Dockets.Justia.com

GOOGLE INC., Defendant.	MATTER OF LAW ON DECOMPILED FILES
v.	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A
Plaintiff,	
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,	No. C 10-03561 WHA
FOR THE NORTHER	N DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE UNITED S	STATES DISTRICT COURT

The evidence at trial showed that Google decompiled eight Java files and copied them each in their entirety. No reasonable jury could find that the copying of entire computer files 18 was de minimis. The trial record contains the source code for the Java code files 19 (TX 623.2–623.8), decompiled versions of Java code files (TX 896.1–896.8), and corresponding 20 Android code files (TX 1031–40). Professor John Mitchell testified about the decompilation process, how he determined that the eight files were decompiled and how, in a side-by-side 22 comparison he found "that the actual code matches completely" (Tr. at 1259–1260).

23 In its opposition brief, Google argues that the jury may have found that Google's use of 24 the copied files was de minimis because these copied files were only "test files" that were not 25 shipped on Android phones. This is unpersuasive. Professor Mitchell testified that using the 26 copied files even as test files would have been significant use. There was no testimony to the 27 contrary. Moreover, our court of appeals has held that it is the amount of copying as compared 28 to

17

21

*plaintiff's* work that matters for the de minimis inquiry, not how the accused infringer used the
copied work. *Newton v. Diamond*, 388 F.3d 1189, 1195 (9th Cir. 2004). Here, Google has
admitted to copying the *entire* files. No reasonable jury could find that this copying was de
minimis.

For the reasons stated, Oracle's motion for judgment as a matter of law of infringement of the decompiled files is **GRANTED**. The answer to Question 3B on the Special Verdict Form from phase one will be deemed "Yes."

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 11, 2012.

Ahre WILLIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE