

1 Robert A. Mittelstaedt (SBN 060359)  
 Jason McDonell (SBN 115084)  
 2 Elaine Wallace (SBN 197882)  
 JONES DAY  
 3 555 California Street, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 4 Telephone: (415) 626-3939  
 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700  
 5 ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com  
 jmcdonell@jonesday.com  
 6 ewallace@jonesday.com

7 Tharan Gregory Lanier (SBN 138784)  
 Jane L. Froyd (SBN 220776)  
 8 JONES DAY  
 1755 Embarcadero Road  
 9 Palo Alto, CA 94303  
 Telephone: (650) 739-3939  
 10 Facsimile: (650) 739-3900  
 tglanier@jonesday.com  
 11 jfroyd@jonesday.com

12 Scott W. Cowan (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
 Joshua L. Fuchs (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
 13 JONES DAY  
 717 Texas, Suite 3300  
 14 Houston, TX 77002  
 Telephone: (832) 239-3939  
 15 Facsimile: (832) 239-3600  
 swcowan@jonesday.com  
 16 jlfuchs@jonesday.com

17 Attorneys for Defendants  
 SAP AG, SAP AMERICA, INC., and  
 18 TOMORROWNOW, INC.

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP  
 DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257)  
 GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468)  
 HOLLY A. HOUSE (SBN 136045)  
 ZACHARY J. ALINDER (SBN 209009)  
 BREE HANN (SBN 215695)  
 Three Embarcadero Center  
 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
 Telephone: (415) 393-2000  
 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286  
 donn.pickett@bingham.com  
 geoff.howard@bingham.com  
 holly.house@bingham.com

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
 DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
 333 Main Street  
 Armonk, NY 10504  
 Telephone: (914) 749-8200  
 Facsimile: (914) 749-8300  
 dboies@bsflp.com  
 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)  
 1999 Harrison St., Suite 900  
 Oakland, CA 94612  
 Telephone: (510) 874-1000  
 Facsimile: (510) 874-1460  
 sholtzman@bsflp.com

DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)  
 JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227)  
 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7  
 Redwood City, CA 94070  
 Telephone: (650) 506-4846  
 Facsimile: (650) 506-7114  
 dorian.daley@oracle.com  
 jennifer.gloss@oracle.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
 ORACLE USA, INC., *et al.*

21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 22 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 OAKLAND DIVISION

23 ORACLE USA, INC., et al.,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26 SAP AG, et al.,

27 Defendants.

Case No. 07-CV-1658 PJH (EDL)

**JOINT STATEMENT PER AUGUST  
 6, 2010 ORDER**

1 Pursuant to the Court's August 6, 2010 Order, Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle  
2 International Corporation, Oracle EMEA Limited, and Siebel Systems, Inc. ("Plaintiffs") and  
3 Defendants SAP AG, SAP America, Inc., and TomorrowNow, Inc. ("Defendants") make the  
4 following joint submission.

5 **I. Parties' Proposal Regarding the Process to Streamline the Case for Trial**

6 The parties agree that the assistance of a Magistrate Judge would help facilitate the  
7 parties' discussions regarding streamlining the case for trial, and that these discussions should be  
8 further managed by Magistrate Judge Spero, the assigned settlement magistrate. The next  
9 settlement conference is scheduled for September 7, 2010. The parties will work with Magistrate  
10 Judge Spero before then to expedite progress toward streamlining the case for trial.

11 **II. Effect of Defendants' Proposed Concessions on Pending Motions for Partial  
12 Summary Judgment**

13 Thirteen issues were presented in the parties' pending motions for partial summary  
14 judgment and Defendants' cross-motion, as set forth in Exhibit A, the list of issues presented  
15 without objection to the Court at the May 5 argument on summary judgment. The parties have  
16 met and conferred regarding the status of those issues. As described below, the parties agree that  
17 Plaintiffs are entitled to summary judgment on Issues Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 6 of their motion by reason  
18 of Defendants' election not to contest, and further agree that Issues Nos. 3 and 7 of Plaintiffs'  
19 motion and Issues Nos. 1, 2 and 4 of Defendants' motion are ripe for decision. The parties  
20 disagree whether the remaining issues, Issue No. 5 of Plaintiffs' motion, Issues Nos. 3, 5 and 6 of  
21 Defendants' motion/cross-motion would be or have been mooted by the concessions proposed in  
22 Defendants' Trial Brief and related public statements.

