, Internet *amici* state that no counsel for a party has written this brief in whole or in part and that no person or entity, other than Internet *amici*, their members, or their counsel, has made a monetary contribution to the preparation or submission of this brief.

2. Internet *amici* and their members are harmed by the unlawful duplication or dissemination of protected content. Many Internet Service Providers (“ISPs”) have joint ventures or revenue-sharing relationships with lawful music and movie websites. Thus, Internet *amici* also suffer revenue losses when peer-to-peer software is misused to bypass these legitimate content sources and infringe copyrighted material.

Studios, 464 U.S. 417 (1984), has stood the test of time and allowed the United States to pioneer innovation in communications and Internet technologies. Internet *amici* have invested billions of dollars in reliance upon that bright-line rule. The surest way to depress capital investment in new Internet technologies, such as wireless data services, on-demand video, and “seamless mobility” – the transmission of content from television, to computer, to cell phone, to new devices yet to be created or marketed – is to modify *Sony* by adopting any of the malleable, multi-factored tests proffered by petitioners and their *amici*.

Copyright monopolies are granted for the benefit of the *consumer* – to “induce” the artist to create and release artistic, scientific, or informational works. *Sony*, 464 U.S. at 429 (citing *United States v. Paramount Pictures, Inc.*, 334 U.S. 131, 158 (1948)). Suppressing *distribution* technologies, while possibly beneficial to the artist in the short run in creating exclusive distribution chains and maximizing monopoly profits, is antithetical to the purpose of Copyright. The difference between these two related but distinct concepts – rewarding the artist versus benefiting the consumer – is seen in numerous laws that condemn or limit improper extension of the copyright monopoly into distribution. To achieve Copyright’s purpose, both *creation* of works and *delivery* of the works must be promoted. The artist is entitled to the quiet of a limited statutory monopoly to reward creative effort, but should not be able to extend that monopoly to all present and future outlets for distribution. They are (and should be) subject to the “creative destruction” of a free-market economy, including improvements in distribution and technological innovation.

Only Congress has the constitutional mandate and institutional capacity to address peer-to-peer technology in a way that promotes the good and punishes the bad. Internet *amici* stand ready to work with copyright owners and the content community to arrive at a comprehensive legislative solution to this problem. Internet *amici* urge this Court, however, not to craft “federal common law” remedies that would take this critical issue away from the Political Branches

and create a litigation nightmare for legitimate innovators and service providers.³

INTRODUCTION & SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Like other modern tools that have vastly increased human understanding and the ability to communicate, the Internet is a “multiple-use” technology. While most people use the Internet for lawful (and constitutionally protected) expressive activity, there is a series of unlawful practices – such as spamming, spyware, identity theft, modem hijacking, and other online schemes and frauds – that injure Internet-related businesses and Internet users. Petitioners maintain, and Internet *amici* agree, that they have been victimized by one such practice: individuals’ use of peer-to-peer file-sharing software for unlawful copying and distribution of copyrighted sound recordings and motion pictures.

This wanton disregard of intellectual property rights should be stopped. Internet *amici* have complied with lawfully issued subpoenas obtained by copyright owners in their campaign to identify more than 8,400 individuals alleged to have engaged in direct infringement through the misuse of peer-to-peer file-sharing software. That effort to punish and deter the direct infringers themselves is bearing fruit and requires no alteration of existing copyright law.⁴

3. The current appeal concerns only a narrow, certified issue pertaining to respondents’ current software. Respondents’ alleged past bad conduct, intent, and means of building their businesses are still before the district court, and not before this Court. The district court retains jurisdiction to determine both monetary relief and the appropriate scope of forward-looking equitable relief if past wrongful conduct is shown.

4. Enforcement against direct infringers has generated thousands of monetary settlements and has increased public awareness of the unlawful nature of distributing protected works and decreased the volume of infringement. *See, e.g., 2004 Transcript of Q&A with RIAA President Cary Sherman*, THE DAILY TEXAN, Mar. 25, 2004, <http://www.dailytexanonline.com/news/2004/03/25/Focus/Transcript.Of.Qa.With.Riaa.President.Cary.Sherman-641217.shtml> (RIAA President explaining “[w]e’ve seen a marked decline in illegal file-sharing, a marked increase in business at the legitimate online music services, and a spike in CD sales as well”). Both CD sales and lawful online sales of music have increased in the wake of this litigation and public education effort against direct infringers. *See, e.g., Sean Daly, 10 Million iPods, Previewing the CD’s End*, WASH. POST, Feb. 13, 2005, at A01.

Unfortunately, petitioners seek to use this case to radically expand the limited statutory monopoly. Their immediate target is peer-to-peer technology, but their positions threaten all multiple-use technologies and services. Petitioners could (and did) ask Congress to expand the Copyright Act to prohibit the offering of specific peer-to-peer software. But dissatisfied with the legislative process they initiated, they now are asking this Court to create a new “federal common law” of secondary liability for *all* technology and service providers. Hoping to bypass the negotiation and accommodation of competing interests that is part of any legislative change, petitioners and their *amici* have filed a raft of Brandeis briefs, literally begging this Court to pretermitt the normal legislative process.

Petitioners proffer various formulations of a broad new “federal common law” rule that would encompass not only peer-to-peer abusers, but also a myriad of legitimate Internet businesses and technologies. Internet *amici* and the technologies that they are developing provide the possibility of vast new international markets where domestic copyright owners’ products can be profitably disseminated. With no principle that would capture only those parties who most agree should be condemned, petitioners’ submissions translate into two vastly overbroad rules of secondary copyright liability.

First: An entity would be presumptively liable for contributory infringement if (a) it “know[s] full well” that some illegal activity is taking place using its technology and (b) the technology “make[s] possible the infringement that could not otherwise occur.” Motion Picture Studio & Recording Co. Pet’rs (“MPRC”) Br. 17-18; see *id.* at 25-26. But every Internet-related company could be made aware that infringement occurs via its service, and almost any computer system component may “make possible” infringement in the sweeping sense that petitioners use that phrase. Therefore, the content providers’ new theory of liability is almost limitless and would force Internet amici to seek to control the content of every Internet user’s private communications.

Second: Any business is vicariously liable if (a) it derives some monetary value (even indirectly through advertising revenue) from use of its service or technology for infringement, and (b) the firm could re-engineer its product or service better to

supervise and control customers' activities. *Id.* at 19-20, 43-44, 46-47. This theory treats Internet users like employees, with Internet amici required to monitor, supervise, and control tens of millions of subscribers. Neither "test" finds any logical or doctrinal roots in the Copyright Act, in Sony, or elsewhere. Moreover, such rules cannot be applied to ISPs, as they conflict with Congress's clear intent, expressed in numerous statutory protections, to prevent the imposition of "Big Brother" duties on Internet amici.

The judicial expansion of secondary copyright liability advocated by petitioners is precisely the wrong approach. It is simply impossible for this Court to craft a rule that will target only a particular business model connected with a specific technology without the threat that the new doctrine will be used by copyright owners – reputable or otherwise – to impose judicially created duties on legitimate businesses and technologies. The result will be a new form of copyright "strike suit" that will reduce innovation and investment in the Internet and, perversely, hamper the most robust forum for the dissemination of copyrighted works.

Only Congress has the institutional capacity to find facts, weigh countervailing economic interests, and arrive at an acceptable approach that will protect copyright owners, while also avoiding excessive restrictions on technological development. Congress works with a scalpel; the common law is a blunderbuss. Only a statute can precisely define liability in such a way as to target only truly culpable offenders; create exemptions or safe harbors protecting those parties (such as libraries) or technologies (such as broadband) least threatening or most in need of deployment incentives; and carefully tailor remedies to be precise and effective.

In fact, late in the 108th Congress, Members of Congress and interested parties almost reached an accord on this problem, and that compromise is *nothing like the broad and unbridled new doctrines that petitioners demand from this Court*. Moreover, the only pronouncements Congress has made in this area point in exactly the opposite direction, *e.g.*, protection of the Internet and Internet *amici* from ill-defined policing duties or liability for the personal communications of individual Internet users. This Court should decline

petitioners' invitation to create a broad common law rule that expands secondary copyright liability and instead defer to Congress to arrive at a legislative solution – as it has done so many times before – to harmonize the Copyright Act with technological change.

ARGUMENT

Petitioners' occasional nod to the text of the Copyright Act and use of carefully isolated snippets from this Court's prior decisions cannot camouflage the fact that petitioners' enterprise is a radical one. What they are seeking is an unprecedented *judicial* expansion of the reach of the copyright monopoly. Petitioners' proposed rewrite of the Copyright Act and this Court's decision in *Sony* would render every multiple-use technology manufacturer or service provider presumptively liable for infringement by others.

I. Petitioners' New Multi-Factor "Common Law" Tests Would Eviscerate *Sony's* Bright-Line Rule.

At the heart of *Sony* lies the Court's recognition that innovative companies should not be forced to abandon development of multi-use technologies that also can be used to commit individual acts of copyright infringement. To avoid that risk and to limit the bounds of the copyright monopoly to the "grants authorized by Congress," 464 U.S. at 421, the Court crafted a bright-line rule that would prevent copyright owners from holding hostage any new technology with a potential for infringement. That rule, which has promoted American success in the high-tech sector for the last two decades, is this: *A technology provider is not liable for secondary copyright infringement if its technology is capable of substantial non-infringing use.* 464 U.S. at 442.

This rule has properly confined the copyright monopoly to the parameters of the limited privilege authorized by Congress. It has also ensured that technology innovators and, indeed, creators of any consumer electronics product that is "merely capable" of any "substantial non-infringing use," can develop and market their products without facing a "veto power" from copyright owners. The *Sony* defense, as applied to information distribution technologies, directly furthers the purpose of Copyright – not only to foster the creation of new

works – but to allow for their broad dissemination to an ever wider national and international audience. Suppression of new distribution technologies will inevitably reduce both incentives to create (by limiting output) and reduce the public enjoyment of copyrighted works (by raising prices and reducing market penetration of expressive works).

Petitioners acknowledge no limits as to who may be conscripted to help them enforce the copyright monopoly. But extreme enforcement efforts that threaten to constrict the very distribution channels through which copyrighted works are disseminated disserve the consumer interest as surely as does failure to create content in the first place. It is for this reason that the courts and Congress alike have time and again limited or condemned the improper extension of the copyright monopoly into the means and technology of distribution. For example, record companies may not fix prices of music CDs⁵; songwriters may not tie all songs into unregulated blanket licenses⁶; cable operators may not discriminate against rivals by denying them access to satellite-delivered programming they or their affiliates create, 47 U.S.C. § 548; and television program owners may be compelled to sell their programs to cable operators for statutory license fees, 17 U.S.C. § 111. Maximizing the monopoly profits of content creators has never justified restraints on content delivery.

Petitioners' four proposed alterations of *Sony's* bright-line rule, if adopted, would create uncertainty and chill the technological advancement that *Sony* sought to protect. A small group of copyright owners would hold sway over our entire digital economy, including the high-tech means of distributing copyrighted works to the public.

1. According to petitioners, the substantial noninfringing use test in *Sony* should not apply if the “defendant engages in

5. E.g., FTC Press Release, *Record Companies Settle FTC Charges of Restraining Competition in CD Music Market*, May 10, 2000, at <http://www.ftc.gov/opa/2000/05/cdpres.htm>; David Lieberman, *States Settle CD Price-Fixing Case*, USA TODAY, Sept. 30, 2002, http://www.usatoday.com/life/music/news/2002-09-30-cd-settlement_x.htm.

6. E.g., *United States v. Am. Soc'y of Composers, Authors & Publishers* (“ASCAP”), No. 41-1395, 2001 WL 1589999 (S.D.N.Y. June 11, 2001).

conduct that encourages or assists infringement.” MPRC Br. 18. That exception would eviscerate the *Sony* defense altogether because the conduct petitioners describe as evidence “of encouraging and assisting infringement” is no different from the neutral act of selling the multi-use technology that was before the *Sony* Court. 464 U.S. at 440.

For example, petitioners find evidence of infringement in the fact that respondents’ technology is “tailor-made for media files” and their technology offers users anonymity. MPRC Br. 25. Petitioners also see respondents’ efforts to “maintain and upgrade their networks” as evidence of infringement. *Id.* at 26. But Sony’s Betamax was no less “guilty” of being tailor-made for recording video images and was no less anonymous. Nor did the Court suggest that Sony could not provide service or technological upgrades to customers without risking secondary liability. Indeed, in the digital age, it is difficult to contemplate a competitive (multi-use) technology that lacks the promise of service and upgrades; orphan hardware or software is well nigh valueless.

2. Petitioners’ next exception permits a copyright owner to prevail merely by showing that the *current, principal* use of a multi-use technology is infringing. *Id.* at 18-19, 30-38. That exception would stop innovation in its tracks regardless of the potential benefits of a new product. The fact is, teenagers and young adults have often been the first adopters of picture phones, digital music players, online games, and so forth, and their circumstances (no cash) and attitudes (no respect for “old-people” rules) often determine how a new technology is first employed. But technologies prone to mischief in their youth often grow up to contribute substantially to our economy. In the 1960s, over-the-air broadcasters vehemently attacked cable operators for “pirating” their broadcast signals. The Court’s decision in *Fortnightly Corp. v. United Artists Television, Inc.*, 392 U.S. 390 (1968), allowed the cable operators to expand and mature to the point that those same broadcasters were eventually demanding the right to force cable operators to carry their content over the same technology broadcasters had tried to demonize scant decades before.

Sony wisely rejected applying a premature brake on new

innovations in content distribution technology, ruling that multi-use technology is lawful as long as it is “merely . . . capable of substantial noninfringing uses.” 464 U.S. at 442 (emphasis added). Were the rule otherwise, the acts of direct infringers would enable copyright owners to veto neutrally designed technologies that offer substantial noninfringing uses to consumers. *Id.* at 441 n.21. As this Court recognized, “it seems extraordinary” to give a veto to copyright owners over new technologies “simply because they may be used to infringe copyrights.” *Id.* That observation is as true today as it was in 1984.

3. Petitioners’ next limitation would render the *Sony* defense inapplicable whenever a technology provider can develop and implement some means of separating infringing from noninfringing uses. *E.g.*, MPRC Br. 32-34. But *Sony* rejected this same argument when copyright owners argued vehemently that Sony should have been required to implement filtering or blocking devices. This Court declined to consider alternative versions of technology eschewed by Sony in considering whether the *Sony* defense was applicable. 464 U.S. at 422-23, 442-55. This decision reflected the sound understanding that courts should not be in the business of second-guessing the particular engineering solution chosen by the technology provider. Any such second-guessing, necessarily based on 20/20 hindsight regarding the predominant use of the technology and subsequent advances in filtering devices, would chill innovation. Even the United States agrees that “[p]roduct manufacturers do not have an independent legal duty under copyright law to modify their products so as to control their customers’ infringing conduct.” U.S. Br. 19 & n.3, 30 n.6.

4. Petitioners argue that the *Sony* defense does not apply to vicarious liability. MPRC Br. 48. But this limitation on *Sony* would render the defense largely meaningless. Under petitioners’ reasoning, any multi-use technology provider who derives any financial benefit from any infringing use of its technology (even if it would derive this benefit irrespective of the use or misuse by individual consumers) and who, with a certain investment of time and money, could devise a

way (however crude or imperfect) to separate infringing from noninfringing use, is liable for vicarious infringement. Under this theory, few technology providers could escape liability because, with the right investment of time and money (and no concern for consumer privacy and First Amendment freedoms), some crude filtering device almost always could be jury-rigged. This Court could not have intended *Sony* to provide a bright-line defense to contributory infringement only to have the same technology providers subjected to debilitating liability under a closely related theory.⁷

5. Finally, several *amici* attempt to roll these four ill-advised new exceptions to *Sony*, along with a grab bag of other “factors,” into a “totality of the circumstances” test. This is essentially the test created by Judge Posner’s opinion in *In re Aimster Copyright Litigation*, 334 F.3d 643 (7th Cir. 2003). Such a test would require the federal district courts to determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether a variety of factors, including the current break-down of companies’ revenues, the current predominant use of the multi-use technology, and the cost of filtering alternatives, counsels in favor of imposing liability. That approach is little better than giving the courts no direction at all, since *amici* do not identify any necessary and sufficient criteria for liability; do not posit any ordinal relationship among these factors; and do not even say whether the various factors they do identify are exclusive. The *Aimster* approach is judicial legislation at its worst. It does not merely blur *Sony*’s bright-line protection; it erases it altogether.

II. Fearing Innovation, Copyright Owners Have a Long and Unsuccessful History of Trying To Use the Courts To Halt New Technologies, Including Distribution Technologies.

This case is the latest in a long string of instances in which copyright owners, frightened by a new technological development, use the same set of tired arguments and overblown rhetoric to defend comfortable delivery systems by asking the federal courts to curtail access to the

7. It is no surprise, then, that even several *amici* supporting petitioners or vacatur acknowledge that the *Sony* defense applies to vicarious liability. *E.g.*, Business Software Alliance Br. 8 n.6; American Intellectual Property Law Ass’n Br. 7 n.3.

development of new content distribution technology. These unsuccessful attempts to restrict new technologies date back to the invention of the mechanical player piano, nearly 100 years ago, *see White-Smith Music Publ'g v. Apollo Co.*, 209 U.S. 1 (1908). The briefs of petitioners and their *amici* in this case echo all of these prior, unsuccessful arguments.

1. Copyright owners always employ ominous rhetoric (more suited to a mystery novel than a legal brief) to describe the supposed threat created by advances in distribution technology. In hindsight, the concerns expressed by copyright owners about such threats have frequently proven overblown or unfounded.

For example, after the Ninth Circuit found that the makers of Sony Betamax VCRs were liable for contributory infringement, but prior to this Court's reversal of that decision, Congress considered a number of bills to correct the enormous technological and commercial roadblock created by the lower court's decision. In hearings on those bills, Jack Valenti, the president of the Motion Picture Association of America ("MPAA"), warned a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee that unless licensing fees were imposed on the VCR, the "VCR avalanche" would "strip[] . . . clean [the post-theatrical market for movies] of . . . profit potential," and that those markets would be "decimated, shrunken [and] collapsed" by widespread use of the VCR.⁸ The VCR, according to Mr. Valenti, was "to the American film producer and the American public as the Boston strangler is to the woman home alone."⁹ The same dire predictions appeared in the content providers' briefs to this Court in *Sony* itself. *See, e.g., Br. of Sony Respondents* (Oct. 1982) ("Respondents simply seek protection against the permanent loss of control over their property and the concomitant erosion of their copyrights that will necessarily result as millions of VTRs are

8. *Home Recording of Copyrighted Works, Hearings on H.R. 4783 et al. before Subcomm. on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice of the House Comm. on Judiciary, 97th Cong. 4, 8* (1982) (testimony of Jack Valenti, President, MPAA) ("HRCW").

9. *Id.*

sold and hundreds of millions of unauthorized VTR copies of respondents' works are made."').¹⁰

After this Court refused to expand the copyright monopoly in *Sony*, 464 U.S. at 456, the motion picture industry readily adapted to the VCR. Far from destroying the post-theatrical market for movies and ruining the industry, the VCR (and successor technologies) has vastly increased the profitability of films, and has allowed studios to produce movies that could not have survived on theater revenues alone.¹¹ Contrary to Mr. Valenti's dire predictions, the VCR and related technologies turned out to be "the greatest friend that the American film producer ever had." HRCW 8. With the benefit of hindsight, it is now clear that had the Ninth Circuit's decision been affirmed, the harm to the public and to the motion picture industry itself would have been irreparable.

2. Nor is this the first time that copyright owners have argued that innovators have an affirmative duty to alter their technology in ways dictated by the copyright industry, just as

10. See also Br. of *Sony* Respondents ("[I]f petitioners are permitted to continue their activities without compensating respondents," such activities will "prejudic[e] the entire television viewing public, VTR and non-VTR owners alike."); MPAA *Sony* Br. (Oct. 1982) ("[D]ue to VTRs, the works of [MPAA's] members have become 'so easy of replication' that incentive to produce would be depressed 'by the prospect of rampant reproduction by free-loaders.'" (citation omitted)).

11. "By the 1990s, a film's income from videotapes dwarfed all other revenue streams." Mark S. Nadel, *How Current Copyright Law Discourages Creative Output: The Overlooked Impact of Marketing*, 19 BERKELEY TECH. L.J. 785, 823 (2004) (citations omitted); see Timothy Wu, *Copyright's Communications Policy*, 103 MICH. L. REV. 278, 347 (2004) (noting that VCRs became one of the most lucrative inventions for movie producers since the movie projector). Time Warner's senior intellectual property counsel noted:

[T]he film industry got together and brought the famous, or infamous, Betamax case thinking that these VCRs were going to destroy the economic basis of film distribution, particularly theatrical exhibition and profitable television distribution. What actually happened was just the opposite. . . . This has become one of the most profitable channels of distribution for the film industry."

Conference: *Digital Technology and Copyright: A Threat or a Promise?*, 39 IDEA 291, 305 (1999) (remarks of Dean Marks).

they contend here. *E.g.*, MPRC Br. 47, 48. The Recording Industry Association of America, Inc. (“RIAA”) sought to enjoin distribution of the Diamond Rio, one of the first portable digital music or MP3 players, a type of device of which Apple’s iPod is perhaps the best known.¹² The argument made by RIAA in the Diamond Rio case, that innovators have a specific duty to alter their technology to meet the demands of the recording industry, is the same as the claim made by petitioners in this case. *Id.* at 47-48 (“[R]espondents have also refused to implement other readily available mechanisms that would prevent the transfer of works that infringe petitioners copyrights.”).

Indeed, RIAA’s statements in the Diamond Rio case—criticizing the inventors for their effrontery in failing to include RIAA in the design of the underlying product, and their unwillingness to alter their business plan to accommodate RIAA—lay bare the veto RIAA expects to wield over the development and marketing of any potential multi-use technology. “To our disappointment, Diamond declined to postpone its product launch so that we could constructively address the issues, leaving us with no other option but to take legal action to prevent distribution of these devices.” RIAA Press Release, *RIAA Takes Stand to Protect Legitimate Online Marketplace*, Oct. 9, 1998, at <http://www.riaa.com/news/newsletter/press1998/100998.asp>.

Using similar logic, RIAA asked the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) to impose expansive constraints on Digital Audio Broadcasting (“DAB”), which uses digital technologies to enable or to provide better sound quality over traditional AM and FM radio frequencies.¹³ The motion picture industry also has demanded changes to the Digital Video Recorder (“DVR”), made popular under the TiVo and ReplayTV brand-names, claiming that this technology infringes its

12. *RIAA v. Diamond Multimedia Sys., Inc.*, 180 F.3d 1072, 1073 (9th Cir. 1999). There, the Ninth Circuit rejected the RIAA’s attempt to classify the novel device as a digital audio recording device and to expand the reach of the Audio Home Recording Act. *Id.* at 1081.

13. Comments of RIAA, *Digital Audio Broad. Sys. & Their Impact on the Terrestrial Radio Broad. Serv.*, FCC MM Dkt. No. 99-325 at iv-v (June 16, 2004).

copyrights even though it performs the same functions as the VCR (but is easier to program than a VCR and allows users more easily to fast-forward through commercials).¹⁴ The plaintiffs urged the court to find ReplayTV liable for copyright infringement in part because the defendants made “a deliberate decision to offer their users features that are specifically designed to enable widespread infringements, when they have the ability to control or greatly limit that conduct by declining to offer or to facilitate or support use of those unlawful features.” Paramount Compl. ¶ 85. Similarly, the motion picture industry opposed certification of TiVo’s Broadcast Flag solution at the FCC, which (ironically) is an FCC effort to certify specific methods of blocking redistribution of digital television programs using peer-to-peer software.¹⁵

3. The recording and motion picture industries invoke the same dire themes and make the same legal arguments in this case. *See, e.g.*, MPRC Br. 43 (“[R]espondents make their money from advertising to users each time they access the services to copy and distribute copyrighted works. The larger the number of users attracted by the infringing content, the more money Grokster and Streamcast make.”). Copyright owners have leveled these same amorphous and overbroad accusations against broadband networks, personal computers, and even peripheral capabilities such as Internet search engines and credit card companies.

RIAA singled out broadband before Congress, claiming that “Verizon and SBC have little or no economic incentive to combat piracy . . . [because] music downloading is driving the

14. *See, e.g.*, Am. Compl., *Paramount Pictures Corp. v. ReplayTV, Inc.*, 298 F. Supp. 2d 921 (C.D. Cal. 2004) (“Paramount Compl.”).

15. *Digital Output Protection Technology and Recording Method Certifications*, 19 F.C.C.R. 15,876, 15,876 (¶ 1) (2004). TiVo developed a technology that the FCC found met the goals of preventing the mass indiscriminate redistribution of content, *id.* at 15,925 (¶ 108), but the MPAA urged the FCC to reject this solution both in an initial opposition and on reconsideration because it permitted the user to access the recorded programs remotely and did not tie the user to his or her living room. Opp’n of the MPAA, *Digital Output Protection Technology and Recording Method Certifications*, FCC MB Dkt. No. 04-63 (Apr. 4, 2004); Pet’n for Partial Recon., *Digital Output Protection Technology and Recording Method Certifications*, FCC MB Dkt. No. 04-63 (Sept. 13, 2004).

[DSL] business.”¹⁶ The recording industry has repeatedly argued that copyright law reaches mere Internet conduits like Verizon and SBC, and that were it not for the specific “safe harbors” created by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (“DMCA”), these “ISPs could face enormous monetary liability for the actions of their subscribers. With the current levels of piracy, that could translate into enormous monetary liability.”¹⁷ Echoing his concerns of 20 years before about the VCR, Jack Valenti said in Senate testimony that the lack of broadband access was a “moat” that has “slowed a widespread assault” on movies.¹⁸

The stratagem of attacking new distribution technologies and channels of distribution, once given legal sanction and set loose upon society, would apply to products as well as services. Thus, copyright owners have complained about personal computers. In March 2002, during a hearing before the Senate Commerce Committee, Michael Eisner, CEO of Disney, accused computer manufacturers generally, and Apple specifically, of promoting copyright piracy. Brooks Boliek, *Mouse Grouse: Dis Boss Lays into Computer Biz*, THE HOLLYWOOD REPORTER, Mar. 1, 2002, at http://www.larta.org/pl/NewsArticles/02Marc01_HR_Eisner.htm (Mr. Eisner charging that “[t]he killer app for the computer industry is piracy,” and “[t]hey think their short-term growth is predicated on pirated content”; accusing Apple of “telling people ‘that they can create a theft if they buy this computer’”).

