

1 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (Bar No. 111664)  
 2 mjacobs@mofo.com  
 KENNETH A. KUWAYTI (Bar No. 145384)  
 3 kkuwayti@mofo.com  
 MARC DAVID PETERS (Bar No. 211725)  
 4 mdpeters@mofo.com  
 DANIEL P. MUINO (Bar No. 209624)  
 5 dmuino@mofo.com  
 755 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304-1018  
 6 Telephone: (650) 813-5600 / Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

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

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

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

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

22 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

23 Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 GOOGLE INC.

26 Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA

**ORACLE AMERICA, INC.'S  
 OPPOSITION TO 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: Honorable William H. Alsup

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 ARGUMENT .....	1
3 I. ORACLE, NOT GOOGLE, IS ENTITLED TO JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF	
4 LAW ON ORACLE’S CLAIM FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT OF THE	
5 SSO OF THE 37 API PACKAGES .....	1
6 II. ORACLE PROVED THE CONTENTS OF THE WORK THAT WAS	
7 REGISTERED AND THAT THE COPYRIGHTS COVER THE COMPONENT	
8 PARTS AT ISSUE .....	2
9 A. Oracle Has Proved The Contents Of The Works At Issue .....	2
10 B. It Is Too Late For Google To Raise A Challenge To Ownership Based On	
11 Alleged Contributions From Third Parties .....	5
12 C. Oracle Is The Author Of The Works At Issue .....	6
13 III. GOOGLE’S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSO OF THE 37 JAVA API	
14 PACKAGES INTO ANDROID IS A DERIVATIVE WORK OF ORACLE’S	
15 SPECIFICATIONS .....	8
16 IV. THE NAMES AND DECLARATIONS ARE PROTECTABLE AS PART OF	
17 THE SSO OF THE 37 JAVA API PACKAGES .....	11
18 V. GOOGLE’S LITERAL COPYING IS NOT DE MINIMIS .....	14
19 A. Google’s Copying Of rangeCheck Was Not De Minimis .....	15
20 B. Google’s Copying Of Comments Was Not De Minimis .....	17
21 C. Google’s Copying Of Eight Decompiled Files—the Eight “Iml” and	
22 “ACL” Files—Was Not De Minimis .....	18
23 VI. ANDROID’S SPECIFICATIONS INFRINGE ORACLE’S COPYRIGHTS .....	19
24 A. Google Should Be Held Liable For Its Admitted Copying of The SSO	
25 From Java Documentation Into Android Documentation .....	20
26 B. Android’s English-Language Descriptions Were Copied From The Java	
27 API Specifications .....	23
28 VII. THE EVIDENCE SHOWS THE INDIVIDUALLY COPIED CODE FILES	
WERE OWNED BY ORACLE .....	24
VIII. GOOGLE’S COLLECTIVE WORKS OWNERSHIP CHALLENGE IS MOOT .....	25
IX. ORACLE’S COPYRIGHT CLAIMS ARE NOT BARRED BY LACHES,	
EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL, WAIVER OR IMPLIED LICENSE .....	25
CONCLUSION .....	25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

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

**Page(s)**

**CASES**

*Aalmuhammed v. Lee*,  
202 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. Cal. 2000) ..... 8

*Aharonian v. Gonzales*,  
No. C04-5190, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2006) ..... 17

*Am. Dental Ass’n v. Delta Dental Plans Ass’n*,  
126 F.3d at 978 (7th Cir. 1997)..... 21, 22

*Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
35 F.3d 1435 (9th Cir. 1994)..... 20

*Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of Am. Inc.*,  
975 F.2d 832 (Fed. Cir. 1992)..... 12

*Baker v. Selden*,  
101 U.S. 99 (1879)..... 20, 21

*Baxter v. MCA, Inc.*,  
812 F.2d 421 (9th Cir. 1987)..... 17

*Brocade Commc’ns Sys. v. A10 Networks, Inc.*,  
No. 10-CV-03428-LHK, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91384 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 16, 2011) ..... 17

*Burrow-Giles Lithographic Co. v. Sarony*,  
111 U.S. 53 (1883)..... 8

*Data East USA, Inc. v. Epyx, Inc.*,  
862 F.2d 204 (9th Cir. 1988)..... 4, 5

*Dream Games of Ariz., Inc. v. PC Onsite*,  
561 F.3d 983 (9th Cir. 2009)..... 6

*eScholar LLC v. Otis Educ. Sys., Inc.*,  
2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 40727 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 3, 2005) ..... 9

*Fisher v. Dees*,  
794 F.2d 432 (9th Cir. 1985)..... 14

*Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters.*,  
471 U.S. 539 (1985)..... 17

*Jacobsen v. Katzer*,  
2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115204, at \*9-10 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2009)..... 20

1	<i>Johnson Controls, Inc. v. Phoenix Control Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
2	886 F.2d 1173 (9th Cir. 1989).....	13, 21
3	<i>Key Publ'n v. Chinatown Today Publ'g Enter.</i> ,	
4	945 F.2d 509 (2d Cir. 1991).....	20
5	<i>Kodadek v. MTV Networks, Inc.</i> ,	
6	152 F.3d 1209 (9th Cir. 1998).....	4
7	<i>L.A. Printex Indust., Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.</i> ,	
8	2012 U.S. App. LEXIS 7079 (April 9, 2012) .....	20
9	<i>Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Seattle Lighting Fixture Co.</i> ,	
10	345 F.3d 1140 (9th Cir. 2003).....	11
11	<i>Merch. Transaction Sys. v. Nelcela, Inc.</i> ,	
12	2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25663 (D. Ariz. Mar. 17, 2009) .....	11, 14, 17
13	<i>Micro Star v. Formgen, Inc.</i> ,	
14	154 F.3d 1107, 1114 (9th Cir. 1998).....	9
15	<i>Mktg. Tech. Solutions, Inc. v. Medizine LLC</i> ,	
16	No. 09 Civ. 8122 (LMM), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50027 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 23, 2010).....	17
17	<i>Newton v. Diamond</i> ,	
18	388 F.3d 1189 (9th Cir. 2004).....	14
19	<i>Ringgold v. Black Entm't Television, Inc.</i> ,	
20	126 F.3d 70 (2d Cir. 1997).....	14, 23, 24
21	<i>Roy Export Co. v. CBS, Inc.</i> ,	
22	503 F.Supp.1137 (S.D.N.Y. 1980).....	16
23	<i>Russell v. Price</i> ,	
24	612 F.2d 1123 (9th Cir. 1979).....	24
25	<i>Sandoval v. New Line Cinema Corp.</i> ,	
26	147 F.3d 215 (2d Cir. 1998), 26 F.3d 70 (2d Cir. 1997).....	14
27	<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. S&amp;H Computer Sys. Inc.</i> ,	
28	605 F. Supp. 816 (M.D. Tenn. 1985).....	9, 10
	<i>Sega Enter., Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.</i> ,	
	977 F.2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1993).....	12
	<i>Seiler v. Lucasfilm, Ltd.</i> ,	
	808 F.2d 1316 (9th Cir. 1987).....	4, 5
	<i>Sheldon v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures Corp.</i> ,	
	81 F.2d 49, 50-56 (2nd Cir. 1936) .....	8, 10

1	<i>Situation Mgmt. Systems Inc. v. ASP. Consulting LLC,</i>	
2	560 F.3d 53 (1st Cir. 2009).....	passim
3	<i>Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. v. MCA, Inc.,</i>	
4	715 F.2d 1327 (9th Cir. 1983).....	9
5	<i>United Fabrics Int’l, Inc. v. C&amp;J Wear, Inc.,</i>	
6	630 F.3d 1255 (9th Cir. 2011).....	2, 6

6 **STATUTES**

7	17 U.S.C. § 201(d) .....	7
8	17 U.S.C. § 410(c) .....	2, 6

9 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

10	2 Nimmer & Nimmer, <i>Nimmer on Copyright</i> , § 8.01[G], at 8-26 .....	15
----	--	----

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

**INTRODUCTION**

Like Google’s first JMOL motion, Google’s Second Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law fails to establish that Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on any of the issues on which it has moved. Google devotes much of its brief to trying to escape a finding of infringement by raising technicalities relating to registration or claimed evidentiary gaps. Google’s arguments are meritless. The copyrighted material was properly registered, Google miscites the relevant law, and all of the evidence Google claims is missing from the record is present. When Google finally does get to the substance, Google ignores record evidence on which the jury could find in Oracle’s favor and misconstrues the law on key points, just as it did in its first JMOL motion. This motion should be denied.

