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LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2015
9:33 A.M.
-oOo-
THE CLERK: Please remain seated and come to order.
This United States District Court is now in session. The Honorable George H. King, Chief Judge presiding.

Calling Item No. 1 on the Court's calendar, Civil 13-4460, Good Morning to You Productions, Corp. versus Warner/Chappell Music, Inc., et al. Counsel, would you please state your appearances for the record.

MR. RIFKIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Mark Rifkin of Wolf Haldenstein on behalf of plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. NEWMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Randall S. Newman, Randall S. Newman, P.C., on behalf of plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. SCHACHT: Good morning, Your Honor. Daniel
Schacht of Donahue Fitzgerald on behalf of plaintiffs.
MS. MANIFOLD: Betsy Manifold, Wolf Haldenstein, on behalf of plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Yes, good morning. Thank you.
MR. GODINO: Good morning, Your Honor. Marc Godino from Glancy, Prongay \& Murray.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. MS. WOLKE: Good morning, Your Honor. Kara Wolke,
also from Glancy, Prongay, Murray on behalf of plaintiffs. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning.

MR. KLAUS: Kelly Klaus from Munger, Tolles \& Olson. With me are my colleagues Melinda LeMoine and Adam Kaplan. THE COURT: Thank you very much. Good morning.

This matter is on calendar for me to consider the further briefing on the issue of abandonment, which I had directed you folks to submit previously. In the meantime, I just want to briefly mention and take care of more of a housekeeping matter, what's happening with your various motions, applications to supplement the record. It's not my intention to take up the merits of these applications or these motions at this time, but I just want to make sure that I have what I'm supposed to have.

The plaintiffs -- both parties are asking to supplement. The defendants, you want to submit what is the equivalent of a British deposit copy for the E51990. Is that basically it?

MR. KLAUS: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. And the plaintiffs, you are also asking, on an ex parte basis, your application to go ahead and submit various things including certain songbook-type publications, whether it's 1922 or 1927, that you think would be helpful on the issue of really divestive publication, general publication.

MR. RIFKIN: Correct. The 1922 publication in
particular, correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And, Mr. Klaus, you folks have not opposed the application to supplement the record, but you do have arguments against -- the substance of the arguments is as to the significance of those documents; is that right?

MR. KLAUS: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And you said that you have not attached a declaration to your explanation, various explanations you offer to provide such a declaration.

MR. KLAUS: We'd be happy to.
THE COURT: Do you folks think that you would require that to be in a declaration form to support the statements made by counsel?

MR. RIFKIN: Your Honor, there are two separate issues in their opposition filed yesterday. One of them has to do with the circumstances around which the document, the 1927 copy of Everyday Song Book, was identified in 2013. It was not produced until just -- we got it. We had access to it on July 13.

On that, as we said in our ex parte application, that's a secondary issue.

We are concerned about that only because we've spent the last two years without that document, and it would have had a significant impact on how this case was conducted, how the briefs were presented, how the arguments were made. But we're
happy to let that sit aside for now while we concern ourselves with the merits of that particular issue.

On that, the defendants have offered a supposition that maybe Summy wasn't authorized to permit the publication of the song in 1922. To the best of our knowledge, there is no evidence of that --

THE COURT: Let's not get --
MR. RIFKIN: -- but if the defendants have something, then, yes, we would expect that to be offered in a declaration; otherwise, there's no facts in the record.

THE COURT: That's not what they're offering the declaration for, is my understanding.

MR. RIFKIN: It wasn't clear to me which part of their response was being supported by the declaration.

THE COURT: Let's get that clear.
Mr. Klaus, are you saying that you are prepared to offer a declaration with respect to the argument that counsel's made as to whether or not -- or rather, it's your argument that Summy didn't have authorization from the Hill sisters to grant that kind of permission for the publication in 1927.

MR. KLAUS: No. That was not why I had offered the declaration. What I had offered the declaration on was on the circumstances of the late production and --

THE COURT: Okay. I think -- I don't think we need that right now. Do you have some evidence to offer as to that,
that Summy was not authorized? I'm just trying to make the record as full as possible.

MR. KLAUS: Well, I think the -- yes, the evidence that we have on -- it's both a question of whether Summy was authorized, and I think there's also a question as to whether the cable company which published this book was authorized. For that, I think the evidence is the actual book itself, which plaintiffs' counsel were kind enough to this morning show me the copies that they retrieved.

There may be material in the copyright office. I, of course, have no facts about what happened in 1922 or 1927 personally, but $I$ don't have any other evidence in the -- we have no other evidence about this.

THE COURT: Nothing else to submit on this subject.
MR. KLAUS: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then you can submit your reply. I think you haven't filed your reply yet. Why don't you file your reply in seven days, and then we'll take a look at it, and I'll most likely rule without further argument.

And then as far as the pending motion of the defendant is concerned, we'll just go ahead and keep that on the usual briefing cycle, and then I'm more likely than not to take that off calendar as well and rule without argument.

MR. RIFKIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So that takes care of the
preliminary matters. Let's get right to the abandonment issue. I have some questions for both plaintiffs and defendants.

Let me start with the plaintiff. Rather than going back and forth, I'll sort of skip around to all the questions $I$ want to have the benefit of your -- your views on, Mr. Rifkin, and then I'll hear from Mr. Klaus.

MR. RIFKIN: Of course, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The first question that's been raised by the defendant is that the Happy Birthday to You was a joint authorship of both Mildred and Patty. Your view seems to be no, it wasn't a joint authorship, it was really a derivative work created by Patty based upon the previous perhaps joint work of Good Morning to You between Mildred and Patty.

What is the evidence -- I'm trying to understand -- what is the evidence that you point to that would tend to support your view that this is a derivative work -- and when I say "this," I'm obviously talking about Happy Birthday to You -- as opposed to a work of joint authorship between Mildred and Patty?

MR. RIFKIN: Well, Your Honor, I think there's two pieces of evidence that are already in the record on this question. The first is Patty Hill's deposition testimony in 1935 in the Hill v. Harris litigation in which she said that she and her sister Mildred composed --

THE COURT: Which page are you talking about? Are
you talking about 1007 of that deposition?
MR. RIFKIN: If you don't mind, Your Honor, I'm going to get my copy of it.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. NEWMAN: Betsy, do you have the copy that's in the summary judgment record of that deposition testimony?

MS. MANIFOLD: What exhibit is it?
MR. RIFKIN: Your Honor, just a moment so that I have a copy that lines up with the pages on there.

THE COURT: I have it as Exhibit 87.
MR. RIFKIN: It is, Your Honor. I have Exhibit 87 in front of me, and you are asking me about page 1007 of the record?

THE COURT: Yes, if that's what you're referring to.
MR. RIFKIN: Yes. She describes that Happy Birthday was one of the earliest songs in the group. Your Honor may recall that the book Song Stories for the Kindergarten -- Song Stories for the Kindergarten, which was published in 1893, consisted of about 70 songs, many of which were written by Mildred and Patty together. One of them was Good Morning to All. Some of them were songs that had been written by others many centuries before, including songs like Twinkle Twinkle Little Star.

THE COURT: Slow down a little bit when you're speaking so my reporter can get it down.

MR. RIFKIN: But yes. On -- on page 1007 Patty Hill says that Happy Birthday -- I'm sorry -- that Good Morning to All was one of the earliest in the group.

And then she later says in that same answer that she then -- "she" being Patty, she then says that she wrote other versions of the song, and she identifies several of them there, including Goodbye to You, Happy Journey to You, Happy Christmas to You, Happy New Year to You. And then toward the bottom of the page she's asked about Happy Birthday, and she says, yes, I wrote the words to that song as well.

The other piece of evidence that's -- that's in the record, which is --

THE COURT: Before you do that, let me talk briefly with you about this piece of evidence -- and don't forget the other piece because I do want to talk to you about --

MR. RIFKIN: Yes.
THE COURT: If you read this page in its entirety and the context of the answer, which is a lengthy answer that she gives, she does begin talking about the Good Morning to You -- to All, but she also said, we used it for, meaning presumably the melody, we used it for all the rest of these versions -- Goodbye to You, Happy Journey to You, including, when asked, Happy Birthday to You.

Doesn't that seem to you to be more suggestive that these were all joint collaborations and various versions of the
melody but there are various versions of the lyrics, that they were working together, as she says "We used it for"?

MR. RIFKIN: I don't believe that the "we" in that paragraph refers to her and her sister Mildred. I think it's clear from the context of the deposition that the "we" there refers to her and the students of her class. There's no evidence anywhere that Mildred and Patty together published any of these other versions of the melody with any of these other lyrics, whether it was Goodbye to You, Good Journey to You, Happy Christmas to You, Happy New Year to You, Happy Vacation to You, or for that matter, Happy Birthday to You.

But what she does say is that she sang Happy Birthday with every birthday celebration in the school. Patty was the educator, and you may recall we pointed out before she called herself the poetess. She said Mildred was the composer, I was the poetess, I wrote the words. And I think it's clear from the context that Patty wrote these alternate words, these derivative words.

THE COURT: The fact that Patty may have written the words is not dispositive. You don't have to jointly write the words to be a joint author of the work. So I don't think it's disputed that Mildred didn't write the words, but for purposes of joint authorship, the test is really not whether you actually authored the words. It's whether, you know, the work prepared by two or more authors with the intention that their
contributions be merged into inseparable and interdependent parts of the unitary whole.