As noted above, there is no doubt that copyright owners have legitimate grievances against some peer-to-peer software distributors. Internet *amici* support targeted legislation that outlaws certain specific products offered in carefully defined ways as opposed to attacking (or allowing debilitating litigation attacks) on multi-use technology in general.

16. *Consumer Privacy and Gov't Tech. Mandates in the Digital Media Marketplace, Hr'g Before the Sen. Commerce Comm.* (Sept. 17, 2003) (testimony of Cary Sherman, President and Counsel, RIAA), http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/testimony.cfm?id=919&wit_id=2584.

17. *Id.*

18. See MPAA Press Release, *Valenti Testifies Piracy Threatens To Destroy Movie Industry and U.S. Economy*, Feb. 12, 2000, at http://www.mpa.org/jack/2002/2002_02_12a.htm.

Unfortunately, copyright owners—not all of which are as responsible as the plaintiffs in this litigation—cannot resist the temptation to overreach. For example, Perfect 10, a copyright owner of pornographic materials, has brought an infringement suit against Google, one of the most popular Internet search engines, asserting that Google’s business is based on the “draw” of illicit content.¹⁹

Perfect 10 argued that Google derives a “direct financial benefit” from the alleged infringement by charging fees to allegedly infringing websites and from the increase in traffic to Google’s website from the “draw” of these allegedly infringing sites. Google Compl. ¶ 56. Perfect 10’s theory, that Google should affirmatively alter its practices to distinguish between copyrighted and non-copyrighted works in its search function, mirrors petitioners’ argument here that technology companies must give copyright owners a co-equal role in the innovation process and must satisfy any concerns raised by any copyright holder in order to avoid suit. Perfect 10 has gone so far as to argue that infringement liability should extend to Visa and MasterCard, because those companies allegedly derive a benefit from infringing conduct.²⁰

In sum, petitioners and other copyright owners routinely target any innovation that alters the status quo and claim that it will result in the Götterdämmerung of Copyright. While petitioners focus on the alleged bad acts of respondents, the history of the copyright owners’ prior conduct shows that their arguments have no theoretical or practical limit and no sense of balancing future innovation (and new and valuable distribution technologies and channels) against today’s monopoly profits. If the Court expands copyright liability in the unprecedented manner called for by petitioners, there can be no doubt that they will continue to use these same arguments against any technology that they claim benefits from infringement in any way, which, in this digital world, is nearly any technology at all.

19. Compl., *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, No. 2:04-cv-09484 (C.D. Cal. filed Nov. 19, 2004) (“Google Compl.”).

20. *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa Int’l Serv. Ass’n, et al.*, No. C-04-0371, 2004 WL 1773349 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 5).

III. Recent Multi-Industry Negotiations over Legislative Solutions Exemplify the Constitutionally Mandated Process for any Expansion of Petitioners' Copyrights.

Congress opened debate on abuses of peer-to-peer file-sharing technology (including copyright infringement) almost three years ago.²¹ Since then, Members have introduced numerous bills designed to address such problems.²² Specifically, in June 2004 six Senators introduced a bill designed to address the type of abuse in which respondents are alleged to have engaged—the use of peer-to-peer technology to induce others to engage in copyright infringement. The history of this bill, the Inducing Infringement of Copyrights Act of 2004 (“Induce Act”), S. 2560 (2004), and the multi-party negotiations-based approach that almost produced a “consensus” draft, demonstrate the correct process for solving this problem. Notably, the solution toward which the legislative process was converging in no way resembles the new judicially-created common law rule that petitioners demand here.

1. On June 22, 2004, Senators Hatch, Leahy, Frist, Daschle, Graham, and Boxer introduced the Induce Act to codify an expanded notion of secondary copyright liability that would reach the type of peer-to-peer firms that intentionally induce others to engage in massive copyright infringement.²³ In his introductory remarks, Senator Hatch described the bad acts or business models that he sought to ban as the theft and widespread distribution of copyrighted material through the

21. *Privacy of Intellectual Property on Peer-to-Peer Networks: Hr'g before Subcomm. on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property of House Comm. on the Judiciary*, 107th Cong. 21 (Sept. 26, 2002).

22. See, e.g., Family Entm't and Copyright Act of 2005, S. 167, 109th Cong. (2005); Artists' Rights and Theft Prevention (ART) Act, S. 1932, 108th Cong. (2004); Piracy Deterrence and Educ. Act of 2004, H.R. 4077, 108th Cong. (2004); Protecting Children from Peer-to-Peer Pornography Act, H.R. 2885, 108th Cong. (2003); Consumer Broadband and Digital Television Promotion Act, S. 2048, 107th Cong. (2002).

23. See 150 CONG. REC. S7189-S7192 (daily ed. June 22, 2004); *id.* at S7192 (describing the bill as importing a codified form of liability in patent law into statutory copyright law); *id.* at S7192 (statement of Sen. Leahy) (same).

use of third-party shields.²⁴ Throughout his remarks, Senator Hatch made clear that the proposed legislation targeted a narrow group of “bad actors” and constituted a change in the existing law of secondary liability in order to reach them.²⁵

Senator Hatch and his colleagues quickly realized that targeting “bad actors,” without doing damage to Internet *amici* and our digital economy, was not an easy task. Any legislative solution had to “address[] this serious threat to children and copyrights *without unduly burdening companies that engage in lawful commerce in the wide range of devices and programs that can copy digital files.*”²⁶ As co-sponsor Senator Leahy explained, it was critical that the bill reach only bad actors and not “target

24. The evil he sought to remedy was

the intentional inducement of global distribution of billions of infringing copies of works at the prodding and instigation of sophisticated corporations that appear to want to profit from piracy, know better than to break the law themselves, and try to shield themselves from secondary liability by inducing others to infringe and then disclaiming control over those individuals.

Id.; see *id.* at S7193 (statement of Sen. Frist) (explaining the bill was designed to “target[] the bad actors who are encouraging others to steal”).

25. See, e.g., *id.* at S7189, S7190, S7191, S7192; see also *Protecting Innovation and Art while Preventing Piracy, Hearing before the Sen. Comm. on Judiciary* (July 22, 2004) (“*Induce Act Hr’g*”), at <http://judiciary.senate.gov/hearing.cfm?id=1276> (statement of Sen. Hatch) (“[I]t is our intent that S. 2560 change the law of contributory liability only for a very narrow class of defendants.”).

