

1 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (Bar No. 111664)  
 2 mjacobs@mofo.com  
 MARC DAVID PETERS (Bar No. 211725)  
 3 mdpeters@mofo.com  
 DANIEL P. MUINO (Bar No. 209624)  
 4 dmuino@mofo.com  
 755 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304-1018  
 5 Telephone: (650) 813-5600 / Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

6 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
 DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
 7 dboies@bsflp.com  
 333 Main Street, Armonk, NY 10504  
 8 Telephone: (914) 749-8200 / Facsimile: (914) 749-8300  
 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (Bar No. 144177)  
 9 sholtzman@bsflp.com  
 1999 Harrison St., Suite 900, Oakland, CA 94612  
 10 Telephone: (510) 874-1000 / Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

11 ORACLE CORPORATION  
 DORIAN DALEY (Bar No. 129049)  
 12 dorian.daley@oracle.com  
 DEBORAH K. MILLER (Bar No. 95527)  
 13 deborah.miller@oracle.com  
 MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (Bar No. 211600)  
 14 matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com  
 500 Oracle Parkway, Redwood City, CA 94065  
 15 Telephone: (650) 506-5200 / Facsimile: (650) 506-7114

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 20 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

21 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.  
 22 Plaintiff,  
 23 v.  
 24 GOOGLE INC.  
 25 Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA

**OUTLINE OF ORACLE AMERICA,  
 INC.'S MEMORANDUM OF  
 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
 SUPPORT OF ITS RULE 50(A)  
 MOTION AT THE CLOSE OF ALL  
 EVIDENCE**

Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor  
 Judge: Honorable William H. 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**
- II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**
- III. LEGAL STANDARD FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW**
- IV. NO REASONABLE JURY COULD FIND THAT GOOGLE DID NOT INFRINGE ORACLE’S JAVA-RELATED COPYRIGHTS**
  - A. Google Infringes Oracle’s Copyrights by Copying the Structure, Sequence, and Organization of the 37 Java API Packages**
    - 1. Google admitted that it directly copied the structure, sequence, and organization of the 37 Java API packages**
    - 2. Google admitted that it had access to the structure, sequence, and organization of the 37 Java API packages**
    - 3. Google admitted that the structure, sequence, and organization of the 37 Java API packages and that of the Google Android API packages are substantially similar**
  - B. Google’s Copying Is Not Fair Use**
    - 1. Google commercially uses the copyrighted work**
    - 2. The copyrighted work is creative in nature**
    - 3. Google uses key, valuable portions of the copyrighted work**
    - 4. Google’s use harms the potential market for and value of the copyrighted work**
    - 5. Google’s copying does not serve a transformative purpose**
  - C. Google’s Copying of the Structure, Sequence, and Organization of the 37 Java API Packages Was Not De Minimis**
  - D. Google’s Literal Copying of Code and Comments Was Not De Minimis**
- V. OTHER ISSUES THAT ARE NOT BEING PRESENTED TO THE JURY**
  - A. Oracle Owns Valid Copyrights in Java-Related Works**
  - B. Google Copied Original Elements of Java-Related Works**
  - C. Google Infringes Oracle’s Copyrights by Copying the Structure, Sequence, and Organization of the Documentation for 37 Java API Packages into the Documentation for the 37 Google Android API Packages**
  - D. Google Infringes Oracle’s Copyrights by Deriving Its Implementations of the 37 Google Android API Packages from the Documentation for the 37 Java API Packages**

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

**VI. GOOGLE’S EQUITABLE DEFENSES FAIL**

- A. Google Has Not Shown that Equitable Estoppel Bars Oracle’s Copyright Infringement Claims**
- B. Google Has Not Shown that the Doctrine of Laches Applies to Oracle’s Copyright Infringement Claims**
- C. Google Has Not Shown that Oracle or Sun Waived Its Right to Assert Copyright Infringement Claims**
- D. Google Has Not Shown that Oracle or Sun Gave It an Implied License to Use Oracle’s Copyrights**

**VII. ALTERNATIVE GOOGLE DEFENSES THAT GOOGLE PLED BUT DID NOT PRESENT TO THE JURY FAIL**

- A. Google Has Not Shown that Merger Doctrine Applies**
- B. Google Has Not Shown that Scenes A Faire Doctrine Applies**
- C. Google Has Not Shown that Oracle or Sun Gave It a License to Use Oracle’s Copyrights**
- D. Google Has Not Shown that It Independently Created the Accused Works**
- E. Google Has Not Shown that a Third Party Is Liable for Google’s Infringing Conduct**
- F. Google Has Not Shown that Oracle’s Copyright Infringement Claims Are Subject to the Doctrine of Unclean Hands**

**VIII. CONCLUSION**

Dated: April 29, 2012

MICHAEL A. JACOBS  
MARC DAVID PETERS  
DANIEL P. MUINO  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

By: /s/ Daniel P. Muino

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.