Doc. 149

UMG Recordings, Inc. et al v. Veoh Networks, Inc. et al

Though Veoh Networks, Inc. ("Veoh") does not consider it necessary for the facts below to be litigated before the Court is able to rule on Plaintiffs' motion, Veoh files this separate Statement of Genuine Issues in response to Plaintiffs' Statement of Uncontroverted Facts and Conclusions of Law.

"UNDISPUTED" FACT	VEOH'S RESPONSE
Background Facts on Veoh	and Its Services
1. Veoh operates two interrelated services, a web site (www.veoh.com) and a client software application (VeohTV). Through both	UNDISPUTED
services, viewers can freely access video content.	
2. Veoh's video content can be viewed through Veoh's website or through its client software, and viewers can download full copies of available videos.	UNDISPUTED
3. Veoh allows its viewers to use its service free of charge. Veoh's revenues and profits come from advertising displayed along with or next to videos.	assumes that Veoh has earned any
Facts Relating to Uploading	Videos to Veoh
4. Some of Veoh's content is uploaded by its users, either through Veoh's website or through VeohTV.	UNDISPUTED
5. When a user uploads a video through VeohTV, the user is asked to enter some information about the video - a title, a description, a category (such as music or travel) and "tags." This information is collectively known as "metadata."	UNDISPUTED
6. Veoh indexes each video's metadata so it can be searched for by others.	UNDISPUTED
7. Video files come in a variety of formats. Veoh attempts to accommodate all the formats it can.	UNDISPUTED
8. When uploading a video through	UNDISPUTED

	1	"UNDISPUTED" FACT	VEOH'S RESPONSE
	2	Veoh's website, a user must "state that [the	
	2	user] ha[s] read and agree[s] to Veoh	
	3	Publisher Terms and Conditions."	
	4	9. Veoh's Publisher Terms and Conditions	UNDISPUTED
	5	provide that users "grant Veoh a limited, non-	
		exclusive, worldwide, revocable,	
	6	sublicensable license to perform such acts in	
	7	connection with [their] Video Material and	
		Publisher Material as are necessary to provide	
	8	the Veoh Service. Specifically, the foregoing license includes, without limitation, and to the	
	9	extent necessary to provide the Veoh Service,	
	10	permission for Veoh, to: (i) publicly display,	
		publicly perform, transmit, distribute, copy,	
4	11	store, reproduce and/or provide [their] Video	
94111-3894	12	Material and Publisher Material on or through	
7411		the Veoh Service, either in its original form,	
CA	13	copy or in the form of an encoded work; (ii)	
co,	14	secure, encode, reproduce, host, cache, route,	
san Francisco, CA	15	reformat, analyze and create algorithms based	
E F		on [their] Video Material and Publisher	
%]	16	Material; (iii) distribute, transmit, and/or	
	17	display [their] Video Material and Publisher	
		Material and encoded works via such	
	18	technologies as are supported by Veoh from	
	19	time to time; and (iv) display advertisements in connection with any display of [their] Video	
	20	Material and Publisher Material and encoded	
		works. For the avoidance of doubt, Veoh	
	21	expressly acknowledges and agrees that the	
	22	Veoh Service does not include taking title to	
	23	any Video Material and Publisher Material	
	۷۵	supplied by [its users]."	
	24	10. When uploading a video through	UNDISPUTED
	25	VeohTV, a user must check a box stating that	
		he or she "ha[s] read, understand[s], and	
	26	agree[s] to the Veoh Terms of Use."	Th the table table
	27	1	UNDISPUTED
	28	a user uploads a video, Veoh receives a	
	20	"worldwide, non- exclusive, royalty-free, 2	

Winston & Strawn LLP 101 California Street San Francisco, CA 94111-5894 Winston & Strawn LLP

Winston & Strawn LLP 101 California Street

	1	"UNDISPUTED" FACT	VEOH'S RESPONSE
	2	25. When a user uploads a video through	UNDISPUTED
	2	Veoh's website, Veoh reformats the video into	
	3	a predetermined dimension (320 x 240 pixels),	
	4	video format (Flash 7), and frame rate (512	
	5	kilobits per second).	TO TO TO THE TOTAL OF THE TOTAL
		26. There is an additional set of preselected	UNDISPUTED
	6	dimensions and formats for videos uploaded	
	7	by Pro users.	LINIDICALITED
	0	27. The user who uploads a video cannot determine the video's dimension, video	UNDISPUTED
	8	determine the video's dimension, video format, and frame rate.	
	9	Searching for and Viewing a Video	Chrough Veoh's Website
	10	28. Veoh uses a method of "streaming"	UNDISPUTED
		known as "progressive downloading,"	
95	11	meaning that when a user "streams" a video,	
Street 94111-5894	12	Veoh (or its Content Deliver Network	
2411 9411	12	("CDN") partner) actually provides a full copy	
101 Calitornia Street Francisco, CA 94111-	13	of the video in the viewer's temporary	
101 Camornia San Francisco, CA	14	computer memory, or browser cache.	
ranci	15	29. So long as the viewer does not stop the	UNDISPUTED
ın Fi		download, every time a viewer streams a	
Š	16	video on Veoh, the viewer will necessarily	
	17	have a complete copy of the video file.	Things are
	18	30. The viewer can direct her internet	UNDISPUTED
		browser to the website www.veoh.com, and	
	19	then type "50 Cent Candy Shop" into the Veoh search box.	
	20	31. In response to a search query, Veoh	UNDISPUTED
		searches the title, description, and tag	
	21	metadata associated with videos uploaded to	
	22	Veoh, looking for videos responsive to the	
	23	request.	
		32. A search for "50 Cent Candy Shop"	UNDISPUTED
	24	returned a list of videos, including a video	
	25	entitled "50 Cent Featuring Olivia - Candy	
	26	Shop."	
		Searching for and Viewing Vide	
	27	33. When a viewer searches for videos	UNDISPUTED
	28	through VeohTV, Veoh returns a list of the	
		5	
	I	I ⁻	

Winston & Strawn LLP

Winston & Strawn LLP

Winston & Strawn LLP	101 California Street	San Francisco, CA 94111-5894
Winston & Straw	101 California St	San Francisco, CA 94

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

"UNDISPUTED" FACT	VEOH'S RESPONSE
40. Even when the "peer-assisted" delivery	UNDISPUTED
mechanism is employed, Veoh itself (or its	
CDN) delivers roughly between 75% and	
100% of the download.	
41. When a peer-assisted download	UNDISPUTED
initiates, Veoh does not inform its users that	
they are participating in the peer-assisted	
distribution of the video.	
42. When a viewer wishes to download a	UNDISPUTED
video through VeohTV, the viewer clicks the	
download icon.	
43. Veoh delivers videos to its users the	UNDISPUTED
same way for downloads initiated on the web	
site as for downloads initiated through the	
Veoh client software.	

Instances of Specific UMG Works Available Through Veoh

44. A video entitled "50 Cent - Candy Shop" was available for streaming and downloading on Veoh and through VeohTV. The video was referenced by Veoh ID number v880111y58q2WGy. The soundtrack to the video contains the sound recording for the work "Candy Shop" by the artist 50 Cent.

DISPUTED to the extent that Plaintiffs imply that the copy of this purported representative example of an infringing video is still available on Veoh. After Plaintiffs filed this motion. Veoh checked the status of all five of these videos. Despite never having received notice from Plaintiffs that these pr any videos were infringing (before the filing of this motion), Veoh had independently terminated access to each of these videos back in 2007. Declaration of Stacie Simons ("Simons Decl."), at \P 6. Two of the videos were terminated in response to DMCA notices Veoh received from a trade organization called Recording Industry Association of America. Id.The other three videos were also independently terminated by Veoh. Id.

7

VEOH'S STATEMENT OF GENUINE ISSUES IN SUPPORT OF OPP TO MSJ

1867036

LA:224064.3

	1	HANDIGDA (FED II E A CIT	VEOLIG DEGDONGE
		"UNDISPUTED" FACT	VEOH'S RESPONSE
	2		received from a trade organization
	3		called the Recording Industry
			Association of America. <i>Id.</i> The
	4		other three videos were also independently terminated by
	5		independently terminated by Veoh. <i>Id</i>
	6	47. The video entitled "Fall out Boy - dance	DISPUTED to the extent that
	O	Dance" referenced by Veoh ID number	Plaintiffs imply that the copy of
	7	v898060DsyB38pB, on Veoh.com, had, at one	this purported representative
	8	time, been viewed 353 times and had been	example of an infringing video is
		downloaded 73 times, according to the	still available on Veoh. After
	9	statistics reported by Veoh.	Plaintiffs filed this motion, Veoh
	10		checked the status of all five of
	11		these videos. Despite never
.P 5894			having received notice from
reet 111-5	12		Plaintiffs that these pr any videos
inston & Strawn L. 101 California Street Trancisco, CA 94111.	13		were infringing (before the filing
form CA			of this motion), Veoh had
on & Cali	14		independently terminated access to each of these videos back in
Winston & Strawn LLP 101 California Street San Francisco, CA 94111-5894	15		2007. Simons Decl., ¶ 6. Two of
San	16		the videos were terminated in
			response to DMCA notices Veoh
	17		received from a trade organization
	18		called the Recording Industry
	19		Association of America. <i>Id.</i> The
			other three videos were also
	20		independently terminated by
	21	40 A video entitled "HICT A CIDI NO	Veoh. <i>Id</i>
	22	48. A video entitled "JUST A GIRL NO DOUBT" was available for streaming and	DISPUTED to the extent that Plaintiffs imply that the copy of
		downloading on Veoh.com and through	this purported representative
	23	VeohTV, referenced by ID number	example of an infringing video is
	24	v891742AsTQR5Rq. The soundtrack to this	still available on Veoh. After
		video contains the sound recording for the	Plaintiffs filed this motion, Veoh
	25	work "Just a Girl" by the artist No Doubt.	checked the status of all five of
	26	_	these videos. Despite never
	27		having received notice from
			Plaintiffs that these pr any videos
	28		were infringing (before the filing

	1	"UNDISPUTED" FACT	VEOH'S RESPONSE
	2		of this motion), Veoh had
	3		independently terminated access
			to each of these videos back in 2007. Simons Decl., ¶ 6. Two of
	4		the videos were terminated in
	5		response to DMCA notices Veoh
	6		received from a trade organization
	7		called the Recording Industry
	.		Association of America. <i>Id.</i> The other three videos were also
	8		other three videos were also independently terminated by
	9		Veoh. <i>Id</i>
	10	49. The video entitled "JUST A GIRL NO	DISPUTED to the extent that
	11	DOUBT" referenced by Veoh ID number	Plaintiffs imply that the copy of
.P 5894		v891742AsTQR5Rq, on Veoh.com had, at one	this purported representative
wn LLP Street 94111-5894	12	time, been viewed 157 times and downloaded	example of an infringing video is still available on Veoh. After
æ	13	22 times, according to the statistics reported by Veoh.	still available on Veoh. After Plaintiffs filed this motion, Veoh
& St liforn So, C	14	by veon.	checked the status of all five of
Winston & Strawn LLP 101 California Street San Francisco, CA 94111-58			these videos. Despite never
Wing 10 n Fr	15		having received notice from
Sa	16		Plaintiffs that these pr any videos
	17		were infringing (before the filing of this motion), Veoh had
	18		independently terminated access
			to each of these videos back in
	19		2007. Simons Decl., ¶ 6. Two of
	20		the videos were terminated in
	21		response to DMCA notices Veoh
	22		received from a trade organization called the Recording Industry
			Association of America. <i>Id.</i> The
	23		other three videos were also
	24		independently terminated by
	25	50 A 11 (1.14D 110D	Veoh. <i>Id</i>
	26	50. A video entitled "Bon jovi- its my life" was available for streaming and downloading	DISPUTED to the extent that Plaintiffs imply that the copy of
		on Veoh.com and through VeohTV,	this purported representative
	27	referenced by ID number v8379297Fyddmxj.	example of an infringing video is
	28	The soundtrack to this video contains the	still available on Veoh. After
		10	

	1	"UNDISPUTED" FACT	VEOH'S RESPONSE
	2		Veoh. Id
		52. A video entitled "Mary J. Blige - Take	DISPUTED to the extent that
	3	me as i am" was available for streaming and	Plaintiffs imply that the copy of
	4	downloading on Veoh.com and through	this purported representative
	5	VeohTV, referenced by ID number v934573ncaPJKP6. The soundtrack to this	example of an infringing video is still available on Veoh. After
	6	video contains the musical composition for the	Plaintiffs filed this motion, Veoh
	7	work "It's My Life" performed by the artist	
		Bon Jovi.	these videos. Despite never
	8		having received notice from
	9		Plaintiffs that these pr any videos
	10		were infringing (before the filing of this motion), Veoh had
	11		independently terminated access
P 894	11		to each of these videos back in
wn LLP Street 94111-5894	12		2007. Simons Decl., ¶ 6. Two of
CO ~	13		the videos were terminated in
c Str formi o, CA			response to DMCA notices Veoh
Winston & Strawn LLP 101 California Street San Francisco, CA 94111-58	14		received from a trade organization called the Recording Industry
inst 101 Fran	15		Association of America. <i>Id.</i> The
San	16		other three videos were also
			independently terminated by
	17		Veoh. <i>Id</i>
	18	53. The video entitled "Mary J. Blige -	DISPUTED to the extent that
	19	Take me as I am" referenced by Veoh ID	Plaintiffs imply that the copy of
		number v934573ncaPJKP6, on Veoh.com had,	this purported representative
	20	at one time, been viewed 116 times and	example of an infringing video is
	21	downloaded 20 times, according to the statistics reported by Veoh.	still available on Veoh. After Plaintiffs filed this motion, Veoh
	22	statistics reported by veoil.	checked the status of all five of
			these videos. Despite never
	23		having received notice from
	24		Plaintiffs that these pr any videos
	25		were infringing (before the filing
			of this motion), Veoh had
	26		independently terminated access
	27		to each of these videos back in
	28		2007. Simons Decl., ¶ 6. Two of
	20	12	the videos were terminated in

Winston & Strawn LLP	101 California Street	San Francisco, CA 94111-5894
----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

"UNDISPUTED" FACT	VEOH'S RESPONSE
	response to DMCA notices Veoh received from a trade organization called the Recording Industry Association of America. <i>Id.</i> The other three videos were also independently terminated by Veoh. <i>Id.</i>
54. Veoh has not obtained authorization	UNDISPUTED
from UMG for its exploitation of these works.	
Other Facts	
55. The American Heritage Dictionary	UNDISPUTED
(Houghton Mifflin 1985) defines "storage" as	
"[t]tle act of storing goods." "Store" means "1.	
To reserve or put away for future use. 2. To	
fill, supply, or stock. 3. To deposit or receive	
in a storehouse or warehouse."	
56. The American Heritage Dictionary	UNDISPUTED
(Houghton Mifflin 1985) defines "reside" as,	
"1. To live in a place for an extended period of	
time. 2. To be inherently present. 3. To be	
vested, as a power or right."	

I. VEOH'S CONTENTIONS REGARDING PLAINTIFFS' "CONCLUSIONS OF LAW"

As discussed in detail in Veoh's Opposition, Veoh disputes Plaintiffs' "conclusions of law" set forth in paragraphs 59-60 and 65-68, which find no support in the plain language of Section 512(c), the legislative history or any cases that have ever interpreted Section 512(c) of the DMCA. In fact, under the same circumstances, contrary legal conclusions have already been reached, as Veoh was found eligible for and entitled to Section 512(c) safe harbor in *Io Group, Inc. v. Veoh Networks, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS, 65915, No. 06-3926, slip op. at 20 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2008), ("*Io Group, Inc.*").

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Veoh has also not been provided sufficient discovery regarding Plaintiffs' purported rights to the works listed in Paragraphs 44-53, and thus the Conclusions of Law set forth in paragraphs 57 and 58 about UMG's purported "exclusive rights to reproduce, distribute, and perform its copyrighted works" under 17 U.S.C. § 106 require a factually premature leap.

With respect to Paragraph 59, Veoh disputes that the upload or download of files by its users is a direct (or indirect) infringement by Veoh. As Veoh has not engaged in any volitional conduct with respect to the alleged infringements, Veoh cannot be liable for direct infringement as a result of the actions of Veoh's users. See CoStar Group, Inc. v. Loopnet, Inc., 373 F.3d 554, 555-557 (4th Cir. 2004); The Cartoon Network LP, LLP v. CSC Holdings, Inc. 536 F3d 121 (2d Cir., Aug. 4, 2008); Religious Technology Center v. Netcom On-line Communications Service, Inc., 907 F.Supp. 1361 (ND Cal. 1995); *Field v. Google, Inc.*, 412 F. Supp 2d. 1106 (D. Nev. 2006). In addition, Plaintiffs overstate the holding in A & M Records v. Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2001) ("Napster") as holding that "the download and upload of copyrighted music constitutes direct infringement of copyright." While that court noted that Napster users who "upload file names to the search index for others to copy violate plaintiffs' distribution rights" . . . and "Napster users who download files containing copyrighted music violate plaintiffs' reproduction rights," the court explicitly stated that "the district court's conclusion that plaintiffs have presented a prima facie case of direct infringement by Napster users is not presently appealed by Napster." Id. at 1013-1014. Napster instead sought to resolve whether the fair use affirmative defense required overturning the preliminary injunction against Napster. *Id.* The court also stated that "absent any specific information which identifies

Plaintiffs have failed to even provide a list of allegedly infringing videos. They have also taken the position that their discovery with respect to copyright ownership should be limited to copyright registrations—despite numerous reasons for requiring more extensive discovery. Such is currently an ongoing and unresolved discovery dispute between the parties. See Veoh's Summary of Discovery Orders in MySpace/Grouper Actions Relevant to Current Discovery Disputes, Docket No. 110, pp. 1-8.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

infringing activity, a computer system operator cannot be liable for contributory infringement merely because the structure of the system allows for the exchange of copyrighted material." *Id.* at 1021.

Moreover, in a very recent decision, Capitol Records Inc., et al. v. Thomas, Civil File No. 06-1497 (MJD/RLE) (D.C. Minn. 2008), the court vacated a judgment and granted a new trial for the defendant, who had been found liable for infringement for making available recordings owned by the plaintiffs' (including Plaintiff UMG Recordings, Inc.), on a peer-to-peer file sharing network. Declaration of Jennifer Golinveaux, ¶ 7 and Exh. F. After "reviewing the Copyright Act itself, the legislative history, binding Supreme Court and Eighth Circuit precedent, and an extensive body of case law examining the Copyright Act," the court held that merely making a work available to the public does not constitute a distribution. *Id.* at pp. 13-40.

In Paragraph 60, Plaintiffs cite footnote 7 in Bonneville Intern. Corp. v. Peters, 347 F.3d 485, 489 n.7 (3d Cir. 2003) ("*Bonneville*") as standing for the proposition that "streaming sound recordings over the internet requires a license." But in Bonneville, the requirements at issue involved internet streaming of AM/FM broadcast signals, and the licensing requirements set forth by Plaintiffs involve "interactive, ondemand" services. *Id.* at 489, n. 7, 499-500.² The entities at issue in *Bonneville*. internet radio webcasters, intentionally select and play certain copyrighted songs. Veoh's users do grant Veoh a license to stream videos uploaded by users, and Veoh removes infringing works when it has notice of such infringement

Paragraphs 65 and 66 set forth legal conclusions far beyond the issue of Veoh's eligibility for safe harbor protection, and instead ask this Court to reach premature legal conclusions that Veoh "engages in infringing activities." Veoh specifically disputes that any of the actions described in paragraphs 65 and 66 constitute either