26. *Id.* at S7192 (emphasis added); see *id.* at S7190 (“[A]ll agree that non-piracy-adapted implementations of P2P could have legitimate and beneficial uses.”); see also *id.* at S7192 (statement of Sen. Leahy) (identifying the goal “to bring affordable and reliable Internet access to every household”); *Induce Act Hr’g* (statement of Sen. Leahy) (“Senator Hatch and I have worked to promote the great possibilities of the Internet and the technologies that capitalize on its potential.”). These sentiments are consistent with Senator Hatch’s own observations as early as 1999 that “[h]igh technology is the single largest industry in the United States” and “is the key to the development of our future economy.” Orrin Hatch, *Antitrust in the Digital Age*, Address before The Progress & Freedom Foundation, Feb. 1998, at 3 (stressing importance of protecting “technological paradigm shifts” like that being wrought by the Internet), <http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/futureinsights/fi5.1antitrustdigitalage.html>.

technology” or “demonize certain software.”²⁷ As co-sponsor and Senate Majority Leader Frist emphasized, “[t]his bill should not . . . threaten in any manner the further advancement of technology.”²⁸

The Senators co-sponsoring this bill understood that the only way to achieve their twin goals of protecting copyrights in the digital environment while also protecting new digital technologies was to “build[] that consensus that is the hallmark of successful and useful legislation,”²⁹ especially in copyright law.³⁰ Accordingly, Senator Hatch explained that the Committee was “willing to enter into a constructive dialogue to ensure that the language is drawn as tightly as possible.”³¹

2. Despite the co-sponsors’ intentions narrowly to target certain actors, most of the experts who testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee agreed that the original draft fell short in two ways: It threatened many legitimate companies and technology developers with liability, and it failed necessarily to capture the specific bad practices and bad actors at which it was aimed.³² As one participant explained, S. 2560

27. 150 CONG. REC. S7192; *Induce Act Hr’g* (Sen. Leahy) (agreeing that “technology is not to blame, we need to target those who have hijacked technology and undermined the rights of copyright holders”).

28. 150 CONG. REC. S7193; *Induce Act Hr’g* (Sen. Leahy) (“This bill will protect our copyright holders *and spur innovation.*” (emphasis added)).

29. *Id.* (Sen. Leahy); *see id.* (statement of Sen. Hatch) (“We want to continue to work with interested parties [including ‘leading technology companies’] to make refinements that will help us achieve the bill’s intent.”).

30. Multi-industry negotiation is the paradigm of amendment to the Copyright Act. “Congress continues to rely on private interests to work out the text of bills,” particularly copyright bills, because “[t]he negotiation process delegates everything to people who are, after all, the real copyright experts, and allows Congress to exploit their accumulated expertise. The participants are people who will have to order their day-to-day business relations with one another around the provisions of the legislation.” JESSICA LITMAN, *DIGITAL COPYRIGHT* 61 (2001).

31. *Induce Act Hr’g* (statement of Sen. Hatch).

32. *See, e.g., id.* (statement of Gary J. Shapiro, President and CEO, Consumer Electronics Ass’n and Chairman, Home Recording Rights Coalition) (“In our view, S. 2560 is the most fundamental threat that consumers and technology industries have faced since the Ninth Circuit’s decision in 1981,” which was overturned in *Sony*).

threatened to gut the defenses of *Sony* and included an intent standard that was “hopelessly [s]ubjective” such that it “[w]ould [t]hreaten [i]nnovation” and “verge[d] perilously on punishing speech.”³³ Still another participant warned that numerous key areas needed revision, “including an express preservation of the defenses outlined in *Sony*,” a clear statement that “mere knowledge” does not demonstrate intent to induce copyright infringement, a carving out of conduct such as “advertising or providing support to users” from consideration in finding liability, and a mechanism effectively to deter “weak, harassing or frivolous law suits.”³⁴

In order to reach a consensus on a targeted legislative solution, the Senate co-sponsors directed the Register of Copyrights to work with the interested parties “to achieve consensus proposals.” Letter from Co-Sponsors of Induce Act to Marybeth Peters, Register of Copyrights, Aug. 13, 2004, <http://leahy.senate.gov/press/200408/081704.html>. The co-sponsors explained, “[w]e are open to any constructive input on how Congress can best frame a technology-neutral law directed at a small set of bad actors while protecting our legitimate technology industries from frivolous litigation.” *Id.*

3. In September 2004, the Copyright Office forwarded its recommended text to the Committee,³⁵ but that draft also was unsuccessful. Even with the input of dozens of leading technology companies, technology and copyright owner trade organizations, individuals, consumer groups, and copyright owners who welcome free distribution of their works, the Copyright Office’s proposed draft fared no better than did the original version of S. 2560. Its proposal cast the liability net too broadly, potentially sweeping within its ambit legitimate Internet-related businesses and technologies. As a coalition of 42 technology industry leaders, trade groups, education and library associations, service providers,

33. *Id.* (Mr. Shapiro); *see also id.* (Mr. Greenberg) (explaining that the “[p]ractical [u]ncertainty over [the] scope and [a]pplication of the [n]ew standard will [c]hill innovation”).

34. *Id.* (statement of Robert Holleyman).

35. Recommendation and Explanatory Mem., at <http://www.copyright.gov/docs/S2560.pdf> (visited Feb. 10, 2005).

equipment manufacturers, and consumer groups explained to the Committee, the Copyright Office's "draft raise[d] a host of new issues and would [have] create[d] an unprecedented new form of liability of uncertain, but potentially unlimited, reach."³⁶

4. With the failure of the Copyright Office's draft to garner anything approaching a consensus, the co-sponsors turned to the industries themselves to negotiate a draft that would achieve the necessary balance between copyright protection and the legitimate concerns of the high-tech community. This multi-industry group met in a series of off-the-record meetings with Committee staff and attempted to shape a consensus bill.³⁷

Although these discussions occurred behind closed doors, enough of their substance is contained in the public record to demonstrate that the tentative drafts created in this process were substantially more narrowly tailored than the original bill as introduced. They included more precise language and express savings clauses that simply could not be mirrored in any broad common law rule. They were in fact light years away from the new tests advocated by petitioners (and the United States) in this case.³⁸ Specifically, the discussions

36. Letter from Ass'n of Am. Univ. *et al.* to Senators Hatch and Leahy, Sept. 17, 2004, at <http://www.publicknowledge.org/news/-letters/inducegroup>; see, e.g., *Copyright Office Draft of INDUCE Fails To Inspire Industry Insiders*, COMM. DAILY, Sept. 7, 2004 (describing the objections of the Consumer Electronics Association, NetCoalition, and Verizon to the Copyright Office's draft that it was too broad and too subjective).

37. See, e.g., *Hatch Puts Off Induce Act for One Week*, COMM. DAILY, Oct. 1, 2004 (describing a meeting between Judiciary Committee staff and "representatives of telecom, high tech, consumer and content interests"); Ted Bridis, *Senate Talks Fail on File-Sharing Software*, MSNBC NEWS, Oct. 7, 2004, at <http://msnbc.msn.com/id/6200562/> ("Sensing an impasse after weeks of acrimonious debate, Hatch invited lawyers and lobbyists representing the sides to propose their own compromise in the waning days of this congressional session.").