**ARGUMENT**

**I. ORACLE, NOT GOOGLE, IS ENTITLED TO JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW ON ORACLE’S CLAIM FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT OF THE SSO OF THE 37 API PACKAGES**

Google cannot establish judgment as a matter of law on Oracle’s copyright claim relating to the SSO of the 37 API packages. Google makes no serious effort to request this relief from the Court. Instead, Google simply refers back to its prior briefs and its proposed findings. They do not support its claim. The only conclusion the Court can reach on the evidence presented at trial is that the SSO is copyrightable and has been infringed. The uncontroverted testimony is that the design of the Java APIs is highly creative and original and is expressed in extensive detail; the Ninth Circuit decided more than 20 years ago that the SSO of computer programs is copyrightable; Google admits it engaged in extensive copying; and Google’s expert testified that the SSO of the APIs for the 37 packages is “virtually identical” in Android and in Java. Oracle’s recent motion for judgment as a matter of law (ECF No. 1044), Oracle’s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law (ECF No. 1049), and its earlier copyright briefing set forth the arguments and evidence in detail. (See ECF Nos. 339, 611,780, 824, 833, 853, 859, 900, 956, and 986.)

1           **II. ORACLE PROVED THE CONTENTS OF THE WORK THAT WAS**  
2           **REGISTERED AND THAT THE COPYRIGHTS COVER THE**  
3           **COMPONENT PARTS AT ISSUE.**

4           Google asserts technical challenges to Oracle’s copyright registration. The arguments are  
5           legally and factually incorrect. In addition, Google sandbagged Oracle by raising a last minute  
6           challenge to ownership. The Court should not consider this ownership argument.

7                   **A. Oracle Has Proved The Contents Of The Works At Issue**

8           Oracle proved the contents of the registered works at trial. The J2SE 1.4 and J2SE 5.0  
9           copyright registrations were admitted into evidence and claim on their face to cover “Java 2  
10          Standard Edition 1.4” and “Java 2 Standard Edition, Version 5.0.” (TX 464, 475, 476.) The chief  
11          architect of the Java platform group at Oracle, Mark Reinhold, authenticated the full contents of  
12          both these platform versions. (RT at 689:21-691:23 (Reinhold); TX 622, 623.) Oracle is entitled  
13          to a presumption that the facts stated on the front of the copyright registrations are correct. 17  
14          U.S.C. § 410(c) (certificate of registration “shall constitute prima facie evidence of the validity of  
15          the copyright and of the facts stated in the certificate”). Google “has the burden of rebutting the  
16          facts set forth in the copyright certificate.” *United Fabrics Int’l, Inc. v. C&J Wear, Inc.*, 630 F.3d  
17          1255, 1257 (9th Cir. 2011). It never did.

18          Because Google insisted on pursuing this issue, Oracle submitted additional evidence of the  
19          contents of the copyright registrations. To register computer software, the Copyright Office  
20          requires the relevant form and 50 pages of source code, which can be submitted in redacted form  
21          to protect confidentiality. Copyright Office Circular 61. Oracle introduced the written source  
22          code deposit that was submitted with each of the registrations, and Dr. Reinhold testified that  
23          these deposits were part of the source code for versions 1.4 and 5.0 respectively. (RT at 2233:18-  
24          2234:19 (Reinhold); TX 3530 (version 1.4); RT at 2234:20-2238:19 (Reinhold); TX 3529  
25          (version 5.0).)

26          This was all Oracle needed to do to establish the validity of the registration. However,  
27          Oracle also submitted into evidence at the trial TX 1076, a copy of a disk submitted to the  
28          Copyright Office along with the registration. (*See* TX 1077-78.) Dr. Reinhold testified that the

1 disk contains “the binary distribution of J2SE 5.0, together with documentation and some tools  
2 and things like that.” (RT at 2235:10-16 (Reinhold).)

3 Google challenges Oracle’s proof at trial claiming that Oracle failed to submit source code  
4 into evidence for various items. (*See* ECF No. 1043 at 3-4). All of these challenges are directed  
5 to TX 1076. (Swoopes Decl. ¶ 10.) As noted above, however, Dr. Reinhold never stated that  
6 Exhibit 1076 contains all of the source code. It contains the binary distribution for version 5.0  
7 and documentation. (RT at 2235:11-16 (Reinhold).) The version 5.0 source code was admitted  
8 separately as Exhibit 623. (RT at 689:21-691:23 (Reinhold).)

9 The parties agree that Exhibit 623 contains all of the items Google claims are “missing.”<sup>1</sup>  
10 Exhibit 623 contains the source code for all 37 packages at issue, all of the redacted source code  
11 files submitted as the copyright registration deposit, and the source code for all eight files that  
12 Google decompiled. (Swoopes Decl. ¶ 1-4.) The fact that Exhibit 1076 does not also contain the  
13 source code is irrelevant. Oracle was not even required to submit a disk to the Copyright Office  
14 in the first place. That disk is further useful proof of the registered work, and there is no rule that  
15 it needed to be in source code form.

16 Google has not raised any real challenge to registration at all, and certainly a reasonable  
17 jury could conclude Oracle proved registration of the copyrighted works and their content.  
18 Google never presented any evidence to show that Exhibit 623 is anything else. The best Google  
19 could do was point out that there may have been an update created between October 2004 when  
20 Sun sent the disk to the Copyright Office and December 17, 2004 when the copyright was  
21 registered. (RT at 2236:2-2238:6 (Reinhold).) But Google did not show that there was such a  
22 release, that the later release is what was filed with the Copyright Office rather than version 5.0,  
23 or that a subsequent release varied in any material way. Dr. Reinhold referred to these periodic  
24 updates as “maintenance releases.” (RT at 2236:12-13 (Reinhold).)

---

25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> So that the Court would not be confronted with conflicting views of the evidence,  
28 Oracle’s counsel contacted Google’s counsel after receiving its brief and the two parties conferred  
and agreed that Exhibit 623 does in fact contain all of these materials. (Swoopes Decl. ¶ 1.)

1 Google is also wrong on the law. A plaintiff can prove the contents of the registration in  
2 the same way it proves the content of any other document. Google claims that, “It is a  
3 fundamental requirement of a copyright claim that a plaintiff introduce into evidence a complete  
4 copy of the work on which it is suing.” (ECF No. 1043 at 2.) But the very first case Google cites  
5 for this proposition, *Data East USA, Inc. v. Epyx, Inc.*, 862 F.2d 204 (9th Cir. 1988) proves  
6 Google’s claim is wrong. The copyrighted work at issue in *Data East* was an arcade game. The  
7 plaintiff never produced the arcade game or a video of the arcade game at trial but instead relied  
8 upon still photographs as evidence of its audiovisual work. *Id.* at 207. The defendant made the  
9 same argument Google does here, claiming the plaintiff needed to put the actual arcade game  
10 before the court. *Id.* The Ninth Circuit disagreed:

11 The issue here, then, is whether sufficient evidence to support the district court’s  
12 findings as to the contents of the arcade game’s audio-visual work was present.  
13 Along with the photographs, testimony as to the content of the original was also  
14 presented. We find the still photographs, which depict all images and all moves  
that occur when the game sequences through the various skill levels, along with  
testimony, to constitute sufficient evidence of the contents of the arcade game’s  
audio-visual work to make a fair comparison with Epyx’s game.