The court in *Bonneville* also stated that: "[t]he subject matter of the present case, Internet streaming, should not be confused with the use of the Internet to exchange digital copies of entire songs through centralized or distributed peer-to-peer file exchange mechanisms like Napster and KaZaA . . ." *Id.* at 489, n. 8.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

direct or indirect infringement by Veoh even apart from Veoh's eligibility for Section 512(c) safe harbor. In addition, none of these actions make Veoh ineligible for Section 512(c) safe harbor as set forth in Section III of Veoh's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. Plaintiffs also add to this paragraph subsections (vi) and (vii) that assume that Veoh "facilitates and encourages" infringing activities, despite the fact that none of the supposed facts to support these legal conclusions were listed in Plaintiffs' Statement of Uncontroverted Facts, and are instead wholly contradicted by the record and Veoh's strong policies against infringement. (Opp., Passim). As Veoh has not engaged in any volitional conduct with respect to the alleged infringements, Veoh cannot be liable for direct infringement as a result of the actions of Veoh's users. See CoStar Group, Inc. v. Loopnet, Inc., 373 F.3d 554, 555-557 (4th Cir. 2004); The Cartoon Network LP, LLP v. CSC Holdings, Inc. 536 F3d 121 (2d Cir., Aug. 4, 2008); Religious Technology Center v. Netcom On-line Communications Service, Inc., 907 F.Supp. 1361 (ND Cal. 1995); Field v. Google, Inc., 412 F. Supp 2d. 1106 (D. Nev. 2006).

Veoh has also already been found to fall squarely within the protections of the Section 512(c) safe harbor. *Io Group, Inc., supra* at 20. In reaching its decision, the court in *Io Group Inc*. found Veoh's automated technological features that permit access to videos did not remove Veoh from the safe harbor, and found Veoh to be a model citizen under the DMCA. Id. at 31 ("[f]ar from encouraging infringement, Veoh has a strong DMCA policy, takes active steps to limit incidents of infringement on its website and works diligently to keep unauthorized works off its website"); see also, The Cartoon Network LP, LLP v. CSC Holdings, Inc. --F3d--, Nos. 07-1480cv(L), 07-1511-cv(CON) 2008 WL 2952614 at *9 (2d Cir., Aug. 4, 2008) (the court found "significant," in reversing a finding of infringement against the defendant, that the defendant was not "volitionally" involved in making infringing copies, as any such copies would be made by the defendant's users through automated functions.)

In Paragraphs 67 and 68, Plaintiffs set forth another flawed legal conclusion

		$oldsymbol{H}$
	1	already rejected in <i>Io Group</i> , <i>Inc</i> .—that Veoh's Section 512(c) protections should not
	2	extend to the automated functions that facilitate user access to content uploaded by
	3	Veoh's users. (See Opp. pp. 6-8). The only cases cited by Plaintiffs (Fair Housing
	4	Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roomates.com LLC, 521 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir.
	5	2008) and Atlantic Recording Corp. v. XM Satellite Radio, Inc., 2007 WL 136186
	6	(S.D.N.Y. Jan. 19, 2007) (<i>See</i> Opp. pp. 24-25)) do not involve the DMCA and are
	7	irrelevant to Veoh's eligibility for Section 512(c) safe harbor.
	8	
	9	DATED G 1 20 2000 WINIGHON 6 GEDANNIA D
	10	DATED: September 29, 2008 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
94	11	Dry /o/Erin D. Donohan
wn LLP Street 94111-5894	12	By: /s/ Erin R. Ranahan
nston & Strawn L. 101 California Street rancisco, CA 94111.	13	Rebecca Lawlor Calkins Erin Ranahan 333 S. Grand Avenue
/mston & Stra 101 California Francisco, CA	14	Los Angeles, California 90071- 1543
	15	(213) 615-1700 (Telephone) (213) 615-1750 (Facsimile)
San	16	Jennifer A. Golinveaux
	17	101 California Street San Francisco, California
	18	94111-5894
	19	(415) 591-1000 (Telephone) (415) 591-1400 (Facsimile)
	20	Michael S. Elkin Thomas P. Lane
	21	200 Park Avenue New York, New York 10166-
	22	4193
	23	(212) 294-6700 (Telephone) (212) 294-4700 (Facsimile)
	24	Attorneys for Defendant
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	