

**Nos. 10-3270 & 10-3342**

IN THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

**VIACOM INT'L INC., et al.** ) On Appeal from the United  
Plaintiffs-Appellants, ) States District Court for the  
 ) Southern District of New York

v. ) No. 1:07-CV-2103  
YOUTUBE, INC., et. al., ) The Honorable Louis L.  
Defendants-Appellees. ) Stanton, United States  
 ) District Judge

**THE FOOTBALL  
ASSOCIATION PREMIER  
LEAGUE LTD., et al.** ) On Appeal from the United  
 ) States District Court for the  
 ) Southern District of New York

**APPELLEES' OPPOSITION TO APPELLANTS' MOTION TO FILE OVERSIZED REPLY BRIEFS**

Appellees YouTube, Inc., YouTube, LLC, and Google, Inc.

(“YouTube”) oppose appellants’ motion to file oversized reply briefs.

Appellants' opening briefs total approximately 28,000 words.

YouTube's combined answering brief was approximately 21,000 words.

Now appellants now seek 18,000 words for their collective replies. If appellants' request is granted, the total word use for this appeal will be:

- **Appellants: 46,000 words**
- **YouTube: 21,000 words**

There is no justification for that disparity. Appellants point to the fact that YouTube chose to file one answering brief rather than two separate briefs. But, by doing so, YouTube used far fewer than the 28,000 words that the rules otherwise made available. That is hardly reason for giving appellants 4,000 more words than the rules allow.

Appellants' invocation of the 13 amicus briefs filed in support of YouTube's position in this appeal does not change that. A total of 14 amicus briefs were filed on appellants' side, yet YouTube stayed well under the word limit provided by the rules. And appellants have already used the filing of amicus briefs as a basis for obtaining permission to take twice the normal time to prepare their reply briefs. No further concession on that ground is necessary or appropriate.

This Court “disfavors motions to file a brief exceeding the length permitted by FRAP 32(a)(7).” Local R. 27.1(e)(1). Appellants’ motions should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

April 15, 2011

David H. Kramer  
Bart E. Volkmer  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 493-9300

s/ Andrew H. Schapiro  
Andrew H. Schapiro  
A. John P. Mancini  
Brian M. Willen  
MAYER BROWN LLP  
1675 Broadway  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 506-2500

*Attorneys for YouTube, Inc.*