15 *Id.*

16 Google’s other two cases also do not support its claim. *Data East* distinguished the  
17 second case Google relies upon, *Seiler v. Lucasfilm, Ltd.*, because in that case, when the plaintiff  
18 introduced “reconstructions” of the copyrighted works, the defendant objected on “best evidence”  
19 grounds and the reconstructions were kept out because there was evidence that the plaintiff had  
20 fraudulently destroyed the originals. *Id.* (citing *Seiler v. Lucasfilm, Ltd.*, 808 F.2d 1316, 1319  
21 (9th Cir. 1987)). Google’s last case, *Kodadek v. MTV Networks, Inc.*, 152 F.3d 1209 (9th Cir.  
22 1998) has no application here either. In *Kodadek* plaintiff’s original copyright registration was  
23 improper because he never submitted his original drawings to the Copyright Office. *Id.* at 1212.  
24 Google makes no such claim here. Oracle complied with Copyright Office procedure by  
25 submitting the required application and source code deposits which, as noted above, Dr. Reinhold  
26 authenticated.

27 Google never made a best evidence objection when Exhibits 622 and 623 were introduced  
28 into evidence. (*See* RT at 689:19-691:19 (Reinhold).) There is no claim of fraud here, like there

1 was in the *Lucasfilm* case, and no dispute as to copying.<sup>2</sup> Even if Google had some basis for  
2 saying that a subsequent maintenance update of version 5.0 was in fact what was filed with the  
3 Copyright Office Exhibit 623 still would be sufficient evidence of the content of what was filed  
4 “to make a fair comparison” with Android. *Data East*, 862 F.2d at 207. Google has not shown  
5 that any of this makes a bit of difference.

6 **B. It Is Too Late For Google To Raise A Challenge To Ownership Based**  
7 **On Alleged Contributions From Third Parties**

8 On Wednesday, April 25, Google’s counsel argued for the first time that Oracle does not  
9 have ownership rights over the 37 API packages at issue because third parties contributed to  
10 them. Google’s belated challenge to ownership is classic sandbagging. Google had many  
11 opportunities to raise this argument previously, and was obligated to do so, but did not.  
12 Moreover, Google represented to Oracle and the Court on the third day of Oracle’s case-in-chief  
13 that it was not disputing ownership. Google changed its position literally at the end of trial. It is  
14 too late for Google to raise this ownership challenge now.

15 Google stated it was only going to pursue this as an alternative argument in the event  
16 Oracle designated the copyright as a “collective work.” (See ECF No. 1007 at 1-2 (“To the extent  
17 Oracle has not already withdrawn with prejudice its ‘collective work’ argument, Google is  
18 entitled to judgment as a matter of law of non-infringement as to all constituent elements of the  
19 registered works.”). *See also* ECF No. 984 at 11 (“If, however, the Court accepts Oracle’s  
20 ‘collective work’ argument, then Google is entitled to judgment as a matter of law of non-  
21 infringement of each of the component parts of the registered works, because Oracle has not  
22 proved authorship of the constituent elements.”).) Oracle withdrew its characterization of the  
23 registration as “collective work” in part based on Google’s representation in its April 25 brief.

---

24  
25 <sup>2</sup> There is no doubt what Google copied here. Google’s statement of work with its outside  
26 contractor, Noser Engineering, required Noser to implement each of the 37 accused packages in  
27 Android in accordance with J2SE 1.5 (another name for J2SE 5.0). (TX 30.) Google *stipulated*  
28 that the jury would be told that, “For the 37 accused API packages, Android and Java 2 SE  
Version 5.0 have substantially the same selection, arrangement and structure of API elements”  
and this stipulation was read to the jury. (ECF No. 946 at 1, RT at 1337: 21-24.)

1 (See RT at 2134:11-17, 2134:7-11.) Because Google has not withdrawn its argument, however,  
2 Oracle will take the Court up on its offer to file a motion on this issue and will do so immediately.

### 3 C. Oracle Is The Author Of The Works At Issue

4 In any event, even if Google is permitted to raise its untimely challenge to ownership now,  
5 Oracle is the author of the works at issue.

6 A copyright registration is “prima facie evidence of the validity of the copyright and the  
7 facts stated in the certificate.” 17 U.S.C. § 410(c). “A certificate of registration raises the  
8 presumption of copyright validity and ownership.” *Dream Games of Ariz., Inc. v. PC Onsite*, 561  
9 F.3d 983, 987 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009). That presumption applies equally to underlying derivative  
10 works. The Ninth Circuit recently considered this issue in a similar context in *United Fabrics*  
11 *Int’l, Inc. v. C&J Wear, Inc.*, 630 F.3d 1255 (9th Cir. 2011). In *United Fabrics*, the plaintiff held  
12 a copyright on a collection of fabric designs. The defendant, Macy’s, challenged United’s  
13 entitlement to pursue a copyright infringement claim on a design that United purchased from an  
14 Italian design house and then modified. *Id.* at 1257. The district court dismissed the action,  
15 finding that United had “not clearly established the chain of title giving it rights in the source  
16 artwork” because its evidence of transfer did not clearly establish ownership of the underlying  
17 design. *Id.* The Ninth Circuit reversed, holding:

18 United did not have to produce any evidence. As the copyright claimant, United is  
19 presumed to own a valid copyright, 17 U.S.C. § 410(c), and the facts stated  
20 therein, including the chain of title in the source artwork, are entitled to the  
presumption of truth.

21 *Id.* at 1258. The Court thus rejected defendant Macy’s challenge to title: “Macy’s argues that  
22 United failed to establish the chain of title to the underlying artwork and therefore does not have a  
23 valid copyright. But Macy’s skips a step; nowhere does it set forth facts that rebut the  
24 presumption of validity to which United’s copyright is entitled....” *Id.* at 1257.

25 Like the defendant’s argument in *United*, Google’s challenge to ownership “skips a step.”  
26 Google’s motion does not point to any evidence showing that Oracle is not the owner of these  
27 copyrights. It simply argues that Oracle failed to meet its burden. (See ECF No. 1043 at 5-7.)  
28 The mere fact that the registration refers to “licensed in components” does not show that Oracle

1 does not own the copyrights to the works asserted here. A copyright claimant may acquire  
2 ownership through a transfer of rights. 17 U.S.C. § 201(d).

3 The effect of the presumption is sufficient for Oracle to prevail on the ownership issue.  
4 But in addition Oracle did present evidence establishing that it was the author and copyright  
5 holder of the 37 API packages. Mark Reinhold testified that he conducted a review of the J2SE  
6 5.0 source code to determine whether any of the 37 APIs at issue were developed by third parties.  
7 (RT at 2231:6-9). He testified that Sun went through a thorough code review as part of an audit  
8 process in 2006-2007, long before this litigation, when it was open sourcing the code:

9 The point of that was to verify that the code we were – that Sun was open  
10 sourcing, Sun had all the rights to. There were some bodies of code which Sun  
11 had licensed from other companies under terms that didn't allow Sun to open  
12 source it, so we couldn't open source those segments. So we had to review every  
13 single line, every line in every file, to make sure that what we were releasing under  
14 the GPL, we were allowed to review.

15 RT at 2231:10-25. Dr. Reinhold testified that he did a similar review for the 37 API packages at  
16 issue and found “that Sun had a copyright notice in every single one of the API class source  
17 files.” *Id.* at 2231:24-2232:4. He identified the one area where part of the APIs were copyrighted  
18 jointly between Sun and Taligent or IBM, several classes in java.text, and related classes in  
19 java.util. *Id.* at 2232:5-23. Dr. Reinhold testified that he was personally involved in this project  
20 and that Sun “worked closely with an engineer from Taligent to revise [the code], to make it fit  
21 into the rest of the Java platform. And that’s why there are joint copyright notices with Sun in  
22 those files.” *Id.* at 2233:2-17.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Reinhold testified further that nobody has ever asserted that  
23 Sun does not own all right, title and interest to the 37 packages. *Id.* at 2254:23-2255:1. Google  
24 does not cite any evidence contradicting Dr. Reinhold’s testimony. Oracle also introduced into  
25 evidence the copyright registrations for the prior versions of the Java platform. *See* TX 450-455,  
26 460-463, 509-511, 513, 518, 520-526.

