Cariou v. Prince Doc. 195

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse 40 Foley Square, New York, NY 10007 Telephone: 212-857-8500

MOTION INFORMATION STATEMENT

Docket Number(s): 11-1197-cv	Caption [use short title]
Motion for:leave to file reply amicus curiae brief	Cariou v. Prince, et al.
Set forth below precise, complete statement of relief sought:	
See attached.	
	_
	-
	_
Amicus The Andy Warhol Foundation for the	_
MOVING PARTY: Visual Arts, Inc.	OPPOSING PARTY: Plaintiff-Appellee Patrick Cariou
☐ Plaintiff ☐ Defendant ☐ Appellant/Petitioner ☐ Appellee/Respondent	
MOVING ATTORNEY: _ Anthony T. Falzone	OPPOSING ATTORNEY: Daniel J. Brooks
[name of attorney, with firm, a	address, phone number and e-mail]
Stanford Law School, Center for Internet and Society	Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP
559 Nathan Abbott Way	140 Broadway, Suite 3100
Stanford, CA 94305 (650) 736-9050 falzone@stanford.edu	New York, NY 10005 (212) 973-8000 dbrooks@schnader.com
(030) 730-9030 Talzonewstanioid.edu	(212) 373 0000 abloomb@belmadel.com
Court-Judge/Agency appealed from: United States District Court	for the Southern District of New York
Please check appropriate boxes:	FOR EMERGENCY MOTIONS, MOTIONS FOR STAYS AND
• •	INJUNCTIONS PENDING APPEAL:
Has movant notified opposing counsel (required by Local Rule 27.1):	Has request for relief been made below?
Yes No (explain):	Has this relief been previously sought in this Court?
	Requested return date and explanation of emergency:
Opposing counsel's position on motion:	
☐ Unopposed ☑ Opposed ☐ Don't Know	
Does opposing counsel intend to file a response:	
Yes No Don't Know	
Is oral argument on motion requested? ☐ Yes ☑ No (requests	for oral argument will not necessarily be granted)
Has argument date of appeal been set? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, ent	ter date:
Signature of Moving Attorney:	
/s/ Anthony T. Falzone Date: 2/22/12	Has service been effected? Yes No [Attach proof of service]
OF	RDER
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the motion is GRANTEI	D DENIED.
	FOR THE COURT:
	CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE, Clerk of Court
Date:	By
Date.	By:

UNITED STATES COURT OF	
APPEALS FOR THE SECOND	
CIRCUIT	Appeal No. 11-1197-CV
Patrick Cariou,	On Appeal From the United Stated District Court for the Southern District of New York, Civil Action No. 08-CV-11327 (DAB)
Plaintiff-Appellee,	
V.	MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY AMICUS
Richard Prince, et al.	CURIAE BRIEF
Defendants- Appellants	

The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. ("The Warhol Foundation") respectfully moves for leave to file the accompanying reply brief as amicus curiae in support of Defendants-Appellants and urging reversal of the district court's decision.

The Warhol Foundation makes this unusual request because it is in a unique position to represent public interests that go beyond those of the parties to this case. It generates substantial revenue from the copyrights it owns and uses that revenue to help fund its non-profit mission of supporting contemporary art, including the work of many photographers. The Warhol Foundation's interest in this case therefore parallels the public's interest in a

balanced copyright system that recognizes the need to provide strong economic incentives and the need to provide plenty of breathing room for artists who use existing images to create new art.

Plainitff-Appellee Patrick Cariou, and the amici curiae that filed in support of him, urge the Court to adopt a fair use standard that would upset that balance profoundly. The Warhol Foundation believes its reply brief will assist the Court in understanding how far Cariou and his amici depart from the controlling law of the Supreme Court and the Second Circuit, why their proposed standard is particularly inappropriate for visual art, and the extent to which the adoption of that standard would threaten established modes of artistic expression and ultimately impede far more creativity than it would promote.

The reply brief meets the requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, totals 2,402 words, and provides the Court with an important perspective not offered by the parties to the litigation. On this basis, The Warhol Foundation respectfully asks the Court to grant it leave to file the reply brief submitted with this motion.

DATED: February 22, 2012

/s/ Anthony T. Falzone

Anthony T. Falzone
Julie A. Ahrens
Daniel K. Nazer
Stanford Law School
Center for Internet and Society
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305
(650) 736-9050

Virginia Rutledge 414 W. 145th Street New York, NY 10031 (212) 368-2949

Zachary J. Alinder John A. Polito Bingham McCutchen LLP Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111 (415) 393-2000

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 22, 2012, I served by E-Mail a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion by Amicus The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. for Leave to File Reply Amicus Curiae Brief and accompanying Motion Information Statement upon the parties listed below:

Daniel J. Brooks SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS LLP 140 Broadway, Suite 3100 New York, NY 10005 (212) 973-8000 dbrooks@schnader.com

/s/ Anthony T. Falzone
ANTHONY T. Falzone