23 **A. Issues Which Have Been Resolved by Defendants' Elections Not to Contest**

24 The Parties agree that by reason of Defendants' election not to contest as set forth in their  
25 opposition papers and at argument on summary judgment, summary judgment may be granted in  
26 favor of Plaintiffs on Issues Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 6 of Plaintiffs' motion, specifically:  
27  
28

- 1 • Direct copyright infringement of six registrations by TomorrowNow, Inc. (the
- 2 three PeopleSoft registrations for the period beginning March 1, 2005 and the three
- 3 Oracle Database registrations with no time limitation);
- 4 • Vicarious copyright infringement of the same six registrations over the same time
- 5 periods by SAP AG and SAP America, Inc.;
- 6 • Direct liability of TomorrowNow, Inc. for violations of Computer Fraud and
- 7 Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(2)(C); and
- 8 • Direct liability of TomorrowNow for violations of California Data Access and
- 9 Fraud Act, Cal. Penal Code § 502(c)(7).

10 **B. Issues Which Remain Open for Resolution on Summary Judgment**

11 The Parties agree that Issues Nos. 3 and 7 of Plaintiffs' motion and Issues Nos. 1, 2 and 4  
12 of Defendants' motion remain and are ripe for decision, even in light of Defendants' proposed  
13 concessions and related statements, specifically:

14 *Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment*

- 15 • Contributory copyright infringement of six registrations by SAP AG and SAP
- 16 America, Inc.; and
- 17 • Indirect liability of SAP AG and SAP America, Inc. for TomorrowNow's
- 18 uncontested Computer Fraud and Abuse Act and California Data Access and Fraud
- 19 Act violations.

20 *Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment*

- 21 • Unavailability of "saved development costs" as a measure of damages in this case;
- 22 • Unavailability of lost profits of related, non-party entities in this case, and whether
- 23 SAP's proposed order seeking a ruling that Oracle cannot seek any damages of
- 24 non-parties is overbroad; and
- 25 • Limitation of damages under the California Data Access and Fraud Act, Cal. Penal
- 26 Code § 502, to no more than Plaintiffs' alleged "investigation costs."
- 27
- 28

1           **C.     Issues As to Which the Parties Disagree Whether They Are Open for**  
2           **Resolution**

3           The parties do not agree on the impact of Defendants' Trial Brief and other statements on  
4           the other issues raised in the pending motions (Issue No. 5 of Plaintiffs motion, Issues Nos. 3 and  
5           5 and Issue No. 6 of Defendants' cross-motion), specifically:

- 6           • Direct liability of TN for violations of Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C.  
7           § 1030(a)(5)(A)(i)-(iii);
- 8           • Unavailability of damages for Plaintiffs' claims of trespass to chattels and  
9           violations of the California Data Access and Fraud Act, Cal. Penal Code § 502;
- 10          • Dismissal of Oracle EMEA, Ltd.'s claims; and
- 11          • Dismissal of pre-March 1, 2005 claims for copyright infringement for all  
12          PeopleSoft and J.D. Edwards registrations at issue in this case based on a lack of  
13          standing.

14          The parties' positions are set forth below.

15                 1.     *Statement of Defendants*

16          Neither Defendants' Trial Brief nor SAP's statement affects or moots any issues pending  
17          on summary judgment. Defendants' Trial Brief proposed some potentially significant  
18          concessions with the goal of focusing this case for trial. As set forth specifically in the Trial  
19          Brief, *see* p. 2, Defendants proposed to concede TomorrowNow's liability, as well as SAP's  
20          vicarious liability for copyright infringement, but in so doing they expressly preserved the  
21          defenses asserted on summary judgment. Defendants believe that the combination of rulings on  
22          the pending motions and focusing the issues as proposed in their Trial Brief would make it  
23          possible to try this case to a fair result on a much shorter schedule. By making that proposal, they  
24          did not render moot the work done on summary judgment, but expressly kept open those issues  
25          ripe for decision because those rulings might further narrow the case. (The elections not to  
26          contest made on summary judgment and addressed in section II.A, above, were made months ago,  
27          before argument on summary judgment; they are neither the product of nor affected by pretrial  
28          filings.)

