

1 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
 DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257)  
 2 GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468)  
 HOLLY A. HOUSE (SBN 136045)  
 3 ZACHARY J. ALINDER (SBN 209009)  
 BREE HANN (SBN 215695)  
 4 Three Embarcadero Center  
 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
 5 Telephone: 415.393.2000  
 Facsimile: 415.393.2286  
 6 donn.pickett@bingham.com  
 geoff.howard@bingham.com  
 7 holly.house@bingham.com  
 zachary.alinder@bingham.com  
 8 bree.hann@bingham.com

9 DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)  
 JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227)  
 10 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7  
 Redwood City, CA 94070  
 11 Telephone: 650.506.4846  
 Facsimile: 650.506.7144  
 12 dorian.daley@oracle.com  
 jennifer.gloss@oracle.com

13 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
 14 Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International Corporation,  
 Oracle EMEA Limited, and Siebel Systems, Inc.  
 15

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 18 OAKLAND DIVISION

19  
 20 ORACLE USA, INC., *et al.*,  
 21 Plaintiffs,  
 22 v.  
 23 SAP AG, *et al.*,  
 24 Defendants.

No. 07-CV-01658 PJH (EDL)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING  
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Date: May 5, 2010  
 Time: 9:00 am  
 Place: 3rd Floor, Courtroom 3  
 Judge: Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton

07-CV-01658 PJH (EDL)

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1 On May 5, 2010, the Court held a hearing on the Motion for Partial Summary  
2 Judgment brought by Defendants SAP AG, SAP America, Inc., and TomorrowNow, Inc.  
3 (collectively “Defendants”), pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and Civil Local  
4 Rules 7-2 - 7-5 and 56-1.

5 Having reviewed the parties’ papers and carefully considered their arguments,  
6 evidence and relevant legal authority, and good cause appearing, the Court hereby **DENIES**  
7 Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as follows:

8 **Plaintiff Oracle EMEA Ltd.**

9 Plaintiff Oracle OEMEA Ltd. (“OEMEA”) brings four California claims against  
10 Defendants. Oracle’s other plaintiffs bring California claims in addition to two federal claims  
11 for copyright infringement and for violation of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. There is no  
12 dispute that Defendants twice admitted in their Answers to Oracle’s Third and Fourth Amended  
13 Complaints that this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over OEMEA and OEMEA’s pendent  
14 state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. There is also no dispute that Defendants twice  
15 admitted that “a substantial part of the events giving rise to the dispute occurred” in California.  
16 Moreover, Oracle has established extensive California conduct that relates to OEMEA’s claims.  
17 Because there is no genuine dispute that OEMEA has suffered from California-based wrongful  
18 conduct, OEMEA’s claims are not wholly extraterritorial as Defendants allege, and OEMEA’s  
19 claims are properly before this Court. *See, e.g., Solid Host, NL v. Namecheap, Inc.*, 652 F. Supp.  
20 2d 1092, 1122 n.67 (C.D. Cal. 2009). Defendants’ due process argument fails for these same  
21 reasons.

22 Accordingly, Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as to OEMEA is  
23 **DENIED.**

24 **Oracle’s Lost Profits Claims**

25 Defendants next seek a ruling that, as matter of law, an Oracle entity is not  
26 permitted to recover the lost profits of an affiliated plaintiff or non-plaintiff entity. However, for  
27 a given cause of action, no Oracle plaintiff has asserted a claim to another entity’s lost profits,  
28 and thus this Court declines to issue the advisory opinion sought by Defendants’ Motion. *United*

1 *States v. Alpine Land & Reservoir Co.*, 887 F.2d 207, 214 (9th Cir. 1989) (“[C]ourts should not  
2 render advisory opinions upon issues which are not pressed before the court, precisely framed  
3 and necessary for decision.”); *Sun Microsystems Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor Inc.*, 608  
4 F. Supp. 2d 1166, 1206 (N.D. Cal. 2009) (declining, on summary judgment, to “conclusively  
5 decide [the] legal impropriety” of a theory of liability that “defendants presuppose[d]” was being  
6 asserted by plaintiffs).

