

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 Caption [use short title]

Motion for: Independent Oral Argument Cariou v. Prince, et al.

Set forth below precise, complete statement of relief sought:

Amicus Curiae The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. seeks ten minutes of oral argument in addition to the time allotted to the parties. See attached.

MOVING PARTY: Amicus Curiae The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. OPPOSING PARTY: Patrick Cariou, Richard Prince
Plaintiff Defendant
Appellant/Petitioner Appellee/Respondent

MOVING ATTORNEY: Anthony T. Falzone OPPOSING ATTORNEY: See attached.
[name of attorney, with firm, address, phone number and e-mail]

Stanford Law School, Center for Internet and Society
559 Nathan Abbott Way, Stanford CA 94305
650-736-9050
falzone@stanford.edu

Court-Judge/Agency appealed from: U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Please check appropriate boxes:

Has movant notified opposing counsel (required by Local Rule 27.1):
Yes No (explain):

FOR EMERGENCY MOTIONS, MOTIONS FOR STAYS AND INJUNCTIONS PENDING APPEAL:

Has request for relief been made below? Yes No
Has this relief been previously sought in this Court? Yes No
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, enter date: May 21, 2012

Signature of Moving Attorney: /s/ Anthony T. Falzone Date: 4/16/12 Has service been effected? Yes No [Attach proof of service]

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the motion is GRANTED DENIED.

FOR THE COURT:
CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE, Clerk of Court

Date: By:

Opposing Attorneys:

Counsel for Patrick Cariou:

Daniel J. Brooks

Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis LLP

140 Broadway, Suite 3100, New York, NY 10005

212-973-8150

dbrooks@schnader.com

Counsel for Richard Prince:

Joshua I. Schiller

Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP

575 Lexington Avenue, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10022

212-446-2300

jischiller@bsfllp.com

Counsel for Consenting Parties Gagosian Gallery, Inc. and Lawrence Gagosian:

Hollis Anne Gonerka Bart

Chaya Weinberg-Brodt

Withers Bergman LLP

430 Park Avenue, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10022

212-848-9800

hollis.bart@withers.us.com

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

----- Appeal No. 11-1197-CV
Patrick Cariou,
Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
Richard Prince, et al.
Defendants-Appellants.

On Appeal From the United
States District Court for the
Southern District of New York,
Civil Action No. 08-CV-11327
(DAB)

**AMICUS CURIAE THE ANDY WARHOL FOUNDATION FOR THE
VISUAL ARTS, INC.’S MOTION FOR INDEPENDENT ORAL
ARGUMENT**

The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. (“The Warhol Foundation”) respectfully moves this Court for ten minutes of oral argument as *amicus curiae* in addition to the time allotted to the parties in order to address the important public interests at stake in this case. Appellants Gagosian Gallery, Inc. and Lawrence Gagosian consent. Appellant Richard Prince and Appellee Patrick Cariou oppose.

Founded upon Mr. Warhol’s death, the Foundation advances the visual arts by promoting the creation, presentation and documentation of contemporary art. It has made grants totaling more than \$200 million to fund individual artists, scholars, researchers, museums and other organizations, including The Andy Warhol Museum. All of its work is premised upon the belief that art reflects an

important cultural dialogue, and that freedom of artistic expression is fundamental to a democratic society. While the Foundation generates substantial revenue from the copyrights it owns, it 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 is therefore the same as that of the public at large: a balanced copyright system that recognizes the need to provide strong economic incentives and the need to provide breathing room for artists who use existing images to create new art.

That balance is especially critical here. The artistic strategy of appropriating and collaging pre-existing images is not unique to Appellant Richard Prince. It is vitally important to contemporary art, and has origins dating back more than a century, as illustrated by these important works, and others reproduced in The Warhol Foundation's brief:



Richard Hamilton, *Just what is it that makes today's homes so different, so appealing?* (1956)
Collage on paper; 10 1/4 x 9 3/4"



Robert Rauschenberg, *Skyway* (1964)
Oil and silkscreen on canvas; 216 x 192"

Prince's work participates in the same tradition:



Richard Prince, *Naked Confessions* (2008), at A-259
Collage, inkjet, and acrylic on canvas; 45 1/4 x 46"

In granting summary judgment for Appellee Patrick Cariou, the district court adopted a fair use standard that threatens this tradition, and is contrary to controlling law. *See Warhol Br.* at 23-38. It refused to recognize any expressive interest or transformative meaning other than parody or direct commentary, and ignored the transformative meaning that is evident on the face of Prince's work because Prince failed to verbalize that meaning to the court's satisfaction. If the

district court's decision is upheld, it will jeopardize important and well-established modes of artistic expression, raise serious First Amendment concerns, and ultimately impede far more creativity than it would promote, both in the visual arts and beyond.

This case implicates important public speech and expression interests that go well beyond those of the parties involved, and the Warhol Foundation is uniquely qualified to speak to those interests. As an organization that is dedicated to supporting contemporary art in all of its forms, the Foundation can provide a broader perspective on the issues this case presents and the impact it may have across the spectrum of visual art.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, The Warhol Foundation requests ten minutes of argument time in addition to the time allotted to the parties.

DATED: April 16, 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.*