---

25 <sup>3</sup> As mentioned above, the source code for J2SE 5.0 is in evidence as exhibit 623. It  
26 shows the copyright notices to which Dr. Reinhold referred. (*See* TX 623, Swoopes Decl. ¶ 5.)  
27 During Dr. Reinhold’s examination, the Court asked a question about areas in the source code  
28 that do not have an affirmative copyright notice. (RT at 2252:7-2253:7.) There is only one such  
segment of code in the APIs at issue, a small segment of code written by Josh Bloch. (TX 623,  
Swoopes Decl. ¶ 5.) Dr. Bloch was employed by Sun. (RT at 732:5-7.)

1 Dr. Reinhold also testified that 7 or 8 of the API packages at issue were released before  
2 the JCP process was instituted, and that Sun was the specification lead as to all of the JSRs (Java  
3 Specification Requests) relating to the 37 API packages (RT at 2239:16-23). Dr. Reinhold  
4 described the role of the specification lead in his earlier testimony: “So a specification lead at the  
5 end of the day is responsible for all technical aspects of an API design.”(RT at 593:22-594:1).  
6 *See also* RT at 709:3-5 (specification lead is “the person who is in charge, broadly speaking, of  
7 developing a particular API”). These facts further confirm that Sun was the author of the 37 API  
8 packages at issue. An author is “the person to whom the work owes its origin and who  
9 superintended the whole work, the ‘master mind.’” *Aalmuhammed v. Lee*, 202 F.3d 1227, 1233  
10 (9th Cir. Cal. 2000) (citing *Burrow-Giles Lithographic Co. v. Sarony*, 111 U.S. 53, 58 (1883); see  
11 also *id.* at 1232 (“authorship is not the same thing as making a valuable and copyrightable  
12 contribution.”)).

13 Google has not shown that it is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on ownership.

### 14 **III. GOOGLE’S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSO OF THE 37 JAVA API** 15 **PACKAGES INTO ANDROID IS A DERIVATIVE WORK OF ORACLE’S** 16 **SPECIFICATIONS**

17 Oracle’s derivative work claim is that by deliberately basing Android on the structure,  
18 sequence, and organization (“SSO”) of the 37 Java API packages as expressed in Oracle’s API  
19 documentation, Google created a derivative work. Numerous cases hold copying structure in this  
20 way constitutes infringement.

21 Google claims that Oracle’s derivative work allegation is “nothing but an assertion that  
22 *Google’s expression infringes Oracle’s ideas.*” (ECF Dck. No. 1043 at 7). But the law does not  
23 consider the structure of a writing to be unprotectable ideas when they are taken *en masse* as  
24 Google did here. In *Sheldon v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures Corp.*, Judge Learned Hand found  
25 copyright infringement when the defendant created a movie that copied much of the detailed plot  
26 outline of the plaintiff’s play, although the movie included none of the dialogue and changed  
27 many specifics: “The play is the sequence of the confluent of all these means, bound together in  
28 an inseparable unity; *it may often be most effectively pirated by leaving out the speech, for which*  
*a substitute can be found, which keeps the whole dramatic meaning.* That as it appears to us is

1 exactly what the defendants have done here; the dramatic significance of the scenes we have  
2 recited is the same, almost to the letter.” 81 F.2d 49, 50-56 (2nd Cir. 1936) (emphasis added).  
3 *See also Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. v. MCA, Inc.*, 715 F.2d 1327 (9th Cir. 1983)  
4 (reversing district court decision as to whether plots of Star Wars and Battlestar Galactica were  
5 sufficiently similar to form basis for copyright infringement claim).

6 Courts have applied the reasoning in *Sheldon* to cases involving infringement of computer  
7 programs. The court in *eScholar LLC v. Otis Educ. Sys., Inc.*, for example, compared the  
8 copyright protection of the structure of a computer program to protection afforded the plot  
9 elements in *Sheldon*. 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 40727, at \*25 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 3, 2005). In *Micro*  
10 *Star v. Formgen, Inc.*, the Ninth Circuit applied a similar analysis in reversing the district court  
11 and remanding for entry of a preliminary injunction because plaintiff had shown it was likely the  
12 defendant created an infringing derivative work of its video game. 154 F.3d 1107, 1114 (9th Cir.  
13 1998). The court rejected defendant’s argument that it had not copied plaintiff’s actual  
14 expression because it used different artwork, and held that the preliminary injunction should be  
15 entered because the defendant had misappropriated the elements of the plaintiff’s story:

16 In particular, Micro Star makes much of the fact that the fact that the N/I MAP  
17 files reference the source art library, but do not actually contain any art files  
18 themselves. Therefore, it claims, nothing of D/N-3D’s is reproduced in the MAP  
19 files. In making this argument, Micro Star misconstrues the protected work. The  
20 work that Micro Star infringes is the D/N-3D story itself—a beefy commando type  
named Duke who wanders around post-Apocalypse Los Angeles, shooting Pig  
Cops with a gun, lobbing hand grenades, searching for medkits and steroids, using  
a jetpack to leap over obstacles, blowing up gas tanks, avoiding radioactive slime.

21 *Id.* at 1112.

22 Likewise, in *SAS Inst., Inc. v. S&H Computer Sys. Inc.*, 605 F. Supp. 816, 830 (M.D.  
23 Tenn. 1985), the court held defendant created an infringing derivative work that was “based on”  
24 the SAS statistical analysis software by copying its structure. The defendant tried to downplay its  
25 copying by emphasizing there were only 44 examples where it had copied specific lines of code,  
26 but the court flatly rejected the argument: “In addition, the copying proven at trial does not affect  
27 only the specific lines of code cited by Dr. Peterson in his testimony. Rather, to the extent that *it*  
28

1 represents copying of the organizational and structural details of SAS, such copying pervades the  
2 entire S&H product.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

3 The reasoning of these cases applies equally to Google’s use of Java’s API structure in  
4 Android. As with the plot elements in *Sheldon*, *Twentieth Century-Fox Film* and *Micro Star*, and  
5 the structure of the software in *eScholar* and *SAS*, even though ideas behind particular individual  
6 elements in the documentation for the 37 API packages that Google copied may not be  
7 copyrightable, Google chose to copy the protectable selection, structure, sequence and  
8 organization of the Java APIs. The copying was much more extensive here, moreover, than in  
9 those cases. The uncontroverted evidence showed Google copied thousands of elements  
10 expressed in Oracle’s documentation, and the relationships among them, in nearly identical  
11 fashion, and effectively gave all of the elements the same “dramatic meaning” within that copied  
12 structure. *Sheldon*, 81 F.2d at 56. As in *SAS*, Google’s deliberate copying of the SSO “pervades  
13 the entire” 37 Android API packages, notwithstanding Google’s claim that, apart from the  
14 thousands of lines of source code expressing declarations and the 11 copied files, it wrote most of  
15 its source code itself. *SAS*, 605 F. Supp. at 830.

16 The Court should enter JMOL in Oracle’s favor, not Google’s, on the derivative work  
17 claim, because the evidence of copying was undisputed at trial and no reasonable jury could find  
18 Google coincidentally wound up with 7000 identically named and organized API elements.  
19 Google engineers Bob Lee and Dan Bornstein both confessed that they were looking at the  
20 specifications on the Sun website while implementing the APIs. (RT at 982:25-983:18 (Lee);  
21 1836:19-1837:2 (Bornstein).) Google expert Owen Astrachan conceded that the structure of the  
22 37 Android APIs is “virtually identical” to the Oracle APIs. (RT at 2214:6-9 (Astrachan) (“Q.  
23 And the Structure, Sequence and Organization of the API elements is virtually identical across  
24 those 37 packages, correct? A. That’s right.”).) He further testified that the method declarations  
25 in the Android code are like the detailed headings in an outline:

26 Q. And the method declarations are like the sub-sub-sub-chapter headings in this  
27 structure, sequence and organization; correct, sir?

28 A. I think that’s one analogy that’s reasonable.

1 (RT at 2215:2-5 (Astrachan).)

2 Google thus copied Oracle’s extremely detailed outline into the Android code. If the  
3 Court concludes that the Java class library SSO is protectable, the conclusion that Google created  
4 an infringing derivative work follows as a matter of law.