7 For the same reason, Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment seeking  
8 an advisory opinion on lost profits of non-plaintiff entities is also **DENIED**.

9 **Recovery of Saved Development Costs**

10 Defendants’ next Motion relates to Oracle’s use of “saved development costs” in  
11 support of its damages claims.

12 Oracle has confirmed that, for its state law claims, Oracle seeks to recover saved  
13 development costs only under its unjust enrichment/restitution claim. Under California law,  
14 Oracle may recover saved development costs on a theory of unjust enrichment/restitution. *Ajaxo,*  
15 *Inc. v. E\*Trade Group, Inc.*, 135 Cal. App. 4th 21 (2005). This Court declines to issue an  
16 advisory opinion regarding a party’s ability to seek saved development costs pursuant to Oracle’s  
17 other California law claims, as Oracle does not seek them. *Alpine Land & Reservoir Co.*, 887  
18 F.2d at 214.

19 Defendants also reargue whether saved development costs are relevant to a “value  
20 of use” measurement of actual damages pursuant to Oracle’s copyright claim. This issue was  
21 previously argued, considered, and decided by this Court’s January 28, 2010 Order on  
22 Defendants’ previous Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Regarding Plaintiffs’ Hypothetical  
23 License Damages Claim. Defendants have not sought reconsideration of that Order pursuant to  
24 Civil Local Rule 7-9, nor could Defendants meet Local Rule 7-9’s requirement for  
25 reconsideration. Using the same arguments and authorities, Defendants reargue their previous  
26 Motion without moving for reconsideration; this is improper and sanctionable. Civ. L.R. 7-9(c).

27 Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment regarding “saved  
28 development costs” is **DENIED**.

1                    **CDAFA and Trespass to Chattels Claims**

2                    Defendants next argue that Oracle is not entitled to recover damages under its  
3 California Computer Data Access and Fraud Act claim (“CDAFA”), pursuant to Cal. Penal Code  
4 § 502, and its trespass to chattels claims, because Defendants claim that Oracle has not disclosed  
5 calculations for these claims. While styled as a Rule 56 motion, this appears to be an improper  
6 and unsubstantiated motion for preclusion sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37.  
7 *Cf. Hsieh v. Peake*, No. 06-5281, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23649, at \*59-60 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 25,  
8 2008) (finding “an opposition to a motion for summary judgment is not a proper place for a Rule  
9 37 motion,” that “[i]n any event, a Rule 37 motion must be filed as a separate motion, and in  
10 accordance with the local rules regarding the filing of motions,” and that “any Rule 37 motion  
11 should have been directed to the magistrate judge to whom the court referred all discovery  
12 disputes). Moreover, the Court finds that Oracle has adequately quantified all of the damages it  
13 seeks under these claims, as set forth its numerous written discovery responses, initial  
14 disclosures, Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) testimony, and its expert damages report. Thus, even had  
15 Defendants brought a properly noticed Rule 37 motion before the assigned discovery magistrate,  
16 Defendants could claim no prejudice.

17                    Defendants’ additional argument that any damages recoverable under the CDAFA  
18 are limited to “investigation costs” is also unfounded. The legislative history of the CDAFA  
19 reveals that the 2000 amendments cited by Defendants were intended to expand the civil  
20 remedies available under the statute, not to limit them. *See* Cal. Bill Analysis, A.B. 2727  
21 Assem., 8/07/2000 (intent is to “expand civil remedies available for computer crimes”). Based  
22 on this and the other legislative history and legal authorities Oracle cites, the Court finds that the  
23 CDAFA envisions “compensatory damages” to include “the amount that will compensate for all  
24 the detriment proximately caused,” including lost profits. Cal. Civ. Code § 3333; *see Fibreboard*  
25 *Paper Prods. Corp. v. East Bay Union of Machinists*, 227 Cal.App.2d 675, 702 (1964).

26                    Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment related to Oracle’s trespass to  
27 chattels and CDAFA claims thus is **DENIED**.

28 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2010

---

Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton  
United States District Court Judge