1 Plaintiffs seek to bind Defendants to additional alleged “concessions,” pointing to a  
2 statement made by SAP and to press reports. Plaintiffs miss the basic point—SAP’s statement  
3 said that Defendants “proposed” to stipulate to TomorrowNow’s liability, as explained in their  
4 pretrial filings. There was no ambiguity or contradiction; Defendants announced what they  
5 proposed to do and directed those interested to their pretrial filings for details.

6 Plaintiffs express confusion over SAP’s statement about taking financial responsibility for  
7 any judgment against TomorrowNow, claiming that this also moots some issues pending on  
8 summary judgment. Not so. Proposing to accept financial responsibility for a judgment against  
9 TomorrowNow should moot the claims against SAP (as proposed in the Trial Brief), not the  
10 defenses to such liability, which Defendants specifically preserved in the event that Plaintiffs  
11 would not agree to focus the issues for trial. Plaintiffs would apparently rather fight for any  
12 ruling against SAP than have assurance of payment of any judgment against TomorrowNow they  
13 may obtain.

14 Making the proposal was itself a significant step because effecting the proposal to shorten  
15 the trial and narrow the claims at issue would require Defendants to forego a variety of significant  
16 defenses (as explained in their Trial Brief). But recognizing publicly that Defendants had made  
17 that significant proposal does not change the proposal to a “done deal,” nor does it mean that a  
18 proposal which specifically preserves defenses presented on summary judgment now suddenly  
19 waives them. Nor too does the hope expressed in the press that this case can be brought to  
20 resolution mean that Defendants’ proposal gave up what they expressly preserved.

21 Defendants proposed to stipulate to TomorrowNow’s liability, as well as SAP’s vicarious  
22 liability for copyright infringement, nothing more and nothing less, expressly preserving a variety  
23 of defenses. None of the issues presented for decision on summary judgment are mooted by that  
24 proposed concession. Defendants respectfully submit that the pending motions for summary  
25 judgment are ready for and require disposition, beyond those four specific issues as to which  
26 Defendants confirmed months ago they were not contesting as to the facts presented by Plaintiffs  
27 on their motion. Defendants remain ready, willing and able to act on their proposal set forth in  
28 the Trial Brief, and hope Plaintiffs will join them in focusing trial on what is truly in dispute.

1 Defendants have addressed the length and structure of trial in detail in their Trial Brief and  
2 relevant sections of the Joint Pretrial Statement and do not repeat those points here.

3                   2.       *Statement of Plaintiffs*

4           Oracle believes that SAP's public statements and concessions on August 5, 2010 warrant  
5 the entry of summary judgment for Plaintiffs in certain additional respects as described below.  
6 SAP has made a series of seemingly contradictory statements about what liability it will and will  
7 not contest in this case, and continues to contradict itself in the statement above.

8           In its August 5, 2010 press release, SAP expanded on the concessions it made on  
9 summary judgment and indicated it would not contest any liability for TomorrowNow.  
10 Specifically, SAP stated that it "proposed that it would not contest the liability of TomorrowNow  
11 for copyright infringement and downloading conduct alleged in Oracle's complaint." SAP's  
12 CFO, Werner Brandt, further stated: "By accepting responsibility for TomorrowNow's actions,  
13 SAP *is taking a decisive move* to focus the issues in this case." (emphasis added) Neither SAP  
14 nor Mr. Brandt stated in any way that SAP's "acceptance of responsibility" was qualified or  
15 conditional in any respect. (By contrast, SAP carefully did reserve the issue of damages as an  
16 issue on which SAP would "continue to present arguments and evidence," thereby both indicating  
17 that it knew full well how to qualify its statements to the public and implying by omission that it  
18 was not doing so with regard to SAP TN direct liability or SAP vicarious liability.)

19           These statements were widely reported in the press, including by the *Wall Street Journal*,  
20 the Associated Press, *Barron's* and Reuters, among other major news outlets. Because they are  
21 neither conditional nor qualified, the effect of these statements is that the Court should:

- 22           1.       Grant Oracle's motion with regard to TomorrowNow's direct infringement prior to  
23                   March 1, 2005 of the three PeopleSoft registrations at issue in Oracle's motion.
- 24           2.       Grant Oracle's motion with regard to the additional violations of the CFAA and  
25                   CDAFA raised in Oracle's motion, as to which SAP previously opposed on the  
26                   elements of intent and damage.
- 27           3.       Deny Defendants' motion with regard to Plaintiff OMEA's claims against  
28                   TomorrowNow.