Don't you think it is at least susceptible of the reading that the two of them were collaborating and trying to manipulate the music in a way that's probably best for small children and their abilities and that in that process they were also applying different words to that tune?

Undoubtedly, Patty probably came up with the words, but they were in that collaborative effort.

MR. RIFKIN: I don't -- respectfully, I don't believe that's what happened. And I think, if we look at the rest of the transcript, Patty describes in some more detail the actual process of writing the Good Morning to You song, and she says --

THE COURT: Go ahead. Go to that, then. Tell me where that is.

MR. RIFKIN: She says, with respect -- and, again, I'm on page 1007 -- she says, It would be written, and I would take it into the school the next morning -- and now here she's clearly talking about Good Morning to All -- and test it with the little children. And then she's describing now the musical composition.

So she says, if the register, which is a musical term, was beyond the children, we went back home -- we and Patty -- Patty and Mildred -- we went back home at night and altered it and
would go back the next morning and try it again -- again, "it" is a reference to the song Good Morning to All -- again and again until we secured a song that even the youngest children could learn with perfect ease.

And while only the words -- she then goes on to describe what happens with these adaptations. I think it's clear from the answer she gives that they were working on Good Morning to All. She had written those words, and Mildred had composed the melody for the song, and then Patty would test it out in school the next day.

If the kids were able to sing it, great. If there was a problem with it, she went home. She and Mildred worked on it, and they developed a song, Good Morning to All, that she says even the youngest children could sing with ease.

Then I think she says "we," and here's where I think the "we" needs to be put into context. We used it -- and it clearly is the song Good Morning to All -- for Goodbye to You, Happy Journey to You, Happy Christmas to You, and so forth.

And I think, if we were to look at this sentence, the word "we" out of context, without recognizing that there's never been a single publication attributed to Patty and Mildred of any of these alternate songs, it's -- it's evident to me that Patty and Mildred never said they wrote it together.

I think, taken out of context, the word "we" could possibly be a reference to Mildred, and so it might lead to the
conclusion that this was a joint work. But in the context of the entire record and the explanation that Patty gives, and one other piece of evidence which I'd like to come to in a moment, it becomes much clearer to me that the song Patty and Mildred wrote together is the only song that has ever been associated with them together, and that's Good Morning to All.

But perhaps even more important is that Summy, Warner's predecessor, Summy actually gives us a temporal reference in Exhibit 51. This is the answer that Summy filed to the amended complaint in the litigation the Hill Foundation brought against Summy. And on page 680 and 681 of the answer, they say that Good Morning to All --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Give me the pages again. MR. RIFKIN: Yes. It's pages 680 and 681 of

Exhibit 51.
THE COURT: Right.
MR. RIFKIN: This is the answer that was filed in the Hill Foundation v. --

THE COURT: Paragraph 6? Are you talking about paragraph 6?

MR. RIFKIN: Your Honor, just give me a moment to turn to the page. I'm talking about paragraph 6, yes. And Summy says in its answer that the song Good Morning to All with -- now I'm quoting -- the song Good Morning to All, with different words, later became entitled Happy Birthday to You.

To me, Summy's admission, their judicial admission in that litigation that the song later became known as Happy Birthday to You, reinforces the fact that it was a derivative work that was subsequently done presumably by Patty.

If we accept Patty's testimony that she wrote the song, the lyrics to the song, then $I$ think the two parts of the record that I refer to -- page 1007 from Patty's transcript where she says she wrote it, she used it with her students in school, Mildred was not a schoolteacher -- the fact that there's no evidence of any alternate version of the song being attributed to the sisters together, and the fact that Summy in their answer says the song later became known as Happy Birthday to You, reinforces the conclusion that Good Morning to All was a unified creation of Mildred and Patty together as a joint work -- there's no dispute about that -- but that Happy Birthday was a later variation by Patty either in her classroom or for use in her classroom, which has never, except by the defendants periodically in this litigation, has never been attributed to Mildred Hill.

THE COURT: What if the agreement between the authors, Mildred and Patty, had been that let's work this song out, the register being perfect for the little kids, with this initial verse, and then I'll just go ahead and add some more verses that we can also plug in.

Does that constitute a joint work?

MR. RIFKIN: No. I don't -- I don't think that necessarily has to be the case because the joint work has to be a deliberate creation on the part of two or more authors to create a single unified work.

And in that case the subsequent work would not be part of the original work. It would still be a derivative work, and Patty made it clear that she was the one who contributed the new matter to that derivative work, not Mildred.

Mildred's work on the song was done when Mildred and Patty were satisfied that the melody was appropriate for, as Patty says, even the youngest child to sing. But once that work was done -- that work was now the work of Mildred and Patty, and the subsequent work became the work of Patty.

And, again, all we can do to think about this is look at what evidence there is in the record, and it seems to me that the evidence in the record in this instance is one sided. Summy says the song later became known as Happy Birthday to You when those lyrics were added. Patty says she wrote those lyrics. There's no suggestion that she wrote them with Mildred the same iterative way that she describes writing Good Morning to All, and the song has never been published together with attribution to Mildred and Patty.

So I don't think that -- I don't think that we can conclude that Happy Birthday was a joint work of Mildred and Patty.

THE COURT: What about on page 1006, which is before the discussion that we've been talking about where there -- you know, 1006 and 1007 explicates all these various versions. But on 1006 there's also some discussion by Ms. Hill when she's talking about these songs.

My memory is a little vague as to the particular year, but it was bound to be between 1889 and 1893 when these songs were demanded by the public for publication. We did not write them for publication. We wrote them for a group of children I was teaching. They were so superior to any other music in the market, and the public demanded the publication.

MR. RIFKIN: Yes, Your Honor. That's -- that's what I -- I referred to earlier when I said the book Song Stories for the Kindergarten was published with a collection of songs by -- some by Mildred and Patty, some by other authors. But if you look up on that same page 1006, at the top of the page there's a paragraph -- there's an answer from Patty that's cut off, but what she describes is how she went about writing Song Stories for the Kindergarten.

She says, when my sister Mildred and I began the writing of these songs -- and then there's a parenthetical, I don't know who inserted it, but it's in the transcript, referring to Song Stories for the Kindergarten -- we had two motives. One
was to provide good music for children. The second was to adapt the music for the little children's limited ability to sing music of a complicated order.

And I think it's clear that the second answer she gives on page 1006 that Your Honor asked about is a reference to those same collections -- that same collection of songs, Song Stories for the Kindergarten.

THE COURT: That's your view.
MR. RIFKIN: Yeah. I don't think -- in other words, on page 1006, I think when she's referring to the songs, it's the songs in Song Stories. And, in fact, she even continues in the -- in the bottom of the answer that you began to read, she says, we published this in response to a demand for publication, and they were published and put on exhibit in the World's Fair in Chicago in 1893.

We mentioned that before. That is the publication of the 70 or so songs in Song Stories for the Kindergarten, only one of which is a version of Good Morning to All. And only the words Good Morning to All appear in that song. None of these alternate versions that Ms. Hill mentions on the next page in her answer to a different question -- none of those alternate versions and none of those alternate lyrics appear in the 1893 publication of Song Stories for the Kindergarten.

Now, if she really wanted to publish those songs together and she really worked with Mildred together, it would have been
easy for them to include the alternate lyrics right then and there in Song Stories for the Kindergarten. They did not do so.

THE COURT: Well, take a look at page 1009. There seems to be then -- there was some talk -- let's go back to 1008. There's a question by Mr. Stark. I ask this book, Song Stories for the Kindergarten, be marked Exhibit A for identification. Okay. Then he says, question, and during the time that this particular song was being written -- presumably referring to Good Morning to All -- did you use the various lyrics in conjunction with the tune while you were working with the children? There's an objection, and the answer is, we certainly -- we certainly did.

MR. RIFKIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Does that not suggest that there was a collaborative effort, not only of the Good Morning to All but also these various lyrics that have been identified on page 1007?

MR. RIFKIN: No. Again, $I$ think, Your Honor, that the "we" in that sentence has to be put into the context of the rest of Ms. Hill's testimony. I think there again the "we" is not a reference to her and to Mildred. The "we" is a reference to her and her students in school.

If she and Mildred had worked on more than one song together, it would have appeared in Song Stories for the

Kindergarten when it was published in 1893, particularly if they worked on them at the same time.

The only way you can harmonize all of the evidence that's in the record, including Summy's admission in the Hill v. Summy litigation that the song later became known as Happy Birthday to You -- the only way you can harmonize all of that is to view it exactly the way I've described, that the Hill sisters wrote Good Morning to All in that iterative manner that Patty described, and then in her classroom Patty separately composed alternate combinations of lyrics which were never published anywhere by the Hill sisters.

So I don't -- I truly don't believe that all of the evidence, the totality of the evidence, permits the -- the conclusion that Happy Birthday to You was written as a joint work by Mildred and Patty at the same time they were writing Good Morning to All. I think the totality of the evidence that I've just gone over is consistent instead with what Summy said, that it later became known as a different work because Patty sang it with her kids in school.

THE COURT: Do you think there's a triable issue at least on this?

MR. RIFKIN: Well, Your Honor, you may recall that there was a question asked to both sides at the last hearing whether, if the Court found there were triable issues, whether the Court could determine those triable issues without a jury.

And this is one of those issues where I suppose one could again -- one could look at some of the answers Patty gave in her deposition and take a word or two out of those answers and say, What did "we" mean? What did "songs" mean?

But then those words have to be put into their proper context, which I've suggested here in my answer, and if there is a disputed issue of fact here, I think the evidence overwhelmingly favors the plaintiffs' point of view that the song that was written as a joint work is the song that was published as part of Song Stories for the Kindergarten, Good Morning to All.

THE COURT: So what you're saying --
MR. RIFKIN: The later work -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What you're saying -- I'm trying to understand the procedural posture that we are in. Typically, if this is going to be a different trier of fact on summary judgment -- I'm only here to determine whether there's a triable issue of material fact. If there is, then summary judgment is denied, and we move on to the trial. In this case, on these issues, you folks have both stipulated to a court trial.

So the question then becomes do I put my summary judgment hat on and say, hmm, it looks like at least it's triable, take it off, and then at the same time put on my trier-of-fact hat,
and I say, all right. Well, it is triable, but this is all the evidence there is, this is all the record there is. Both sides make their argument, here's my finding of fact.

Do you think it will be appropriate to do it all in basically one order?

MR. RIFKIN: I think that we -- we both consented to Your Honor making those fact findings when we were here back in March, and we have no reason to change our view on that at all.

If the Court finds that the question of whether this was -- whether Happy Birthday was a joint work is not clearly answered for summary judgment purposes, then I believe the Court could make the determination along the lines that I've suggested, based upon the totality of the evidence that we've described to you, including Summy's reference to it as a song that later became known as Happy Birthday to You.

The fact that the Hill sisters --
THE COURT: Let's not go --
MR. RIFKIN: Okay.
THE COURT: I guess what I'm saying is there's no need, from a technical standpoint, for me on the summary judgment to say, well, if $I$ find there's triable issues, summary judgment denied. All right. Now let's set a time for court trial. You folks come in, and you basically move in the same thing you've already moved in. You're making the same argument you've already made. And then I say, all right. Now
that I'm a trier of fact, I'm going to make these findings of fact and conclusions of law if, from your perspective, that's really form over substance.

MR. RIFKIN: That's correct, Your Honor, based upon our consent, both parties' consent on March 23rd to Your Honor making those findings of fact.

And I will, of course, say that -- I know you don't want to address the issues raised by the ex parte application, but this all becomes subject to the 1922 publication of the song without a copyright notice. I don't want to lose sight of that. I just want to merely --

THE COURT: I'm well aware of the many issues that are raised here, and depending upon the Court's resolution either as trier of fact or on summary judgment, it may obviate the necessity of further inquiry --

MR. RIFKIN: Correct.
THE COURT: -- but --
MR. RIFKIN: Correct.
THE COURT: But since we only called this hearing for purposes of addressing the issue of abandonment, I think we should do that.

MR. RIFKIN: And I want to make sure I answer all your questions on abandonment.

THE COURT: All right. Next. Let's move on.
You take the position that, while the law may be that an
overt act of abandonment is required where there is a statutory copyright, you think that that requirement is not present where there is a common law copyright. And basically I've looked at your cases. I don't think any of your cases directly stand for that proposition.

But in fairness to you, I think what you have done is you have followed a logical argument, saying that common law copyright is a property right and any property right can be abandoned in many ways and they do not typically require an overt act necessarily. In fact, in some instances like the Roby case that you cited, mere nonuse might be sufficient to constitute abandonment of the easement and so forth.

MR. RIFKIN: Correct.
THE COURT: I take it you have no cases directly on the issue of whether a common law copyright may be abandoned without any need for showing of an overt act. Am I correct in that?

MR. RIFKIN: Other than the cases we've cited, we're not aware of any direct authority on that point.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. RIFKIN: Our argument is as comprehensive as we can make it in the brief.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.
Now let's move on to the next subject. In terms of overt acts, you've identified various of them.

MR. RIFKIN: Right.
THE COURT: One of them is the teaching of the song to the teachers and the kids.

MR. RIFKIN: Correct.
THE COURT: So you all -- it's interesting because you and the defendant both seem to rely on the same passage from Ms. Hill's deposition, which is Exhibit 87 at page 1024, and you cite that her statement that we are trying to protect ourselves -- we are not trying to protect ourselves in any way except as to publication at this time.

So your take of it is, because she said that, it means that she was thereby abandoning anything other than that, which she wanted to protect the publication. Publication obviously ripened into the Song Stories book, and Happy Birthday lyrics at least were not in there.

MR. RIFKIN: Right. I think it's pretty clear when she says we were not trying to protect ourselves in any way except as to publication at that time. And we recognize that there's no dispute the only publication, the only publication that existed at that time, was Good Morning to All.

And this ties obviously to the answer to the first question you asked about whether it was a joint work. I think, you know, here, if they intended to protect themselves regarding any of these alternate arrangements that Patty claims to have written, then they could have done so easily by
including them in the book.
She was not reticent about protecting the work in Song Stories for the Kindergarten, including Good Morning to All -neither of the Hill sisters was -- but she makes it very clear that that's all we wanted to protect. We were not trying to protect ourselves in any way except as to publication at that time, and that publication was Good Morning to All.

THE COURT: What about some of her other statements that the defendants cite, including exchanges also in that deposition between counsel and Ms. Hill in terms of how she was trying to limit the authority or the permission, only for educational uses, only as far as the kids singing them concerned and so forth? How does that -- if you read everything other than there's just that one line, but if you read what she has said at various parts during the course of the deposition --

MR. RIFKIN: Right.
THE COURT: -- does it at least raise a triable issue as to whether or not there was evidence of abandonment by it?

MR. RIFKIN: Your Honor, I don't -- I don't think on this question it does because, No. 1, the clearest statement she makes in the deposition is the one you just asked me about on page 1024 of the deposition transcript, where she says what the extent of their interest was. The purpose that she
describes for creating and publishing the collection of songs in Song Stories for the Kindergarten we certainly don't need to challenge or dispute or in any way explain because Happy Birthday to You simply isn't in that publication.

And, again, I think that the failure to include that song in the 1893 publication, if the Court believes there's some question about whether it was written then -- and by "it" I mean the Happy Birthday lyrics -- is conclusive when you put it against the statement that she makes that we were only trying to protect the publication at that time. I think that is the clearest black-and-white expression of what the limits of her interests were. But then if there's even any doubt about it after that --

THE COURT: If she was only trying to protect the publication because that was what's being published in the songbook, and the Happy Birthday lyrics if it existed at that time was not being published in the songbook, does that necessarily mean that she was abandoning the lyrics to Happy Birthday?

MR. RIFKIN: Oh, I think, in and of itself she says this was the extent of our rights. But I don't think you need to look at that in a vacuum because, as we say in our brief, if you look at the question of abandonment, you don't look at one act and say that's not abandonment and another act and say that's not abandonment and a third act and say that's not
abandonment any more than you look at a tree and say, well, that's not a forest and you look at the tree next to that and say that's not a forest either when you're standing in the midst of a forest, because there is other evidence, including what she says to the New York Times in 1934, when she says that her only claim was regarding the music of Good Morning.

When you look at what she says to Time Magazine, she says I had long ago resigned myself to the fact that the ditty had become common property of the nation. When you look at the rights that she --

THE COURT: Let's go back because I want to make sure -- let's go back to the New York Time article. The New York Time article doesn't say exactly what you just said. It doesn't purport to quote from Ms. Hill, saying, I only have a gripe with them with respect to the music and not the lyrics. MR. RIFKIN: Correct.

THE COURT: That may be your gloss on it, and that's fine, but as we look at it, what it says is she also admitted, meaning I assume this was Ms. Patty --

MR. RIFKIN: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: -- Smith Hill, she also admitted that it was her sister Jessica Hill, instructor of English at Teachers College, who had signed a complaint in the suit filed earlier in the day in federal court, alleging the Happy Birthday to You sung in As Thousands Cheer was a plagiarism on the music of her
own song.
MR. RIFKIN: Right. Right.
THE COURT: It does not say anything about "but it is not plagiarism of the words, because that I've already given up." That doesn't go that far.

MR. RIFKIN: That --
THE COURT: What you're saying is an inference that might be drawn from the fact that she had emphasized in her lawsuit that plagiarism of the music, without any discussion of plagiarism of the lyrics, because obviously the lyrics were sung in As Thousands Cheer -- you say that is some indication of an overt act to abandon.

MR. RIFKIN: Yeah. If -- if someone performs your work without your permission -- and although only Jessica signed the complaint, the complaint was brought in the name of the foundation for the benefit of both sisters. Although Jessica was the only one who signed the complaint, the complaint was that the song Happy Birthday to You was used in the play As Thousands Cheer without their permission. And the claim was that the performance, again, plagiarized the music.

Now, had they believed that it also plagiarized Patty's writing of the lyrics, it wouldn't have taken much for them to say that. Again, this is -- this is a -- this is a piece of evidence in the negative. There's a claim that Happy Birthday to You infringes upon your rights to the -- to the music, but
there's no corresponding claim that it infringes upon your right to the lyrics.

THE COURT: Your point, going back to the trees and the forest, I guess your point is that you're not necessarily saying any one of these pieces of evidence may in and of itself constitute the overt act that is indicative of an intent to abandon but that, when you put everything together -- the teaching, the various articles, and then of course the Time Magazine article and so forth --

MR. RIFKIN: Right.
THE COURT: -- together they do constitute the type of overt act which evidences an intent or purpose to abandon.

MR. RIFKIN: I think all these various affirmative acts on the part of Patty, together, the totality of those acts, is clear that they regarded -- that she regarded the Happy Birthday lyrics fundamentally differently than she regarded the composition of Good Morning to All, which she was fiercely protective of -- again, to the point where she sued over it, she demanded compensation for it, she fought with her publisher over it, "it" being Good Morning to All, but never, never anything about Happy Birthday to You even when Happy Birthday to You was the work being performed.

So, yes, I think, if you wanted them all -- if -- if the -- if the interview she gave to Time Magazine, where she says she long ago resigned herself to the fact that the ditty
had become common property of the nation, if that's not alone sufficient to say she's abandoned any claim to copyright, then, yes, I think all these other overt acts are certainly sufficient to do that.

Again, also, we have what she says in -- in the deposition in 1935 that all she was trying to protect was the publication at that time. I don't know how much more we can ask for as far as overt acts of abandonment are concerned for a song, Happy Birthday to You, that Patty Hill really didn't particularly take much -- I guess the answer that I want to give is pride in. When you read how she talks about Good Morning to All and you compare that with how she talks about Happy Birthday to You, Happy Birthday to You was an afterthought. She had to be prompted to even mention it when asked about it when her deposition was taken in a lawsuit over Happy Birthday to You. The first thing she wanted to talk about was Good Morning to All. So, yes, I think they are -- they are fundamentally different.

THE COURT: Let me ask you one last question before I have you sit down, and I'll talk to Mr. Klaus. And, that is, if the Court were to find that this was a joint -- "this" meaning Happy Birthday to You lyrics -- that was a joint -work of joint authorship with Mildred, then do you have any evidence of any acts evidencing intent to abandon those lyrics by Jessica?

MR. RIFKIN: And, again, leaving apart the 1922 publication, the answer is yes. In the litigation that was filed by Jessica and Patty together against the Hill Foundation -- I'm sorry -- on behalf of the Hill Foundation against --

THE COURT: Summy.
MR. RIFKIN: -- Summy. The only claim that was made in that case had to do with Good Morning to All and the copyrights in Good Morning to All, which by that time Jessica had renewed in 1921. And, again, there are allegations in that complaint having to do with the use of that song, the public performance of that song, not as Good Morning to All but instead as Happy Birthday to You.

Jessica was not at all embarrassed to assert her rights as the heir of Mildred to the composition of Good Morning to All. If Jessica thought she had a right to the Happy Birthday lyrics, they would have appeared in that complaint with certainty. Why go through the trouble of suing someone for using Happy Birthday to You without your permission and not say I own the rights to Happy Birthday? Why would you sue someone for using Happy Birthday to You and only say I own the rights to a different song, Good Morning to All, if you truly believed you owned copyrights to the Happy Birthday lyrics, whether they were common law copyrights, statutory copyrights, or any other kinds of rights? If you were going to file --

THE COURT: That's not -- doesn't that become, as to her, just a failure to assert?

MR. RIFKIN: No, because there was a complaint and there was an amended complaint, and it is clear -- again, it is clear from the allegations in that case that what they were talking about was the musical composition. Your Honor may recall that in the complaint they refer to -- "they" being the Hill Foundation -- they refer to a license of various piano arrangements of the musical composition Good Morning to All. That's Exhibit 50. And then in Exhibit 51 -- this is the amended complaint in Exhibit 51, which is --

THE COURT: Wait, wait. I think you're getting a little confused here. In the amended complaint there are three causes of action. The third cause of action is neither here nor there for our purposes, I think.

The first cause of action largely talks about the songbook and the various iterations of the songbook. The second -- and the agreements that had been reached back then at the time -at or about the time of the publication of the songbook, which would have been around the turn of the previous century.

MR. RIFKIN: Correct.
THE COURT: The second cause of action talks about the piano arrangement licenses that $I$ think we've been talking about that you and the defendants dispute, the scope of that. But be that as it may, that was entered into allegedly far
later. That was '34 or '35, and that was when there was discussion with respect to the piano arrangements of Happy Birthday to You, whereas the first cause of action, while it's true in two of those paragraphs -- I think 10 and perhaps 15 -there is some mention of Happy Birthday to You, but it seems to me most of the discussion, as well as the copyrights referred to therein and the renewals of the copyright referred to therein, have nothing to do with E51990 or E51988.

MR. RIFKIN: Correct. The first part of the case concerned the original copyright to Good Morning to All in 1893, and it concerned the renewal by Jessica in 1921, and Summy's exploitation of Song Stories for the Kindergarten. That's the work that was covered by the 1893 copyright and Jessica's renewal of it in 1921, which expired in 1949. There's no dispute about that. But, yes, that's right. The first part of the case concerned that particular publication. The second part of the case, which is the part of the case -- the Hill Foundation v. Summy case -- that's really germane to our present dispute -- has to do with these 1934 and 1935 assignments. And again, you know, Jessica makes it clear the Hill Foundation, on behalf of both Jessica and Patty, make it clear that what was assigned was rights to piano arrangements of the musical composition. And Summy in its answer makes it clear that that's all they acquire.

Now, there was a dispute back then about whether it was a
license or a sale. Summy says we bought it, but Summy says what we bought was the rights to various piano arrangements of the said musical composition Good Morning to All. Period.

THE COURT: Okay. So with that understanding where we are, tell me again how you believe that this is an indication of some act of abandonment by Jessica. That's the context that we're talking about it.

MR. RIFKIN: Because by then Patty and Jessica both knew that the song Happy Birthday to You was being performed. And if it was being performed without their permission and if they believed their permission was necessary, either Patty's permission because she was the author of the derivative work, or Patty's and Jessica's permission because the Court concludes that Happy Birthday was a joint derivative work, then we have to look at the failure to assert any rights to the lyrics Happy Birthday to You in that litigation brought by both Jessica and Patty.

And we have to say that there was some significance to the fact that they sued over the work that they believed they owned, which is Good Morning to All, and that they didn't -- in the same action against the same defendant, they didn't assert any rights to the derivative work, no matter who it was. Whether it was Patty -- she was an interested party in that litigation -- or Patty and Jessica together because the Court finds it's a joint work, then the Court has to conclude from
the absence of any assertion of any rights to the lyrics Happy Birthday to You, that Patty and Jessica together didn't believe they had any rights to those lyrics.

So either way, whether it's because Patty didn't believe she had the rights alone and it was her derivative work, or because Patty and Jessica together didn't believe they had rights in a joint work, it's pretty compelling evidence that they didn't have those rights and didn't think they had those rights.

And, of course, we have all the other litigation that was brought, not just by Patty and Jessica or the Hill Foundation, but also by Summy for performances of Happy Birthday to You, both before the copyright was filed in 1935 and after the copyright was filed in 1935 where the only rights asserted were the rights to the musical composition Good Morning to All, never to the lyrics Happy Birthday to You, even when the performance was Happy Birthday to You.

So if it was an act of forgetfulness on Patty's and Jessica's part when filing the first complaint, they hadn't overcome that forgetfulness when they filed the amended complaint, and it apparently spread to Summy when Summy filed its own lawsuits over the songs after they acquired the rights, whatever rights they acquired from Patty and Jessica in 1934 and ' 35 in those infamous assignments, because they filed lawsuits against third parties who used Happy Birthday to You,
and they never claimed any right to the lyrics Happy Birthday to You.

After a while, even leaving apart the 1922 publication, the evidence is just overwhelming that the claim of Patty and of Mildred and of Jessica was limited to Good Morning to All. It never reached Happy Birthday to You.

And Patty tells us why on multiple occasions. She told us why in her deposition. She told us why in the Time Magazine article. The reporter certainly mentions it in the New York Times article. You know, this is the record the Court's going to have to decide, and this record is so completely one sided that I think summary judgment is appropriate.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
MR. RIFKIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Klaus, let's start with the issue of joint authorship, and I'm going to give you a chance to address what Mr. Rifkin had argued. And that is the same -- basically the same page of the deposition that you also rely on of Patty Hill that is at page 1007 of her deposition. If you have other aspects of this deposition that you want me to take a look at, that's fine. But I'd like to hear from you as to why you believed that this was a joint work as opposed to a derivative work of Patty only, subsequently pending.

MR. KLAUS: I think we have to step back, first, on what the legal standard is for a joint work with respect to a
musical composition. And the case we had directed Your Honor to would be the Shapiro, Bernstein case from the Second Circuit in 1947. And at page -- 161 F.2d 409 to 410, they -- this is what the Second Circuit said:

The words and music of a song constitute a musical composition in which the two contributions merge into a single work to be performed as a unit for the pleasure of the hearers. They are not a composite work like the articles in an encyclopedia but are as little separable for purposes of the copyright as are the individual notes which constitute the melody.

And they go back, and they cite a case where you have a composer of -- of the -- of the music, the tune, and the lyrics who had never met each other.

The case in the -- the case in Shapiro, Bernstein involved a set of music that was taken to a different lyricist a year after the underlying composition. And so this is a matter of law. When you have somebody who is writing the music and the lyrics, they are combined together.

But in this case what the evidence in this transcript actually shows, these aren't two strangers. One of the things that we have -- we haven't really discussed is these are two sisters. They're living in the same house. They are working with both Patty and her sister Jessica. And I would also
direct you to page 1031 of the record, which is the portion which is -- 1031 and 1032, which is where Jessica, who apparently was 14 or 15 years old at the time these works were being done in around 1893, she says one of the earliest ones they put together was Happy Birthday to You.

And on page 1032 she's asked, will you describe to us one particular incident or one particular hour of work during which your two sisters were at work? That is, tell us what Ms. Mildred Hill did and what Ms. Patty Hill did.

And Jessica says, well, my sister would be at the piano playing it, and my sister Patty would often say to her that the children did not sing that interval well. I can remember that, and this is entirely consistent with what Patty says.

We have a situation where, even if Mildred was not going to the school and listening to how the children are singing the tune, what the testimony in this deposition shows is Patty saying I came home at night, Mildred sat at the piano, and we went -- I told her the words that I had written, and we figured out what would be good enough for the little kids in the register.

I would also point out, Your Honor, Exhibit 50 to the summary judgment record, which is the amended complaint in Hill versus Harris -- I'm sorry. Hill Foundation against Summy. The flat-out allegation of the Hill Foundation on behalf of both of the sisters, on page 664, the said song Happy

Birthday to You, written and composed by the said Patty S. Hill and Mildred J. Hill.

I just don't see, in light of the legal standard for what a joint work of authorship is with respect to a composition containing musical notes and lyrics, and the facts that we have in this deposition about the way this was being composed, how this could be anything other than a joint work of authorship.

THE COURT: Let me move on to -- you put in a footnote only that, to the extent that this was a work of joint authorship and if there's going to be abandonment, there would be the requirement of two overt acts, one by each of the holders of the joint authorship interest. Do you have any authority for that other than the ones that you cite which really don't say that? They just say simply that one joint author cannot delegate the rights of the other.

But do you have any particular authority which says that in this circumstance the overt act must be one committed by each of the joint authors or the interest holders of the joint authorship, or can it be one joint author exhibiting some overt act or acts with the knowledge and acquiescence of the other but not necessarily additional overt act on the part of the second joint author?

MR. KLAUS: I don't at -- I don't have, on that precise question, authority for you. What I do have, Your Honor, though, is on a closely related question, which is
the Davis against Blige case which we cited, and that is 505 F.3d 90 --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. KLAUS: -- and that's pages 99 through 100.
Again, this is the Second Circuit.
THE COURT: That just says that a coauthor cannot grant an exclusive license without the other --

MR. KLAUS: Correct.
THE COURT: -- author's consent.
MR. KLAUS: But if -- but if one co-owner can't grant an exclusive license without the other's consent, then it makes no sense to say that one co-owner can effectively abandon the other --

THE COURT: That's not my question. I'm not saying one co-owner tries to abandon and the other co-owner says I don't want to abandon anything. That's not what I'm positing.

What I'm saying is one co-owner wants to abandon and, for purposes of argument, has exhibited the requisite overt act or acts to do so. The second co-owner is fully aware of it, doesn't complain about it, but doesn't take any independent overt act.

Maybe I'm misreading the importance of your footnote, but it sounds like, to me, that you say, if we were to conclude that it's a joint authorship between Mildred and Patty, and by Mildred passing the interest to Jessica, both Jessica and Patty
must independently exhibit an overt act or acts. That's what I'm just trying to question you on, whether you have that level of authority.

I am not questioning the fact that, if Jessica didn't want to abandon, Patty didn't -- if they were joint authors, didn't have the authority to do that for her.

MR. KLAUS: I don't -- the direct answer is I don't have the case. I think it follows from the nature of abandonment in copyright, which is somebody abandoning their copyright interest. That is, if co-owner A and co-owner B each have an undivided interest in the copyright, that in order for there to be an entire -- a dedication of the entire work to the public, that A and B both -- they could do it jointly. They could both together say we are -- we are giving this -- here is an overt act. We are giving -- we are giving this work to the public for all time.

But to say that one -- but to say that A could do something to divest itself of its interest and to say that that would have any sort of an effect on B, B's interest in the copyright, I don't think that can be squared with -- I don't think that can be squared with the law on that.

THE COURT: But if you have some people like the Hill sisters, as you described, they have a certain level of closeness. This is not just any two individuals, any individuals. They are sisters. They have joint interest in
the Hill Foundation that acts for them and so forth. There's no evidence that Jessica and Patty were estranged or at odds with each other or so forth.

So if Patty had taken certain steps that, let's say for argument's sake, sufficient to constitute the overt act and Jessica were aware of what she was doing and had even in some instances mentioned that -- something to the effect that Patty had done these things, would that be enough?

MR. KLAUS: I don't think so, Your Honor. I think that would be inaction on Jessica's part, which under the Hampton case it's clear inaction is not enough to constitute abandonment of her interest. In fact, we have, as we cited in our papers, numerous pieces of evidence of Jessica working to protect her own interests and the interest of the Hill Foundation.

I would also just -- in saying that, I don't -- obviously, as you know from reading our papers, we have a fundamental disagreement as to whether what is cited with respect to Patty is evidence of Patty abandoning.

THE COURT: I understand. I understand that.
All right. Let me ask you about the Time Magazine article. That's Exhibit 90. You say that -- you object that this is hearsay. Let me just make sure that I understand what your objection is. I take it you don't object on the basis of authenticity, that you're not saying that this is not really a
reproduction of Time Magazine but that somebody pretended this to be a Time Magazine.

MR. KLAUS: We don't dispute the authenticity of this document.

THE COURT: Okay. Then in terms of hearsay, I take -- well, why don't you tell me precisely what your hearsay objection is.

MR. KLAUS: Well, the first is that there's no -there's no quotation of Patty Hill. The person who wrote this article in August of 1934 never said, I sat down and interviewed Patty Hill, and this is what she told me. There are a number of statements here that looks like a Patty Hill -I don't know how the reporting for Time Magazine worked in 1934. That could have come from an interview with her, could have come from piecing together other statements. But there's no statement that's actually attributed to being --

THE COURT: Let's take it one step at a time.
MR. KLAUS: Yes.
THE COURT: On the face of it, appears to be two layers of hearsay. The first level of hearsay is the article itself.

MR. KLAUS: Correct.
THE COURT: Are you objecting to that, or do you concede that, because of the ancient document exception, that this would satisfy the hearsay on that level?

MR. KLAUS: On that level, yes. As an ancient document, it would.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. KLAUS: Correct.
THE COURT: The second level would be if this were attributable to Patty.

MR. KLAUS: Correct.
THE COURT: Let's -- for purpose of discussion, let's assume that the magazine article had said, "And Ms. Patty Hill said, quote, 'I have no complaint to make on the'" -- you know, so forth and so on, close quote.

If it were that, do you have any objections?
MR. KLAUS: Yeah. The objection we cited, citing the -- the Hsia case from Washington, D.C., is that it's not an admission. It can't be taken to be an admission against pecuniary interest because there's no showing that's been made that at the point in time, if Patty Hill had made this question, she understood the consequences of what she -- she understood the consequences of what she was saying.

THE COURT: Isn't there some, at least, inferences that could be drawn that this could be admissible but goes to weight, not admissibility, inasmuch as we are talking in the context of her having some kind of a lawsuit, and then we talk about the scope of her assertion of her rights in that lawsuit on the same work that we're talking about?

MR. KLAUS: True, although the purpose of the hearsay rule, Your Honor, is we're not -- obviously, we're not able to cross-examine Patty Hill on what it was that she said. So we're looking, even before you get to --

THE COURT: Our record would be much better if we could.

MR. KLAUS: Understood, Your Honor.
The point being that, even before you get to assigning it any weight, there's a question of the reliability of the statement and whether it is sufficiently reliable. And for purposes of admitting it under the admission against pecuniary interest, I think that is drawing it quite a few inferences without -- without further corroborating evidence that she understood that, by saying this, somebody was going to stand up and say that you have no rights. You affirmatively were saying to the world that you have no rights forever to the song.

THE COURT: That doesn't seem obvious from the quote? Sorry, not a quote. Doesn't it seem obvious that, if she had said I have no complaint to make on the use of the words because long ago I resigned myself to the fact that that ditty had become common property of the nation? That seems pretty clear that she -- she's not going to be able to assert anything else, having told everybody, hey, I resign myself that this is common property, this is public domain, in effect.

MR. KLAUS: Well, I think that is -- again, those
are inferences that are being drawn from the words which we're assuming for purposes of the question, the quote about common property of the nation.

But, again, to my point that, given the standard for abandonment is beyond an action, is beyond somebody saying to a reporter, you know, everybody is singing this and so there's nothing I can do about it, doesn't contain the indication that by -- that she was aware that the consequences of saying that would one day be taken to mean it's not just that there is inaction on your part or perceived inability to control, but you are intending to say $I$ intend to give this to the nation.

THE COURT: Well, what you just said there sort of intermixes two different concepts, one of abandonment, one for purposes of hearsay exception. There's some crossover there, but technically there's two different concepts.

Let me ask you then, since this does not purport to say quotation marks around it, are you of the view that in context it does not appear that this is a quotation or this is a summary of what she had said?

MR. KLAUS: Yes. Yes. I don't think -- I don't think there is enough, from the face of this document, for us to know what she said, to whom, what else may have been said for us to treat this as a statement that can be attributed to this declarant.

THE COURT: Okay. Assuming for the moment that I
find that this is admissible for the reasons that we've talked about -- that is, this is an exception of hearsay rule -- you say that, in and of itself, is not enough still for purposes of abandonment. I'm not necessarily agreeing or disagreeing, but for purposes of argument, if we accept your argument on that point, what about when, in conjunction with the other failures-to-assert situation -- and not just any failure to assert. It's a failure to assert where there is an assertion of the same work, albeit in other aspects or other rights within the work.

Would that not as a totality suggest that there has been an overt action? And we're not just barely talking about overt act. It has to be an overt act that is indicative of an intention to abandon. So if you took the whole group of evidence as been posited by Mr. Rifkin, would that not tend to show that there was an overt act or acts evidencing an intent or purpose to abandon?

MR. KLAUS: I don't think that it would meet the standard, Your Honor, for the following reason, which is the line that Hampton draws in the Ninth Circuit -- Rohauer follows -- is fairly clear, which is, in order to find that somebody -- because there are lots of things somebody can do where they may not complain, for whatever their reasons are. But if the -- what those cases stand for is you really have to take -- it's not just a combination of -- it's not putting
tree, tree, tree together and saying, aha, I've come up with an overt act that I'll call a forest, or forest I'll call an overt act.

You actually need that act requirement for a reason under the cases, which is that this is -- it's an important right. It's a right that's protected by -- through not only the constitution and statute and that what you are going to require is some overt act. You're not going to require something that is a totality of the circumstances and a totality of inaction being combined together to say that this totality of inaction somehow becomes an overt act.

And the reason I would say this, Your Honor, which is they are focused on the complaints that were filed in the Harris v. Hill case and the Hill Foundation against Summy case. And then, of course, they -- they cite to later things that are not attributable to the Hills.

But the rule -- that is the rule of applicability for copyright owners, generally. Again, this is -- the law here is -- the law on overt act and abandonment continues to be the same. If that's what it is, then what you're doing is you're requiring copyright owners, on the penalty of one day being held to have lost their copyright, to either throw everything in and assert everything or risk that somebody will come back and say we're going to apply a totality of the circumstances test.

So what I think, this is one of the areas where -- as you know, many areas of the law we say let's look at -- let's come up with a standard, and let's throw everything in, and we'll balance it and we will weigh it together.

In a number of areas of the law, we say, no, there's going to be a clear, bright line, and what we are going to require is the act of abandonment. I think the fact that it's called not just an act demonstrating an intent but that it is overt means it has to be something that is affirmative and bright line.

THE COURT: Of course an act need not be a physical act. It could be an oral act or oral statement to constitute an act.

MR. KLAUS: That's correct. That's correct.
THE COURT: Now, I think you also, in support of your position that there is no abandonment, you've also made the argument that the lyrics had been granted or transferred in some way, whether it's licensed or assigned or whatever, to the Summy Company back in '34 to '35. And I just want to make sure that this is still part of your argument because it does tend to sort of bleed into the subsequent argument as to whether or not any rights were even granted to the Summy Company before the copyrights were -- were sought to be taken out on them, the purported copyrights.

So I want to make sure that I understand whether you are also arguing that that's further evidence of lack of
abandonment, something like how could you have abandoned something, and then you would have transferred the rights to somebody else.

Is that what you're saying?
MR. KLAUS: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Then let me understand -- again, I know you and I had a nice conversation about it last time, and I went back and read the transcript. And if we can just spend a couple more minutes where you can try to make it as clear to me as you can as to what you believe is the evidence of the transfer of any of the rights to the lyrics of Happy Birthday to You from the Hills to your predecessor.

MR. KLAUS: Well, I don't have all of it at the tip of -- at my fingertips, Your Honor, but what I've looked at in coming to the hearing today is the, No. 1, the allegations that are in the complaint, in the Hill v. --

THE COURT: The amended complaint.
MR. KLAUS: The amended complaint, which is 1942, I believe.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. KLAUS: One must remember at this point in time the Summy Company had been publishing sheet music. Sheet music. I would ask the Court, if you assume for the purposes of what I'm saying, that the sheet music for E 51990 was the familiar lyrics to Happy Birthday, that the sheet music that we
have in the record is in fact the sheet music that Summy was publishing in 1935 with those lyrics as well as the E51988 with the unison song version.

That had to have been known to the Hill -- they admit that they had given -- they had given permission for the work to be done in sheet music form. The complaint in the case was you are going beyond the limited license that we gave you, and you were licensing -- you're sublicensing sound and dialogue, meaning the lyrics, rights to Happy Birthday to You to people in the motion picture industry, and by that you were exceeding the scope of your license.

THE COURT: That -- I'm sorry. Finish, and then I've got two questions.

MR. KLAUS: Yes. And then, of course, we have the settlement of the Hill Foundation against Summy case -- I think that's Exhibit 126 in the summary judgment record -- which specifically lists the Happy Birthday to You copyright and again has -- and says that Summy is the publisher of these works and the Hills -- the Hill Foundation is the one that has the sisters' interest in them.

Again, $I$ don't think there is -- to the point of $I$ don't think there is any evidence that I'm aware of where the Hill sisters said to anyone, we didn't give Summy the right to publish sheet music with the lyrics to Happy Birthday to You. And indeed the copyright registration in 1935, at least prima
facie evidence -- and we think uncontradicted -- that they did have that right, that right was granted to them.

THE COURT: Well, in reading this amended complaint --

MR. KLAUS: Yes.
THE COURT: -- the discussion about the grant of any sheet music does not include Happy Birthday. It repeatedly talks about those songs in the Song Stories book and versions of Song Stories book. It talks about copyrights and the renewal of those copyrights later by Jessica, but those are not the copyrights of E51990 or E51988.

So, yes, it is true that there is some mention of Happy Birthday in some of the paragraphs -- 10, 11, and 15 of the first cause of action -- but when you look at everything, the rights that they're talking about are limited to circumstances involving the songbook, Good Morning to You, and the copyrights to those and the renewal of copyrights, none of which included Happy Birthday within it, the lyrics to Happy Birthday within it. The music, of course, it's the same music. MR. KLAUS: Those are -- the legal claim was brought under the Good Morning to You or the Song Stories for the Kindergarten songbook copyright, but paragraph 15 says -- this is on page 665 and 666 -- at the time of granting the aforesaid licenses to Summy under the original and renewal copyrights above mentioned and described --

THE COURT: Which does not include Happy Birthday, because anything above mentioned and described -- copyrights, licenses -- did not include Happy Birthday lyrics.

Happy Birthday lyrics happened, if anything, you're asserting, happened later in -- well, skip that.

Go ahead, because I don't think any of these things that you have read, as defined by this first amended complaint, purports to include anything having to do with Happy Birthday lyrics.

MR. KLAUS: It says, though, if you continue on to the next -- if you continue on to the next page, nor did such licenses contemplate or contain any agreement Summy should have the right to grant licenses or sublicenses to the producers of dramatic performances in respect to the use of any said songs therein and in -- said songs therein and, in particular, the aforesaid song, Happy Birthday to You --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. KLAUS: -- being included within said songs within. The only rights acquired at any time by Summy under the express license and the oral renewals thereof being those of publication and sale of said songs -- again, repeating the words "said songs," which is up above -- or works in sheet music form.

THE COURT: All that is really saying -- I think what you're trying to say is that somehow suggests that there
was an agreement by the Hills to license the lyrics to Summy but that somehow the license and the lyrics was limited to sheet music but that Summy went and exceeded the scope of the license by dealing with people uncontemplated back in the turn of the last century, i.e., dramatic performances or movie directors, movie producers.

But none of that says that the lyrics of Happy Birthday had ever been licensed to Summy.

MR. KLAUS: Well, except for the -- the paragraph that I just read, it said, said songs including Happy Birth- -including Happy Birthday to You.

THE COURT: It says it didn't give you that right. It's true they didn't give them any rights to that. You could have said, in dealing with these music -- with these movie producers, we didn't give you the right to You're a Hound Dog. We didn't give you the right to Beat it. You could have said all those things because it's true we didn't give you any rights.

But the fact that we didn't give you the right to deal with them, including for this song, does not logically follow that we had given you the rights to the lyrics for Happy Birthday for sheet music when everything that has been alleged thus far refers to the sheet music of those publications, copyrights, and renewals relating to the Song Stories publications and related publications.

MR. KLAUS: Well, two things. One is the end, what it says is the only rights acquired at any time by Summy under the --

THE COURT: What page?
MR. KLAUS: This is on page 666, the end of paragraph 15.

THE COURT: Paragraph 15. Okay.
MR. KLAUS: So the only rights acquired at any time by Summy under the original express license and the oral renewals thereof, meaning there were rights that were acquired, being those of publication and sale of said songs, the said songs including Happy Birthday to You in sheet music form.