5 **IV. THE NAMES AND DECLARATIONS ARE PROTECTABLE AS PART OF**  
6 **THE SSO OF THE 37 JAVA API PACKAGES**

7 Attempting to bootstrap the Court’s prior ruling that individual names are not protectable  
8 under the “words and short phrases” doctrine, Google moves without legal or factual support for  
9 judgment that its use of declarations as well as names from the 37 Java API packages is not  
10 infringement. Google’s motion should be denied for at least three reasons.

11 First, as explained in Oracle’s comments regarding the Court’s proposed jury instructions  
12 (ECF No. 997 at 4-6) and discussed at the April 27, 2012 charging conference, while individual  
13 names and short phrases (including short declarations) are not protectable on a stand-alone basis,  
14 they are protectable as part of the SSO of the 37 API packages. (RT at 2380:14-2381:25.) Oracle  
15 is not claiming that Google infringed its copyrights by copying any single name or declaration,  
16 but by copying the SSO of the 37 Java API packages, which includes the names and declarations.

17 As the Court properly instructed the jury:

18 While individual names are not protectable on a stand-alone basis, names must  
19 necessarily be used as part of the structure, sequence, and organization and are to  
20 that extent protected by copyright.

21 (ECF No. 1017 at 10.) This instruction tracks Oracle’s copyright infringement claim and  
22 properly recites the law on “words and short phrases.” *See* ECF No. 433 at 7-8 (Court’s prior  
23 ruling that “[c]opyright protection for the selection and arrangement of elements within a work is  
24 a separate question from whether the elements themselves are protected by copyright”); *Lamps*  
25 *Plus, Inc. v. Seattle Lighting Fixture Co.*, 345 F.3d 1140, 1147 (9th Cir. 2003) (“a combination of  
26 unprotectable elements is eligible for copyright protection only if those elements are numerous  
27 enough and their selection and arrangement original enough that their combination constitutes an  
28 original work of authorship”); *Merch. Transaction Sys. v. Nelcela, Inc.*, No. CV 02-1954-PHX-  
MHM, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25663, at \*49 (D. Ariz. Mar. 17, 2009) (“the Court cannot

1 conclude that no reasonable juror could not find creativity in the selection and arrangement of the  
2 Lexcel software’s field names, let alone the remaining allegedly similar non-literal elements of  
3 the Lexcel software, sufficient to render the compilation original enough for protection”).

4 *Sega Enter., Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.*, 977 F.2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1993), the only case Google  
5 cites in support of its argument, is not to the contrary. Google relies on *Sega’s* footnote statement  
6 in dicta that “*Sega’s* security code is of such de minimis length that it is probably unprotected  
7 under the words and short phrases doctrine.” 977 F.2d at 1524. But in the same footnote, the  
8 court distinguished protection of security code in *Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of Am. Inc.*, 975  
9 F.2d 832 (Fed. Cir. 1992) on the basis that “creativity and originality went into the design of that  
10 program.” *Id.* Unrebutted evidence here established that the choice of names and declarations in  
11 the 37 Java APIs was highly creative and original and an essential part of the SSO of the APIs.  
12 The API designers thoughtfully selected thousands of names for aesthetic purposes and  
13 consistency. (RT at 628:2-21 (Reinhold); TX 624 (Bloch presentation) at 17 (“Code should read  
14 like prose.”); RT at 746:20-748:13 (Bloch); RT at 1248:14-20 (Mitchell).) The names and  
15 declarations are organized within the same complex and creative structure as the API elements  
16 they label, and Oracle’s selection and arrangement of those names and declarations is  
17 copyrightable.

18 As the Court recognized at the charging conference, the SSO of the 37 API packages is  
19 manifested in a hierarchy of named packages, classes, methods, interfaces, and fields. (RT at  
20 2381:9-12 (“The Court: You’ve got to use symbols in order to have an SSO. It won’t work  
21 otherwise.”).)

22 Second, while *short* declarations for methods or classes may not be protectable on a stand-  
23 alone basis, not all of the declarations within the 37 API packages are short. Two examples of  
24 longer declarations from the source code include:

- 25 • In `java.security.cert.Certificate` (method declaration):

26 *public abstract void verify(PublicKey key, String sigProvider)*  
27 *throws CertificateException, NoSuchAlgorithmException,*  
28 *InvalidKeyException, NoSuchProviderException,*

1           *SignatureException*;

- 2           • In java.nio.channels (class declaration):

3           *public abstract class DatagramChannel*  
4           *extends AbstractSelectableChannel*  
5           *implements ByteChannel, ScatteringByteChannel, GatheringByteChannel {*

6 TX 623.

7           These declarations are in source code, and are long enough that they may be protectable  
8 on their own. *See Johnson Controls, Inc. v. Phoenix Control Sys., Inc.*, 886 F.2d 1173, 1175 (9th  
9 Cir. 1989) (“Source and object code, the literal components of a program, are consistently held  
10 protected by a copyright on the program”). But of course, Oracle is not asserting infringement  
11 based on Google’s copying of these declarations alone, but based on copying of the SSO of the 37  
12 Java API packages, which includes thousands of these declarations.

13           Finally, Google’s argument that the declarations “must remain exactly the same in order  
14 to ensure compatibility with Java programs calling on those 37 API packages” is a red herring.  
15 Google chose to take the 37 Java API packages because it believed they were the most  
16 appropriate for Android. (RT at 1783:23-1785:4 (Bornstein).) Google did not have to copy the  
17 37 packages. Google’s own expert admitted that Google could have designed its own APIs. (RT  
18 at 2212:25-2213:10 (Astrachan).) Every other witness at the trial confirmed the same thing.  
19 (*See, e.g.*, RT at 684:16-685:24 (Reinhold) (no need to use Oracle APIs); RT at 1335:9-24  
20 (Mitchell) (no need for Google to use Oracle APIs); RT at 290:15-291:9 (Ellison) (same).)  
21 Google chose not to take the time and incur the expense of doing so.

22           Moreover, the evidence at trial showed Google chose only a subset of the full group of  
23 Java API packages, and that Android is *incompatible* with Java, damaging Java’s “write once /  
24 run anywhere” promise. (RT at 1007:6-11 (Morrill); RT at 1331:16-1332:2, 2287:23-2288:5  
25 (Mitchell); TX 383 at 8 (“Q49. Is Android Java compatible? / A. No.”).) As Google engineer  
26 Dan Bornstein testified, Google did not even attempt full compatibility with the Java platform:

27           Q. Did Android implement all the API packages present in any particular Java  
28           Platform?

1 A. No.

2 Q. All right. And why not?

3 A. That wasn't a goal of the project. The goal of the project was to provide  
4 something that was familiar to developers. It wasn't to provide any particular  
preexisting set of packages.

5 (RT at 1783:15-22 (Bornstein).)

6 Google took what it wanted and left the rest. By doing so, it disrupted many years of  
7 effort by members of the Java community at maintaining Java compatibility. Google cannot hide  
8 behind compatibility to try to justify its conduct here.

9 **V. GOOGLE'S LITERAL COPYING IS NOT *DE MINIMIS***

10 Google admits that it copied protected Java code into twelve Android code files but argues  
11 that the copying was *de minimis*.<sup>4</sup> Copying is *de minimis* only "if it is so meager and fragmentary  
12 that [compared to the work as a whole] the average audience would not recognize the  
13 appropriation." ECF No. 1018, JI 28; *Fisher v. Dees*, 794 F.2d 432, 434 n.2 (9th Cir. 1985).

14 A *de minimis* defense is closely related to the requirement of substantial similarity.  
15 *Situation Mgmt. Systems Inc. v. ASP. Consulting LLC*, 560 F.3d 53, 58-59 (1st Cir. 2009).  
16 "Substantiality is measured by considering the qualitative and quantitative significance of the  
17 copied portion in relation to the plaintiff's work as a whole." *Newton v. Diamond*, 388 F.3d  
18 1189, 1195 (9th Cir. 2004); *see also Merch. Transaction Sys.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25663, at  
19 \*61 ("Thus, Nelcela will not escape liability unless it can show that the protectable elements in  
20 the Lexcel software constitute an insignificant (quantitatively and qualitatively) portion or aspect  
21 of the Lexcel software."). "Where substantial similarity exists and the fair use doctrine, as here is  
22 inapplicable, 'the overwhelming thrust of authority upholds liability even under circumstances in

---

23  
24 <sup>4</sup> The Court's instructions provide that Oracle has the burden of proving that "the part  
25 copied was more than *de minimis* when compared to the work as a whole." ECF 1017, JI 24. As  
26 previously briefed, it is Oracle's position that this is error and Google has the burden of proof on  
27 its *de minimis* defense. *See, e.g., Sandoval v. New Line Cinema Corp.*, 147 F.3d 215, 217 (2d Cir.  
28 1998), 26 F.3d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1997), quoting *Ringgold v. Black Entm't Television, Inc.*, 126 F.3d  
70, 74 (2d Cir. 1997) ("To establish that the infringement of a copyright is *de minimis*, and  
therefore not actionable, the alleged infringer must demonstrate that the copying of the protected  
material is so trivial 'as to fall below the qualitative threshold of substantial similarity, which is  
always a required element of actionable copying.'")

1 which the use of the copyrighted work is of minimal consequence.” *Situation Mgmt. Sys.*,  
2 560 F.3d at 59, quoting 2 Nimmer & Nimmer, *Nimmer on Copyright*, § 8.01[G], at 8-26.

3 Here, Oracle presented evidence that Google literally copied either the entirety of the  
4 accused files or a quantitatively or qualitatively significant portion. That evidence was more than  
5 sufficient for a reasonable juror to conclude that the copied code was not “so meager and  
6 fragmentary” as to be unrecognizable as an appropriation.

7 **A. Google’s Copying Of rangeCheck Was Not *De Minimis*.**

8 The evidence established the qualitative significance of the copied rangeCheck method.  
9 rangeCheck is included in one of the 37 API packages primarily at issue. (RT 1254:19-1255:2  
10 (Mitchell).) The rangeCheck method operates on Android mobile devices, and the rangeCheck  
11 “code appears in the source code archive of Samsung,” indicating that it “very likely appears on  
12 the Samsung phones.” (RT at 1255:22-25, 1264:19-23 (Mitchell).) Professor Mitchell testified  
13 that the rangeCheck method is qualitatively significant and “useful” to Android as part of the API  
14 libraries. (RT at 1316:17-19 (Mitchell).) He testified that he analyzed the significance of  
15 rangeCheck to other code in the same class file and found “a number of other source code [sic] in  
16 other files” that called upon it. (RT at 1329:9-14 (Mitchell).)

17 In addition, to further determine the significance of the rangeCheck method, Professor  
18 Mitchell also experimented with an Android device and found that it called the rangeCheck  
19 method no less than 2,600 times during start up:

20 Q. Did you conduct an analysis of the significance of rangeCheck to other code in the  
21 same class file?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. What did you conclude?

24 A. I found a number of other source code in other files that called that function. And,  
25 also, I did an experiment with the phone source code instrumented, and counted the  
26 number of times that rangeCheck was called in starting up the phone. And I found that it's  
27 called 2600 times just in powering on the device or starting the emulator.

28 (RT at 1329:9-21 (Mitchell).)

Google presented no evidence rebutting any of this testimony. Google argues that  
Professor Mitchell did not “offer any testimony about the qualitative significance of the calls to

1 rangeCheck” (ECF 143, at 11), but in fact Professor Mitchell did indicate that this was a large  
2 number, stating that “2600 seems like a pretty big number for the number of calls to this  
3 function.” (RT at 1329:20-21 (Mitchell).)

4 Google selectively quotes from Professor Mitchell’s testimony to try to trivialize the  
5 rangeCheck method. (ECF No. 984 at 5 (“Dr. Mitchell conceded that ‘a good high school  
6 programmer’ could write rangeCheck.”).) But Professor Mitchell actually testified that “a good  
7 high school programmer or graduate student, *if told exactly what was needed*, could write the  
8 code.” (RT at 1316:24-25 (Mitchell) (emphasis added).) In fact, the “code has some subtlety”  
9 and “the interesting part is figuring out exactly what you wanted the function to do, more than  
10 realizing that function in Java code once that’s understood.” (RT at 1317:1-5 (Mitchell).) The  
11 method might seem “[v]ery, very simple” to Dr. Bloch, who originally wrote the code while he  
12 was working at Sun, but other programmers might not find writing the method so simple. (RT at  
13 815:13-16 (Bloch); *see also id.* at 755:6-8 (Bloch).)

14 More importantly, the ease or difficulty of creating this code is not relevant to whether  
15 Google’s copying was *de minimis*. Professor Mitchell’s unrebutted testimony supports that the  
16 copied rangeCheck method was qualitatively significant—that is, not “so meager and fragmentary  
17 that compared to the work as a whole the average audience would not recognize the  
18 appropriation.” (ECF 1017, JI 28.)

19 Google argues that copying of rangeCheck was not quantitatively significant because it  
20 represented only 13 of the 3,179 lines in the Arrays.java file or “less than three-tenths of one  
21 percent of the work as a whole.” (ECF 1043, at 11.) Courts have found in the fair use context,  
22 however, that copied segments of similar comparable length to the work as a whole were  
23 quantitatively substantial. In *Roy Export Co. v. CBS, Inc.*, 503 F.Supp.1137, 11145 (S.D.N.Y.  
24 1980), for example, the court held that the jury could reasonably have found use of film excerpts,  
25 including a fifty-five second excerpt from a one hour and twenty-nine minute film—less than two  
26 percent—was “quantitatively substantial.”

27 In any event, “[e]ven if a copied portion be relatively small in proportion to the entire  
28 work, if qualitatively important, the finder of fact may properly find substantial similarity.”

1 *Baxter v. MCA, Inc.*, 812 F.2d 421, 425 (9th Cir. 1987); *see also Mktg. Tech. Solutions, Inc. v.*  
2 *Medizine LLC*, No. 09 Civ. 8122 (LMM), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50027, at \*9 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 23,  
3 2010) (even if copied material is a “quantitatively very small part” of the work as a whole, “[t]he  
4 smallness alone is not enough by itself to avoid liability.”). In *Baxter*, the Ninth Circuit upheld  
5 denial of summary judgment for the defendant even assuming the similarity between the two  
6 musical works could be reduced to six-note sequence and cited a long line of cases finding  
7 substantial similarity even where the copied portion was a very small fraction of the work as a  
8 whole. 812 F.2d at 425; *see also Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters.*, 471 U.S. 539,  
9 565-66, 579 (1985) (holding in fair use context that copying of 300 words from 200,000 word  
10 manuscript of presidential memoir was substantial).

11 **B. Google’s Copying Of Comments Was Not *De Minimis***

12 Professor Mitchell compared Oracle’s CodeSource.java file (TX 623.9) against Android’s  
13 CodeSourceTest.java file (TX 1039) and concluded that except for some HTML commands,  
14 certain English-language comments are “syntactically . . . identical.” (RT at 1262:13-1263:4  
15 (Mitchell).) He also testified that Android’s CollectionCertStoreParametersTest.java (TX 1040)  
16 contained the “same kind of comment copying” from Oracle’s  
17 CollectionCertStoreParameters.java (TX 623.10). (RT at 1263:9-10 (Mitchell).)

18 Google argues that the comments are not qualitatively significant because “they have  
19 absolutely no effect on any compiled code.” (ECF 1043, at 12.) But Google cannot just freely  
20 copy comments to code written by others because they are not compiled. Comments in computer  
21 programs warrant protection from copying under copyright law *because* they represent an  
22 expressive element of a computer program. *See, e.g., Merch. Transaction Sys.*, 2009 U.S. Dist.  
23 LEXIS 25663, at \*52 (noting “commenting” as among the discretionary, creative and therefore  
24 protectable aspects of programming); *Brocade Commc’ns Sys. v. A10 Networks, Inc.*, No. 10-  
25 CV-03428-LHK, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91384, at \*7-8 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 16, 2011) (because  
26 comments are “the equivalent of explanatory asides, they are likely capable of being expressed in  
27 many different ways and therefore may be protectable expression”); *see also Aharonian v.*  
28

1 *Gonzales*, No. C04-5190, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13, 14-15 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2006) (noting that  
2 programmer has “great discretion . . . how to comment the code”).

