

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

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

No. C 10-03561 WHA

v.

GOOGLE INC.,


Defendant.

**FURTHER ITEM FOR TWENTY-PAGE
BRIEFS DUE MAY 10**

16. Assuming that a copyright protection does *not* extend to names, including fully qualified names, and assuming that copyright protection does *not* bar others from using identical input-output (argument-return) designations, such that Google was free to use the identical names and identical input-output designations, what more did Google allegedly copy from the 37 packages that is allegedly covered by copyright? Put differently, assuming Google was free to do the foregoing, to what extent was Android's SSO dictated by the rules of the basic programming language?

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 7, 2012.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE