

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065
 2 rvannest@kvn.com
 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - # 184325
 3 canderson@kvn.com
 DANIEL PURCELL - # 191424
 4 dpurcell@kvn.com
 633 Battery Street
 5 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
 Telephone: 415 391 5400
 6 Facsimile: 415 397 7188

KING & SPALDING LLP
 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279
 fzimmer@kslaw.com
 CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323
 csabnis@kslaw.com
 101 Second Street, Suite 2300
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Tel: 415.318.1200
 Fax: 415.318.1300

7 KING & SPALDING LLP
 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER
 8 (Pro Hac Vice)
 sweingaertner@kslaw.com
 9 ROBERT F. PERRY
 rperry@kslaw.com
 10 BRUCE W. BABER (Pro Hac Vice)
 1185 Avenue of the Americas
 11 New York, NY 10036
 Tel: 212.556.2100
 12 Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819
 ballon@gtlaw.com
 HEATHER MEEKER - #172148
 meekerh@gtlaw.com
 GREENBERG TRAUIG, LLP
 1900 University Avenue
 East Palo Alto, CA 94303
 Tel: 650.328.8500
 Fax: 650.328.8508

13 Attorneys for Defendant
 14 GOOGLE INC.

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,
 19 Plaintiff,
 20 v.
 21 GOOGLE INC.,
 22 Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA
**GOOGLE’S SECOND MOTION FOR
 JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW ON
 SECTIONS OF COUNT VIII OF
 ORACLE’S AMENDED COMPLAINT**
 Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
 Judge: Hon. William Alsup

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 50, Google hereby moves for Judgment as a Matter of Law on sections of Count VIII of Oracle’s Amended Complaint. Pursuant to the Court’s request, Google will file supplemental briefing in support of its motion on Tuesday, May 1.

II. ARGUMENT

First, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the source code and object code implementing the 37 API packages are not derivative works of Oracle’s specifications. As explained in Google’s April 25, 2012 Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law [Dkt. No. 984] (“Apr. 25 JMOL”) at 2-3, Oracle’s derivative work claim is foreclosed by 17 U.S.C. § 102(b) and *Baker v. Selden*, 101 U.S. 99 (1879).

Second, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the method signatures are not protected by copyright under both section 102(b) and the short words and phrases doctrine. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 3-4; *Sega Enters. Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.*, 977 F.2d 1510, 1524 n.7 (9th Cir. 1992).

Third, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that the alleged literal copying is *de minimis* and thus non-actionable. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 4-6.

Fourth, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law that its specifications for the 37 API packages do not infringe Oracle’s specifications. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 6-10.

Fifth, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s claims based on “direct code copying” relating to the rangeCheck code, the eight “Impl/ACL” test files and the allegedly copied comments, as a result of Oracle’s failure to prove that either of the two copyright registrations on which Oracle relies provides protection for or covers the individual files on which those claims are based.

Sixth, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s copyright claim as a result of Oracle’s failure to prove the contents of the works that are the subject of the two copyright registrations on which Oracle relies. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 10-11.

Seventh, to the extent Oracle has not already withdrawn with prejudice its “collective

1 work” argument, Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law of non-infringement as to all
2 constituent elements of the registered works, because Oracle has failed to prove authorship of any
3 component parts of the works. *See* Apr. 25 JMOL at 11-12.

4 Google’s Rule 50 motion is based on this Motion, Google’s April 25th motion for
5 judgment as a matter of law and the evidence and authorities cited therein, the brief in support
6 and the evidence and authorities cited therein that the Court has directed Google to file in support
7 of this Motion, the entire trial record, and such argument as the Court allows on this Motion.

8 Rule 50 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure applies only to issues on which the jury is
9 being asked to render a verdict. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(a)(1) (rule applies where “a party has been
10 fully heard on an issue during a jury trial and the court finds that a reasonable jury would not have
11 a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for the party on that issue”). Google’s Rule 50
12 motion therefore does not address copyrightability or its equitable defenses—issues which are
13 reserved for the Court. To the extent that the Court concludes Rule 50 motions can be directed to
14 issues reserved to the Court (or such issues in combination with issues left for the jury), Google
15 further moves for judgment as a matter of law on Count VIII in its entirety on the grounds that (a)
16 the structure, sequence, and organization of the Java APIs is not protectable by copyright, and
17 Oracle has not carried its burden of proof as to the remaining parts of its claim, namely the
18 specifications and allegedly copied items (as referenced in the paragraphs beginning with “*Third*”
19 and “*Fourth*” above); and (b) Count VIII of the Oracle’s Amended Complaint is barred by
20 Google’s equitable defenses of laches, equitable estoppel, waiver, and implied license. Such
21 further motion is based on this Motion, the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and
22 the evidence and authorities cited therein that the Court has directed Google to file on issues
23 reserved for the Court, the entire trial record, and such argument as the Court allows on this
24 Motion.

25 Dated: April 29, 2012

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

26 By: /s/ Robert A. Van Nest
ROBERT A. VAN NEST

27 Attorneys for Defendant
28 GOOGLE INC.