38. See, e.g., *Copyright Owners' Tentative Proposal* (Oct. 5, 2004), at http://www.corante.com/importance/archives/induce_copyright_owner_tentative_proposal_10-5-04.pdf ("Oct. 5 Draft"). "Copyright industry executives defended the process, however, saying the criticism obscured the progress that is being made. 'What we're really quibbling

(Cont'd)

included, among others, the following limitations, safeguards, and exemptions designed to weed out bad actors without ensnaring legitimate businesses or threatening them with crippling litigation:

(i) Expansion of liability only to a defined subset of “covered peer-to-peer product[s],” a term that expressly excluded ISPs. Liability would have been premised on two fundamental requirements: the defendant must “manufacture[], offer[] to the public, or provide[] a covered peer-to-peer product” *and* the defendant must have engaged in “covered viral infringement,” *see, e.g.*, Oct. 5 Draft (g)(1). Both key statutory terms were carefully defined with the intention of reaching only the type of conduct that created a certain level of risk to copyright owners and not all multi-use distribution and reproduction technology, *see id.* (g)(2).³⁹

(ii) Further limitations on the business models subject to liability to those for whom “the majority of the revenues, including revenues from advertising, of a covered peer-to-peer product result[ed] from covered viral infringement,” *see, e.g., id.* (g)(1)(A) & (B), where “the availability of copies or phonorecords resulting from covered viral infringement is the principal reason the majority of users are attracted to the covered peer-to-peer product,” *id.* (g)(1)(B).

(Cont’d)

over here is how to define P2P,’ the executive said. ‘That’s not easy, but it’s solvable.’” Brooks Boliek, *Induce Act Stalls as Compromise Talks Break Down*, THE HOLLYWOOD REPORTER, Oct. 8, 2004, http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/thr_article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1000661869.

39. In the Oct. 5 Draft, for example, “[t]he term ‘covered peer-to-peer product’ . . . mean[t] a widely available device, or computer program for execution on a large number of devices, communicating over the Internet or any other publicly available network and performing or causing the performance at each such device all of the following functions,” including “providing search information relating to copies of phonorecords available for transmission to other devices,” locating other devices to respond to the search requests; and “transmitting a requested copy or phonorecord to another device that located the copy or phonorecord through such other device’s performance of the [locating] function,” “unless the provider of the device or computer program has the right and ability to control the copies or phonorecords that may be located by its use.” *Id.* (g)(2)(B).

(iii) Limitations on frivolous lawsuits and extended discovery until a prima facie case is presented that the infringement and product are of the type covered. *See, e.g., id.* (g)(3).

(iv) “Limitations on Remedies,” permitting “[n]o award of statutory damages . . . unless the copyright owner sustains the burden of proving, and the court finds, that such violation was committed willfully,” *see, e.g., id.* (g)(4)(A), and directing courts, “[i]n granting injunctive relief . . . to the extent practicable, [to] limit the scope of the injunctive relief so as not to prevent or restrain noninfringing uses of the covered peer-to-peer product,” *id.* (g)(4)(B).

(v) Preclusion of any possibility that courts could add a layer of secondary liability to the new violation. *See, e.g., id.* (g)(5) (“No court shall apply a doctrine of secondary liability to the cause of action created by this subsection.”).

(vi) Preservation of limitations in existing doctrines of secondary liability. *See, e.g., id.* (g)(6) (“Nothing in this subsection shall enlarge or diminish liability for direct infringement or the doctrines of vicarious and contributory infringement, *including any defenses thereto or any limitations on rights or remedies for infringement.*” (emphasis added)). This provision would have protected the existing parameters of the *Sony* defense – something the content owners are now trying to undo through this lawsuit.

(vii) Broad protections for service providers for performing functions defined under Section 512 of the DMCA (for example, transmitting, caching, hosting, or linking). *See, e.g.,* Oct. 5 Draft (g)(7). Even “service providers that primarily host[] on [their] website[s], or advertise[], the sale or offering for sale of covered peer-to-peer products by third parties through [their] website[s]” were to be exempted if they complied with the conditions in Section 512(c)(1) of the DMCA. *See, e.g., id.* (g)(8).

While imperfect, the bills discussed in the negotiations came closer to targeting only those actors whose behavior the co-sponsors intended to prohibit than did the original bill or the Copyright Office draft. They also included some of the provisions that, with revisions, would be necessary to protect

other technologies both present and future, such as exempting Internet service providers, and preserving the *Sony* defenses. By contrast, none of the new “federal common law” rules proposed by petitioners or their amici contains these limiting attributes.

IV. The Expansive Secondary Liability Sought by Petitioners Is Inconsistent with Federal Law and Policy Regarding the Internet and Broadband Internet Access.

In the 1996 Telecommunications Act, Congress sought to “accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services.”⁴⁰ Congress directed the regulatory agencies to “encourage the deployment . . . of advanced telecommunications capability to all Americans . . . by utilizing . . . methods that remove barriers to infrastructure investment.”⁴¹

Congress has also spoken directly to the issue of secondary liability and Internet service providers. In the DMCA, Congress expressly limited the applicability of copyright remedies to service providers based upon the functions that they perform, in storing, transmitting, or providing Internet links to all forms of content. The DMCA contains an express disclaimer of any intent to require ISPs to monitor (let alone police) any user-to-user communications, as well as recognition that technological protection measures for copyrights must be developed by consensus among the relevant industry parties in an open standards-setting process.

Congress cautioned that, “without clarification of their liability, service providers may hesitate to make the necessary investment in the expansion of the speed and capacity of the Internet.”⁴² Specifically, Congress was concerned that the

40. S. CONF. REP. NO. 104-230, at 1 (1996); H.R. CONF. REP. NO. 104-458, at 1 (1996).

41. Telecommunications Act of 1996, § 706, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 153 (1996), *reprinted in* 47 U.S.C. § 157 note.

42. S. REP. NO. 105-190, at 8 (1998); *see id.* at 19-20 (describing need for “greater certainty to service providers concerning their legal exposure for infringement that may occur in the course of their activities”).

possibility of courts imposing liability on the functions performed by most service providers, such as in the case of *Playboy Enterprises v. Frena*, 839 F. Supp. 1552 (M.D. Fla. 1993) (holding bulletin board service strictly liable for material posted on its service without regard to knowledge), would chill investment in Internet access upgrades. S. REP. NO. 105-190, at 8, 19 & n.20 (1998).

