

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.