3 The literally copied comments here are qualitatively significant because they “give some  
4 guidance to programmers reading source code.” (RT at 1317:21-25 (Mitchell).) They are also  
5 quantitatively significant. Google acknowledges that they amount to about 25% of Oracle’s  
6 *CollectionCertStoreParameters.java* file (31 lines out of 124 lines in the file) (TX 623.10) and  
7 about 2.90% of Oracle’s *CodeSource.java* file (18 lines out of 621 lines in the file) (TX 623.9).

8 **C. Google’s Copying Of Eight Decompiled Files—the Eight “Iml” and  
9 “ACL” Files—Was Not De Minimis.**

10 The evidence showed that Google decompiled eight Java files and copied them each in  
11 their entirety. By definition, the copied code was qualitatively and quantitatively significant to  
12 each file. No reasonable jury could find otherwise.

13 Google’s response is to raise yet another technical argument, complaining that adequate  
14 evidence of copying was not presented. But the source code for the copied files was admitted  
15 (TX 623; 623.2-623.8)<sup>5</sup>, decompiled versions of the Java code files were admitted, and  
16 corresponding decompiled Android code files were admitted (TX 1031-1040). Professor Mitchell  
17 testified at length about the decompilation process, how he determined that the eight files were  
18 decompiled and how, in a side-by-side comparison he found “that the actual code matches  
19 completely. (RT at 1259:16- 1260:18 (Mitchell).) Dr. Mitchell showed the jury a side-by-side  
20 comparison of a decompiled version of Oracle’s *PolicyNodeImpl.class* file (TX 896.1) and  
21 Android’s *PolicyNodeImpl.java* file (TX 1031). (RT at 1259:16-25 (Mitchell).) He also  
22 confirmed that Android contains decompiled versions of Oracle’s *PolicyNodeImpl.class*,  
23 *AclEntryImpl.class*, *AclImpl.class*, *GroupImpl.class*, *PermissionImpl.class*, *PrincipalImpl.class*,  
24 *AclEnumeratorImpl.class*. (RT at 1259:16-25; 1260:5-18 (Mitchell).) And Dr. Mitchell walked  
25 the jury through another side by side comparison of *OwnerImpl.java* from both Java and Android

---

26  
27 <sup>5</sup> Google again mistakenly states that only 7 files were admitted. All 8 files are contained  
28 in these exhibits, but two of the copied files are contained in a single exhibit. (Swoopes Decl. ¶ 2;  
*see* TX 623.4.)

1 (TX 623.6). (RT at 1261:14-1262:2 (Mitchell).) The copied Android files were also identified in  
2 Exhibit TX 1072. (See RT 1334:18-1335:7 (Mitchell).) Dr. Reinhold also authenticated the  
3 copied Oracle source code files. (See RT at 693:2-694:14.)

4 Despite all of this, Google seems to be complaining now that Dr. Mitchell did not further  
5 identify the names of the copied files he examined. (ECF No. 1043 at 13.) But if Google had  
6 some issue with the foundation for Dr. Mitchell's testimony it needed to object. It never did.  
7 There was more than ample evidence for the jury to conclude that Google engaged in this  
8 copying, particularly since Google chose not to have its own expert—or any other witness—  
9 refute it.

10 In addition, though no further proof was necessary, the evidence showed that the  
11 decompiled code is also qualitatively significant to more than the files from which they were  
12 taken. The eight Oracle files concern the security governing access to files in a network. Dr.  
13 Mitchell testified that “[t]hey have to do with access control lists, which are a standard  
14 mechanism in computer security to govern access to a file or a network or other resource.” (RT at  
15 1329:22-1330:5 (Mitchell).) Google did not challenge this testimony. While Google has claimed  
16 in the past that these files were simply “test files” for Google, Google did not present evidence at  
17 trial that these were test files except to note that the file paths for these files contain the word  
18 “test.” (RT at 1319:1-3 (Mitchell).) Dr. Mitchell testified that they are not test files as used by  
19 Oracle. (RT at 1330:6-11 (Mitchell).) In addition, the possibility that the corresponding Android  
20 files might be test files in no way decreases their value. Companies invest significant time and  
21 money into testing because it is important to ship their devices bug-free and thus these test files  
22 could have had a “big value” for Google as well. (RT at 1330:6-1331:5 (Mitchell).)

## 23 VI. ANDROID'S SPECIFICATIONS INFRINGE ORACLE'S COPYRIGHTS

24 Google copied the Java API specifications for the 37 packages into Android's  
25 specifications. It did so in three ways: it copied the selection, structure, organization and  
26 sequence of the Java APIs; it copied the selection and arrangement of the names; and it copied the  
27 English language definitions by paraphrasing them. Google wants the Court to view each of  
28 these elements in isolation. As a result there is a striking similarity between the documentation

1 for these 37 packages for the two platforms. For roughly 11,000 pages, Android’s packages are  
2 laid out in the same organization, with thousands of the same names, nearly all the same  
3 packages, classes and methods and a paraphrased English definition next to each.

4 The Court should consider Google’s extensive copying of these three elements together  
5 when evaluating Google’s documentation copying. *See, e.g., Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft*  
6 *Corp.*, 35 F.3d 1435, 1447 (9th Cir. 1994) (works should be “considered as a whole” under  
7 intrinsic test, including protectable elements and selection and arrangement of unprotectable  
8 elements). *See also L.A. Printex Indust., Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.*, 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS 7079  
9 (April 9, 2012) (holding plaintiff’s original selection, coordination, and arrangement of fabric  
10 design was protectable and remanding for jury determination of substantial similarity)  
11 Collectively, and individually, they establish copyright infringement.

12 **A. Google Should Be Held Liable For Its Admitted Copying of The SSO**  
13 **From Java Documentation Into Android Documentation**

14 The SSO of documentation is protectable. In *Jacobsen v. Katzer*, for example, the court  
15 followed the Supreme Court’s decision in *Feist* to hold that the “selection, ordering and  
16 arrangement” of text files reflecting decoder information from model railroad manufacturers was  
17 protected by copyright. 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115204, at \*9-10 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2009). *See*  
18 *also Key Publ’n v. Chinatown Today Publ’g Enter.*, 945 F.2d 509 (2d Cir. 1991) (holding  
19 business directory copyrightable because of selection of businesses and arrangement of  
20 businesses into categories).

21 *Baker v. Selden* stands for the proposition that the description in a document may be  
22 copyrightable even when the underlying system it describes is not. *Baker v. Selden*, 101 U.S. 99  
23 (1879). In *Situation Mgmt. Sys.*, the First Circuit applied this principle in reversing the district  
24 court and extending copyright protection to the plaintiff’s training materials for teaching effective  
25 techniques of communication and negotiation within the workplace. *Situation Mgmt. Sys.*,  
26 560 F.3d at 61 (1st Cir. 2009). As the court explained, “[t]he fact that SMS’s works describe  
27 processes or systems does not make their *expression* noncopyrightable. . . SMS’s creative choices  
28 in describing those processes and systems, including the works’ overall arrangement and

1 structure, are subject to copyright protection.” *Id.* (emphasis in original). Though “others may  
2 freely describe that process or system by using their own original expression,” they “may not  
3 appropriate SMS’s expression when describing that process or system.” *Id.*

4 As the Seventh Circuit explained in *Am. Dental Ass’n v. Delta Dental Plans Ass’n*, in  
5 affording copyright protection to American Dental Association code on dental procedures and  
6 nomenclature:

7 *Section 102(b)* permits Delta Dental to disseminate forms inviting dentists to use  
8 the ADA’s code when submitting bills to insurers. But it does not permit Delta to  
9 copy the Code itself, or make and distribute a derivative work based on the Code,  
any more than Baker could copy Selden’s book.

10 126 F.3d 977, 980-81 (7th Cir. 1997). The court stated that taxonomies, such as the West Key  
11 Number System and the dental code, are not “systems” and are protectable as expression.  
12 126 F.3d at 978 (7th Cir. 1997) (noting that “[b]lueprints for large buildings (more committee  
13 work), instruction manuals for repairing automobiles, used car value guides, dictionaries,  
14 encyclopedias, maps” are protectable original expression).

15 Unlike *Baker v. Selden* and *Situation Mgmt*, in this case the structure that is described by  
16 the Java API documentation is itself copyrightable because it is the structure of a computer  
17 program. *Johnson Controls*, 886 F.2d at 1175 (9th Cir. 1989). The parties agree here that the  
18 structure expressed in the documentation is the same as the structure expressed in the source  
19 code. (*See* RT at 606:14-608:3 (Reinhold) (code is run through Java Documentation Extractor to  
20 pull out structure and English language comments); ECF No. 1043 at 14 (“the documentation is  
21 generated by an automated program, such that the SSO of the documentation is a natural  
22 derivative of the SSO of the API packages it represents.”).) The structure is no less protectable in  
23 documentation than it is in the code.

24 Google did not dispute copying the SSO in the documentation was not disputed by Google  
25 at trial and does not do so here. Dr. Mitchell testified to comparing the documentation side by  
26 side on the web:

27 Because the APIs in both cases are available on the web, it’s fairly straightforward to open  
28 two web browsers side by side and navigate through the two APIs and libraries

1 simultaneously in the same way and compare the way one looks on the screen with the  
2 other.

3 By and large, that – they are really identical. They are displayed in different colors and so  
4 on. But the content is the same. You see the same classes in the same hierarchy in the  
5 same – in packages of the same name supporting the same interfaces and arranged in – in  
6 the same way.

7 (RT at 1244:17-1246:3 (Mitchell).)

8 Professor Mitchell further testified: “I don’t think there’s any way that a separate team  
9 could have come up with so many things that are identical except by copying the original API.  
10 There are just thousands of things that match and I don’t see how that could have happened in any  
11 other way than by copying.” (RT at 1249:18-25 (Mitchell).)

12 Google’s expert confirmed the SSO for the 37 packages is virtually identical:

13 Q. We have the 37, where the API is virtually identical, correct?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And the Structure, Sequence and Organization of the API elements is virtually  
16 identical across those 37 packages, correct?

17 A. That’s right.

18 (RT at 2214:3-9 (Astrachan).) Google developer Bob Lee agreed. (RT at 1174:9-12 (Lee)

19 (Q. And the structure of the documentation is identical, correct, sir? And if you think of it as an  
20 outline, the outline would match identically, correct, sir? A. Yes.).)

21 Google does not claim in this motion that the SSO for documentation is generally  
22 unprotectable or that it did not copy. Rather it argues that the Java APIs generally is not  
23 copyrightable, whether expressed in code or in documentation. That, of course, is the larger issue  
24 being decided by the Court. Google’s only other argument is that because the documentation is  
25 generated automatically, Oracle’s claim for infringement of the documentation “collapses” into  
26 its claim for infringement of the SSO of the code. (ECF No. 1043 at 17-18.) This argument  
27 makes no sense. Accepting Google’s logic would lead to the perverse and unacceptable result  
28 that the Court can find Google infringed by copying the SSO in the source code but that Google  
29 somehow remains free to distribute documentation describing the same copyrightable structure.

1 Google infringes Oracle’s copyrights in more than one form. Oracle is entitled to relief  
 2 from that infringement as to all of the forms in which it occurred. In *Am. Dental Ass’n v. Delta*  
 3 *Dental Plans Ass’n*, the structure of the dental code that organized various dental procedures into  
 4 a hierarchy was represented in three formats—numerically, by short description, and by long  
 5 description. 126 F.3d at 980-981. The court found each format was protectable. (“The long  
 6 description is part of the copyrighted work, and original long descriptions make the work as a  
 7 whole copyrightable. But we think that even the short description and the number are original  
 8 works of authorship.”) Google cites no case law to support “collapsing” Oracle’s claims by  
 9 dismissing one in Google’s favor.

10 **B. Android’s English-Language Descriptions Were Copied From The**  
 11 **Java API Specifications.**

12 The evidence at trial also showed that Google engineers copied Oracle’s English language  
 13 descriptions into Android. Google claims that Oracle failed to introduce sufficient evidence at  
 14 trial to support a finding of infringement because it limited its proof to three examples. This  
 15 misrepresents the record at trial.

16 Google’s copying was so extensive that Oracle could not possible have displayed all of it  
 17 to the jury. While Android developer Bob Lee did testify regarding three examples that were  
 18 shown to him, he acknowledged that these examples were representative of the copying that  
 19 occurred:

20 Q. So you would expect the same level of similarity that the jury has seen in these  
 21 examples so far across the documentation for the 37 package, sir?

22 A. Generally, yes.

(RT at 1175:25-1176:3 (Lee).) One of the examples is shown below:

J2SE 5.0	Android
<p>A pair of channels that implements a unidirectional pipe.</p> <p>A pipe consists of a pair of channels: A writable sink channel and a readable source channel. Once some bytes are written to the sink channel they can be read from source channel in exactly the order in which they were written.</p>	<p>A pipe contains two channels, forming a unidirectional pipe. One is the writable sink channel, and the other is the readable source channel. When bytes are written into the writable channel they can be read from the readable channel. Bytes are read in the order in which they were written.</p>

1 Mr. Lee also admitted that the English-descriptions in Android were paraphrased from  
2 Sun’s documentation and were therefore “substantially similar.” (RT at 1191:4-13 (Lee).)  
3 Indeed, he even expressed regret that such re-writing had occurred:

4 I actually wasn't even a big fan of including these. I would have preferred that we  
5 just point people to Sun’s site for this specific documentation because you  
6 shouldn't really be rewriting a contract. And in doing so they are going to be  
substantially similar.

7 *Id.*

8 Based on Mr. Lee’s admission that the English-language descriptions in the Android  
9 specifications were paraphrased from the Java specifications, that they were substantially similar,  
10 and the English language descriptions that were provided, a reasonable jury could find for Oracle  
11 on this claim.

12 **VII. THE EVIDENCE SHOWS THE INDIVIDUALLY COPIED CODE FILES**  
13 **WERE OWNED BY ORACLE**

14 Google also tries to raise a last minute ownership challenge to the 11 individual files that  
15 it copied. As discussed in section II.B, it is far too late for Google to make this argument now.  
16 The challenge is also baseless. Google does not offer any proof that anyone other than Sun  
17 employees wrote the code. Josh Bloch testified that he authored the rangeCheck code while he  
18 was working for Sun. (RT at 754:17-755:8 (Bloch).) The source code for each of the eight files  
19 that Google decompiled and copied bears a copyright notice for Sun, indicating that Sun had  
20 determined in the course of its 2006-07 audit that it owned the rights to the code. (Swoopes Decl.  
21 ¶ 5; Ex. 623; RT at 2231:6-2232:4 (Reinhold).)<sup>6</sup> The source code for the two files from which  
22 Google copied comments also bear Sun copyright notices. (Swoopes Decl. ¶ 5; Ex. 623.)

---

23  
24 <sup>6</sup> Google’s claim that Oracle’s submission of code from J2SE 5.0u22 as well as version  
25 5.0, excuses its copying is baseless. (See ECF No. 1043 a5 4 n. 5). Copying the same material  
26 from a later version of a work infringes the underlying copyright: “The established doctrine  
27 prevents unauthorized copying or other infringing use of the underlying work or any part of that  
28 work contained in the derivative product so long as the underlying work itself remains  
copyrighted.” *Russell v. Price*, 612 F.2d 1123, 1128 (9th Cir. 1979). Google does not claim that  
the code it decompiled and copied is not present in any sub-release of J2SE 5. Regardless of  
which sub-release it copied, Google is liable. Further, Oracle introduced the registration for  
J2SE 6.0 at trial as well. *See* TX 659.