To this end and after “3 months of negotiations supervised by [Senate Judiciary Committee staff and] Chairman Hatch and assisted by Senator Ashcroft among the major copyright owners and the major OSP[]s and ISP[]s,” *id.* at 9, Congress expressly limited copyright remedies against those service providers who perform conduit, caching, storage, and information location functions, 17 U.S.C. § 512(a)-(d). Congress, however, went further than curbing such liability for service providers, announcing that nothing in the DMCA could be construed as imposing a duty on service providers to monitor their services for infringement. H.R. REP. NO. 105-551, Pt. 2, at 61 (1998) (nothing in the DMCA “suggest[s] that a provider must investigate possible infringements, monitor its service, or make difficult judgments as to whether conduct is or is not infringing”).

Service providers are obligated only to avoid interference with “standard technical measures” – measures that, among other things, “have been developed pursuant to a broad consensus of copyright owners and service providers in an open, fair, voluntary, multi-industry standards process” and “do not impose substantial costs on service providers or substantial burdens on their systems or networks.” 17 U.S.C. § 512(i). The DMCA also forbids the imposition of affirmative duties on service providers to police their users’ communications or to deploy technological measures that could weed out infringing from noninfringing communications. *Id.*; H.R. REP. NO. 105-551, at 61. In fact, a different law, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, codified at 18 U.S.C. §§ 2701, *et seq.*, makes

unauthorized access to private electronic communications a federal felony.⁴³

The DMCA squarely placed the burden on copyright owners to investigate infringement and invited all implicated industries to take part in reaching a “broad consensus” on the appropriate “technological solutions” that should be used, 17 U.S.C. § 512(i)(2)(A); H.R. REP. NO. 105-551, at 61. Thus, the DMCA evinces a clear intent to limit copyright liability for service providers, and to insulate them from any general duty to police their services or unilaterally to install filters or other devices to sort out infringing content.⁴⁴

The broad multi-factored tests for contributory and vicarious liability advocated by petitioners here are antithetical to the goals of the DMCA and would do precisely what Congress wished to preclude in that legislation.⁴⁵

43. Various other statutes demonstrate the same national policy of protecting the Internet from crippling duties or monetary liability: a) Congress immunized providers of “interactive computer service[s]” from liability as a “publisher or speaker” of any content provided by another information content provider, 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1); b) in the child protection statute at issue in *Ashcroft v. ACLU*, __ U.S. __, 124 S. Ct. 2783 (2004), Congress exempted from all liability a whole host of passive carriers and Internet-related technologies and services, including telecommunications carriers, Internet access providers, and providers of Internet directories and hypertext links, 47 U.S.C. § 231(b); and c) last Fall, in amendments to a copyright-related statute, 18 U.S.C. § 2318, that broaden its prohibition against trafficking in falsified authentication features for copyrighted works, Congress jettisoned earlier versions of the legislation that would have imposed potential liability on service providers for electronic dissemination of authentication features, see H.R. REP. NO. 108-600, at 6 (2002); compare Section 103(a)(2) of H.R. 3632, as enrolled, 108th Cong. 2d Sess. (2002), with S. 2395 as reported, 107th Cong. 2d Sess. (2004).

44. The DMCA reflects extraordinary solicitude to Internet users’ privacy and makes clear that service providers need not engineer their systems to include measures to protect copyrights. Specifically, Congress “designed” Section 512(m) “to protect the privacy of Internet users,” H.R. REP. NO. 105-511, at 64, and “ma[d]e[] clear that the applicability of” the limitations on liability outlined in the DMCA “is in no way conditioned on a service provider,” *id.*, “monitoring its service or affirmatively seeking facts indicating infringing activity, except to the extent consistent with [the ‘standard technical measures’],” 17 U.S.C. § 512(m)(1).

45. See, e.g., MPRC Br. 32-33 (asking this Court to consider “separating
(Cont’d)

Petitioners' new "federal common law" rules would require courts to circumvent the approach Congress mandated in the DMCA (and has adopted whenever it sought to amend Copyright Act) to craft multi-industry technological solutions, and would virtually guarantee that multi-use technology providers must violate the privacy rights of their subscribers in order to avoid liability. Congress never contemplated that courts could or would create such sweeping new rules of secondary liability and thereby undermine the careful balance struck by the DMCA.⁴⁶ Indeed, because Congress has spoken directly to the duties that may and may not be imposed on service providers in the name of copyright law, "the need for such an unusual exercise of [federal common] lawmaking by federal courts disappears." *City of Milwaukee v. Illinois & Michigan*, 451 U.S. 304, 314 (1981).

(Cont'd)

mechanisms [that] are readily available" in determining liability); *id.* at 39-40 (same for "willful blindness" or the decision not to monitor the content of users' communications); *id.* at 40-41 (advocating that *the Court* create incentives for multi-use technology providers unilaterally to implement filtering mechanisms); *id.* at 44-46 (same).

46. Although Senate Committee Reports did suggest that "the Committee decided to leave current law in its evolving state and, instead, to create a series of 'safe harbors,' for certain common activities of service providers," S. REP. NO. 105-190, at 19, there is no suggestion that eviscerating the defenses and principle of deference identified in *Sony* would be considered part of the "evolving state" or that the law could "evolve" in such a way as to permit courts to impose the very duties on service providers that Congress had foreclosed by statute.

CONCLUSION

The judgment of the court of appeals should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted.

ANDREW G. McBRIDE
Counsel of Record
KATHRYN COMERFORD TODD
JOSHUA S. TURNER
WILEY REIN & FIELDING LLP
1776 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 719-7000
Counsel for Amici Curiae

MICHAEL ALTSCHUL
Cellular Telecommunications
AND INTERNET ASSOCIATION
1400 16th Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 785-0081

JAMES W. OLSON
ROBIN E. TUTTLE
UNITED STATE TELECOM ASSOCIATION
1401 H Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 326-7300

DAVID P. McCLURE
US INTERNET INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
815 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 620
Washington, D.C. 20006
(703) 924-0006

FRANK L. POLITANO
LAURA KASTER
AT&T CORP.
1 AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921
(908) 532-1860

BENNETT L. ROSS
BELLSOUTH CORPORATION
1133 21st Street, N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 463-4113

JEFFREY A. RACKOW
MCI, INC.
1133 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 736-6933

GRIER C. RACLIN
JOANNA S. LOWRY
CATHLEEN K. WASILEWSKI
SAVVIS COMMUNICATIONS
CORPORATION
12851 Worldgate Drive
Herndon, VA 20170
(703) 667-6566

MICHAEL STANDARD
SBC INTERNET SERVICES, INC.
1010 N. St. Mary's Street
14th Floor
San Antonio, TX 78215
(210) 246-8106

LOWELL SACHS
SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Suite 420 East
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 326-7521

JOHN THORNE
SARAH B. DEUTSCH
PAUL J. LARKIN, JR.
VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC.
1515 N. Courthouse Road
Fifth Floor
Arlington, VA 22201
(703) 351-3900

*Counsel for Individual Amicus Curiae
as Designated Above*

March 1, 2005