1 In its statement above, SAP seeks to continue to limit or preserve its ability to resist SAP  
2 TN liability by “expressly preserving a variety of defenses.” In the absence of these defenses,  
3 there is no ground on which SAP can resist entry of summary judgment for Oracle on the three  
4 points we set forth above. Neither SAP’s press release (nor a new offer made by SAP to Oracle  
5 earlier today) would reserve *any* defenses to SAP TN’s liability. SAP insists that its public  
6 statements were a mere “proposal.” But nothing about Mr. Brandt’s statement to the press, as  
7 included in the press release, states that in “accepting responsibility for TomorrowNow’s actions”  
8 and being “committed to compensating Oracle for the harm the limited operations of  
9 TomorrowNow actually caused,” SAP was merely negotiating. Either SAP accepts  
10 responsibility, as Mr. Brandt suggested, or it does not. Oracle accordingly contends that the  
11 Court should hold SAP to its public statements and enter summary judgment for Plaintiffs in the  
12 two additional respects (#1-2), and deny Defendants’ motion for summary judgment in the one  
13 additional respect (#3), identified above.

14 Oracle remains committed to negotiating in good faith – and not in the press – in order to  
15 streamline this case for trial. It has made several proposals of its own, as explained in the Pre-  
16 Trial Statement, which SAP has rejected. As a result, it welcomes SAP’s offer to concede SAP  
17 TN’s direct liability on each of Oracle’s claims and SAP AG’s and SAP America’s vicarious  
18 liability (whether limited to Oracle’s copyright infringement claims or not). These offers alone  
19 can and will streamline trial, and thereby reduce it from approximately twelve weeks (which  
20 Oracle estimates a non-streamlined trial would require based on the pre-trial submissions) to less  
21 than the six weeks the Court has set aside, with the key issues (among others) of SAP’s  
22 involvement in the infringing activities and damages remaining for trial. Unfortunately, SAP has  
23 been inconsistent as to whether it insists on unacceptable strings to these offers (there are none in  
24 the press version). Oracle looks forward to continuing to discuss how best to streamline trial,  
25 though it also believes the parties are already there if SAP’s public statements are taken at face  
26 value.

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: August 10, 2010

JONES DAY

By: /s/ Tharan Gregory Lanier  
Tharan Gregory Lanier

Attorneys for Defendants  
SAP AG, SAP AMERICA, INC., and  
TOMORROWNOW, INC.

In accordance with General Order No. 45, Rule X, the above signatory attests that  
concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the signatory below.

DATED: August 10, 2010

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard  
Geoffrey M. Howard

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE  
INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION,  
ORACLE EMEA LIMITED, and SIEBEL  
SYSTEMS, INC.

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

**EXHIBIT A**

**Issues Presented on Motions for Summary Judgment**

<u>Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment</u>	<u>Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment</u>
1. Direct Copyright Infringement of Six Registrations by TN	1. Unavailability of “Saved Costs” as a Measure of Damages in this Case
2. Vicarious Copyright Infringement of Six Registrations by SAP AG and SAP America	2. Unavailability of Lost Profits of Related Non-Party Entities in this Case
3. Contributory Copyright Infringement of Six Registrations by SAP AG and SAP America	3. Unavailability of Damages for Trespass to Chattels and CDAFA Claims
4. Direct Liability of TN for Violations of CFAA § (a)(2)(C)	4. Limitation of Damages under the CDAFA, If at All, to No More Than Alleged “Investigation Costs”
5. Direct Liability of TN for Violations of CFAA § (a)(5)(A)(i-iii)	5. Dismissal of Oracle EMEA Ltd.’s Claims
6. Direct Liability of TN for Violations of CDAFA § (c)(7)	<u>Defendants’ Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment</u>
7. Indirect Liability of SAP AG and SAP America for CFAA and CDAFA Violations	6. Dismissal of pre-March 1, 2005 Copyright Infringement Claims for All PeopleSoft and J.D. Edwards Registrations Based on Lack of Standing (Cross-Moves on Plaintiffs’ Issues 1-3)