THE COURT: You know, if you read this in isolation, perhaps because it was this mention of Happy Birthday, but if you really look at this entire first cause of action and context and the way it's been set up, there is nothing that suggests that there were any rights acquired by Summy under the original express license because the original express license, the oral renewals, had nothing to do with Happy Birthday. Lyrics, I mean.

MR. KLAUS: Okay. Let me go to paragraph 24, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That now --
MR. KLAUS: So just to -- taking your point about not looking at these in isolation --

THE COURT: Right. This is the second cause of action.

MR. KLAUS: Correct.
THE COURT: Now we're talking about a different license that was granted much later. This license is granted in 1934 or ' 35 and a license granted at a time when hardly the allegation could be that we never contemplated the successes or the popularity of movies, I would think, in '34, '35. There should be some contemplation of that unlike at the turn of the century. But go ahead. Make your point.

MR. KLAUS: The point is that what she's saying -this goes to -- this is our fundamental point, Your Honor. In 1934 and 1935 Jessica Hill -- what this is saying is she said I trust you. I trust that -- I trust Summy because of what they've done. I think what she's also saying is I didn't know they were out licensing to motion pictures at the time, but $I$ trust you. And because I trust you, I'm going to give you -I'm going to grant you a license.

And she says that she reposed faith, trust, confidence, granted to this defendant a number of licenses for the publication, sale, and performance of various piano arrangements of the song variously entitled Good Morning to All or Happy Birthday to You.

THE COURT: Correct.
MR. KLAUS: I know this takes us back to the
question about whether the piano arrangement consists not only of the -- the putting the notes in particular order on the -on the little lines on the page but that $I$ think in context what this is plainly saying is I've licensed you because you can -- you can publish it either as Good Morning to All or as Happy Birthday to You.

THE COURT: The piano arrangement meaning the music to it because, if it were the lyrics, it wouldn't make sense to say it's variously called this or that because this is not the same as that.

MR. KLAUS: Your Honor, the question I would have, Your Honor, is then why seven years after Summy had published Happy Birthday to You with lyrics and if Jessica -- if Jessica Hill is complaining about the fact that you are using this in motion pictures and I don't -- I don't like you using it in motion pictures and I only granted you a license with respect to a particular musical arrangement that some other people have called Good Morning to All and some other people call Happy Birthday to You, why is there no complaint by Jessica Hill or the Hill Foundation about Summy's publishing the sheet music, including the lyrics?

THE COURT: Maybe it's the same answer that why is it that they would not have asserted their rights against these other defendants when they were already suing them for the music? Maybe, you know, sort of turned around on your argument
because the argument you want to assert against them is the same one that could be said about against you.

MR. KLAUS: Except for the fact that -- except for the fact that they -- the actual actions here are not only not asserting a claim in it but settling the lawsuit with express recognition of the E51990 copyright and transferring all of the Hill Foundation, which was all of the Hill sisters' interest to the song.

THE COURT: Isn't that also circular because the 1944 agreement transfers whatever they had in E51990 and -988, whatever it is they had. But if they never had ever transferred any rights, either because they felt that they didn't have any more rights because they had given to the public or whatever reason they never transferred the rights, then those -- the copyrights of 1935, whatever they are, wouldn't have included it either.

So it's really basically circular. I'm giving you what I have, and the question is what did you have? If I didn't give it to you before and I give you something that's in the copyright and the copyright didn't include what I had given you, then you still don't have it.

MR. KLAUS: 1944, when there have been these lawsuits when the value of the work is clear and when, as the agreement expressly provides that these -- that the remaining Hill sisters were receiving, as they continued to do and as
their legatee, the Association For Early Childhood Development, has continued to receive a third of the royalties for this song, that, Your Honor, seems to be inconsistent with the idea that going through all of these steps, taking -- settling the lawsuit, continuing to take royalties, continuing to take monies from ASCAP for the exploitation of this particular work, that one would say that these sisters actually thought that somehow long ago they had dedicated this work to the public or it had slipped from their hands into the public domain.

If you look at the combination of the evidence, Your Honor, here -- again, I don't -- this is not a question of do you have to say that they gave up their copyright. This is not the overt act requirement for abandonment. This is, in a sense, protecting the interest of the two people who we know -effectively, Mildred's heir Jessica and Patty, who wrote the song -- who were the authors of the song.

It's a matter of protecting -- it's a matter of saying, when you look at the totality of what they did and how they behaved, that you -- that you say I think that there's clear evidence that, whatever they said in one section of the complaint or not, they had granted a license for the publication in sheet music form. That's what the copyright was registered for in 1935. That's what they had -- that's what they had -- that's what they had continued to exploit.

And I'm not aware of -- other than these statements that
are -- we've got the hearsay issues with, anything that says that Jessica and Patty Hill said, at some point in time, we didn't care about the Happy Birthday to You copyright, we didn't care what Summy was doing in terms of publishing the lyrics because it had somehow -- it had somehow slipped away, I think all the evidence is to the contrary, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me wrap up with you, Mr. Klaus, by asking you the same question I asked Mr. Rifkin. And, that is, from a procedural standpoint, do you see -- if I were to decide that I think there are triable issues of fact on any variety of issues presented, starting from authorship to abandonment to transfer to whatever, if $I$ find that there is a triable issue of fact inasmuch as both sides have consented to a court trial, is there any need from a form standpoint to say okay, that motion is denied; now let's come back and put everything -- the same thing into the record?

Because this is one of those cases where the record is -just as soon as I say it's unlikely to be expanded, you folks expanded the record; so maybe I should be more careful. But it's largely unlikely to be expanded, at least not expanded by any further explication by the principal players in this case, shall we say.

Would it, in your view, be appropriate for the Court then to make the factual findings as part of the same order or to bifurcate it for purposes of some other opportunity for you to
come in and resubmit the same evidence in essence?
MR. KLAUS: Much as I, Your Honor, would not -would like to be mindful of your time and all of our time with respect to this, I think that, given the nature of -- given the nature of the summary judgment process and the fact that we've got a certain set of papers, that if there is a -- if there is a triable fact, if there's a fact that has to be tried, that in fairness to both parties, we should have the ability to -- just as in -- just as in any other trial with a jury trial, you're not in a sense limited to the arguments that you've made or the way you connect the dots on the evidence from summary judgment through trial. I think the same thing would apply here.

THE COURT: But you don't see, even if we were to have that subsequent proceeding -- and I can understand your point -- you don't foresee any need to call any witnesses. I don't know what witnesses you would be calling.

MR. KLAUS: We have discussed at least on our side -- we have not discussed yet with -- I assume, if we get to that point, we'll talk to Mr. Rifkin and his colleagues about what exactly this trial would look like. It would be -I don't think there would be any -- I don't foresee any percipient witnesses coming to testify, shall we say.

THE COURT: You don't want to go out on a limb now, Mr. Klaus.

MR. KLAUS: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. KLAUS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Rifkin, why don't I just have you start by commenting upon the second-to-the-last thing that Mr. Klaus said, not the procedural aspect but his discussion with respect to what he believes to be another piece of evidence against abandonment, and that is his arguments with respect to what Exhibit 50 and Exhibit 126 would tend to show, that there had been rights to the lyrics of Good Morning -- I'm sorry -- Happy Birthday to You having been granted to Summy. MR. RIFKIN: I'll try to keep my comments brief because I think largely the Court has already heard an awful lot about this. And I think it's helpful to have Exhibit 50 and Exhibit 51 side by side because one is the amended complaint by the Hill Foundation, and the other one is Summy's, the defendant's predecessor's answer. And I think, if we look at them together, it is clear exactly what was meant by the plaintiffs' allegations and what the defendant had to say about them.

First, Your Honor asked questions of Mr. Klaus about the first claim in the amended complaint and how it was related to the original publications and the original copyrights, the 1893 works, the 1896 work, and the 1899 work, and I would essentially say exactly that.

Mr. Klaus referred to some references to the said songs.

He mentioned that twice. It appears in two different paragraphs. It appears in paragraph 15 on page 665 and 666. It appears twice.

And Your Honor, I believe, was correct to note that paragraph 15 is part of the first cause of action and the said songs that are referred to in paragraph 15 by the plaintiff Hill Foundation is a reference to the songs that were included in the original works -- the 1893, 1899, and 1896 works -- that are covered by the copyrights that are identified in paragraph 12, which begins on page 664 and carries over to page 665.

There is no dispute that those works included only the lyrics to Good Morning to All, and I believe Your Honor understands that argument. I don't want to belabor it.

Mr. Klaus then asked the Court to turn to paragraph 24, which is part of the second cause of action. And the second cause of action concerns those unidentified assignments from Jessica in 1934 and 1935 which unfortunately are not in the record. And in these two pieces of evidence are essentially the best evidence of what those assignments covered and didn't cover.

And I would make just two brief comments, but I'm happy to answer any other questions the Court has.

First, the reference to the various piano arrangements of the song, singular -- the various piano arrangements of the
song variously entitled Good Morning to All or Happy Birthday to You could only mean the musical composition because, as Your Honor knows, the song was the musical composition that was common to that particular work, whether it was called Good Morning to All or Happy Birthday to You.

But let us not read past the allegation that the transfer was of various piano arrangements. Now, I don't know any context in which the phrase "various piano arrangements" can possibly refer to human lyrics. I just don't understand that.

But even if we were going to say, well, there's some doubt about whether they were talking about one song when they used the word "song" in the singular and whether they only meant Good Morning to All when they said "variously entitled" Good Morning to You or -- or Happy Birthday to You, Summy answers that for us. And so let's look at Exhibit 51, and this time I think what we need to look at is their answer to paragraph 24, which is on page 684 of the reproduced record.

There, in response to the Hill Foundation's allegation that various piano arrangements of the song variously entitled Good Morning to All and Happy Birthday to You were licensed, Summy says as follows:

The said Jessica Hill sold, assigned, and transferred to this defendant various piano arrangements of the said musical composition, quotation mark, Good Morning to All, close
quotation mark, and all world rights including publishing, public performance, and mechanical reproduction rights of and to copyright, extension of copyright, so on and so forth.

The only song title that is mentioned in the answer filed by Summy was Good Morning to All. It removes whatever conceivable lingering doubt the defendants might try to introduce about what was meant by the Hill Foundation in paragraph 24 of the amended complaint, and I think we don't need to belabor it anymore. It's just the musical composition, not the words. It's that simple.

I did want to comment on a couple of points that Mr. Klaus made in the beginning of his argument. One had to do with his citation to Shapiro, Bernstein. And he says that that case discusses the difference -- it somehow supports his argument that Happy Birthday was a derivative work even if the words were later written by Patty. That's just not so.

What that case talks about is the difference between a joint work, which Good Morning to All unquestionably was, and a composite work, which Good Morning to All unquestionably was not. A composite work is, for example, the publication of Song Stories for the Kindergarten in 1893. A composite work is, for example, the publication of Everyday Song Book in 1922. It includes works by multiple authors that are assembled by a compiler.

The case Shapiro, Bernstein simply did not discuss anything about joint works versus derivative works. And, Your Honor, if Mr. Klaus's argument is that no one can subsequently add to an original joint work by the inclusion of new material without that subsequent work becoming a joint work with the original authors, there's simply no authority that I'm aware of, certainly none that's been cited to the Court to support that proposition. Happy Birthday was a derivative work, not a composite work, and not a joint work. And that was our point.

The only other point I wanted to make from Mr. Klaus's earlier argument, other than to answer any questions the Court has, is to turn back to page 664 from Exhibit 50. Again, and I don't mean to jump around, but Mr. -- Mr. Klaus had --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Six sixty -MR. RIFKIN: Page 664 of Exhibit 50. THE COURT: Okay. MR. RIFKIN: Mr. Klaus had referred to this, and I looked at it, and if you recall during my initial comments, I talked about how Summy had identified Happy Birthday to You as a later composition. And lo and behold, when I was reading now not Summy's answer, Exhibit 51, which I referred to before, but this time Exhibit 50, the Hill sisters' amended complaint, and they too describe Happy Birthday as a later composition.

In paragraph 10 they say one of the songs contained in the
works mentioned above -- and, again, those works are undoubtedly Song Stories for the Kindergarten and Song Stories for the Sunday school, the 1890s compositions. One of the songs contained in the works mentioned and described in paragraphs 4 to 7, inclusive, is one entitled Good Morning to All, which, with words written by the said Patty S. Hill was later entitled Happy Birthday to You.

Again, I think this answers the Court's question about the temporal connection between the writing of Good Morning to All and the subsequent writing of Happy Birthday to You -- this time not in the words just of Summy in his answer, but now in the words of Patty and Jessica in their amended complaint.

THE COURT: But the very next paragraph says the said song Happy Birthday to You, written and composed by the said Patty S. Hill and Mildred J. Hill.

MR. RIFKIN: Right. Because the song consists not just of the lyrics but also of the melody. And there's no doubt, no doubt at all, that Mildred Hill wrote the melody, and there's no doubt at all that Patty wrote the words. So I think that's what paragraph 11 means. It's clear to me that, if you read paragraph 10 of this complaint, that what the Hill Foundation said is Good Morning to All was written by Patty and Mildred. Patty then later wrote Happy Birthday to You. It just seems in -- unavoidable to reach that conclusion.

And, again, in the context of all the other evidence that
we've discussed today -- and I don't want to belabor all those points -- lastly, Your Honor, I would ask if you would like to hear anything on the admissibility of the article, the Time Magazine article.

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.
MR. RIFKIN: I think, first, we've satisfied the authenticity requirement, and we've satisfied the ancient document requirement of the hearsay rule at least for the article itself. And then the question becomes, well, what about the statement that is attributed to Patty -- although, I agree, not with quotation marks around it.

But just like a witness sometimes in Court testifies this is what she said to me, without putting air quotes around hearsay, the article does the same thing. And it is clearly a statement against interest for the reasons that $I$ think the Court asked Mr. Klaus about. But I thought I heard Mr. Klaus say that it was not supported by any corroborating circumstances that indicate its trustworthiness, and that is a part of rule $804(\mathrm{~b})(3)(\mathrm{B})$.

804 are exceptions to the hearsay rule when the declarant is unavailable. $804(\mathrm{~b})(3)$ generally is statement against interests. $804(\mathrm{~b})(3)(A)$ says that statements against interest are admissible if they are the kind that a reasonable person would have made only if the person believed it to be true because, when made, it was so contrary to the declarant's
pecuniary or proprietary interests.
804 (B) adds a second qualification, when that evidence is offered in a criminal case as one that tends to expose the declarant to criminal liability, that it be supported by corroborating circumstances that indicate its trustworthiness.

So that argument that we need to provide corroborating circumstances clearly indicating the trustworthiness only would arise if this were a criminal case and only if there was a question of Patty Hill's criminal liability. It simply doesn't apply.

THE COURT: Let me ask you if you agree with Mr. Klaus's statement, albeit somewhat in passing, that dialogue rights, as referred at least at paragraph 18 on page 666 of the first amended complaint, is synonymous with lyrics.

MR. RIFKIN: No, I don't. I don't agree.
THE COURT: And what's your view on what is the meaning of dialogue rights?

MR. RIFKIN: I think dialogue is exactly what it says. It's spoken dialogue. But either way -- and if you give me just a moment to get to that page -- okay. Either way, paragraph 8 in exhibit -- I'm sorry. I think -- is that paragraph 9?

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MR. RIFKIN: 663, paragraph 8. I'm sorry. Either
way, that's within the context of Count 1 in the complaint which, as Your Honor has noted, has to do with the original assignments, original assignments being Song Stories for the Kindergarten under the 1893 and so forth copyrights. It just has nothing to do with Happy Birthday to You.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
MR. RIFKIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Klaus, I just want, very limited, to ask you about these dialogue rights. I didn't have a chance to talk to you when you mentioned it. Now I remember.

What evidence do you have to suggest that dialogue rights, as used back then in paragraph 18, is synonymous with lyrics?

MR. KLAUS: I guess one is I don't know that we have anything that is in the current summary judgment record that says what the industry custom and usage would be. I don't know what else it could be other than "sound" meaning -- this would be the equivalent, I think, Your Honor, of what we would today call a sync license that -- synchronizing the -- synchronizing the recording with the moving pictures.

But I think what -- I think it's clear from the complaint, and the complaint is -- and the allegations of the complaint are you went out and you allowed people to make movies where they were singing Happy Birthday to You. That's -- that's the dispute between the Hill Foundation.

And it seems to me that, if what you're talking about
is -- the allegation is they granted sound and dialogue rights, I believe the answer in paragraph 51 refers to yes, we did. They said we held ourselves out as saying we were granting sound and dialogue rights to motion picture producers.

THE COURT: Aren't dialogue rights really referring to a genre of pictures just coming out, which were the talkies? Those are the dialogue rights, that you have a right to use it in this kind of a film or a film that's a talkie? Isn't that the context of what dialogue rights means; it has nothing to do with lyrics?

MR. KLAUS: If the distinction is with silent, then I think the word "sound" would be sufficient. If the contrast is with silent, all you would need is sound rights, but if it's --

THE COURT: Certainly we can call it something else, but a lot of times different industries have their own little way of saying things. I'm sure the legal profession has been accused of that more than one time. But I seem to have run across this case around the same time -- about 1940, 1942 -where the dialogue rights discussion was in the context of whether or not it was properly licensed for that type of movie where there is dialogue, not that it relates to any kind of lyrics.

MR. KLAUS: I confess, Your Honor, I don't know the answer. I'm happy to look at it. If you'd like us to submit
something, I'm happy to do that.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. KLAUS: I just don't know off the top of my head.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Very good.
Thank you very much, Counsel. I appreciate your helping to enlighten me on this, and just like before, I'll think some more about this.

MR. KLAUS: Your Honor, and I'll say, if -- I know that Mr. Rifkin is going to file a reply with respect to their ex parte. I don't know if there will be any new -- if you would like -- if there are questions that you have about the legal standards or additional issues that may be raised by the submission, we obviously would like to have a further opportunity to reply to them if they're -- particularly if they're going to be dispositive, because we put together our ex parte opposition in relatively short order.

THE COURT: I'll take a look at it.
MR. KLAUS: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. RIFKIN: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
THE CLERK: This court now stands in recess. (Matter adjourned at 11:25 A.M.)
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