

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
ASSOCIATION, INC.;

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,
INC.; and

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MEASUREMENT IN
EDUCATION, INC.,

Plaintiffs/Counter-Defendants,

v.

PUBLIC.RESOURCE.ORG, INC.

Defendant/Counterclaimant.

Case No. 1:14-CV-00857-TSC-DAR

**PRELIMINARY AND NON-BINDING
STATEMENT OF ISSUES BY
APPELLANT/DEFENDANT-
COUNTERCLAIMANT
PUBLIC.RESOURCE.ORG, INC.**

Action Filed: May 23, 2014

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 10(b), Defendant and Counterclaimant Public.Resource.Org, Inc. hereby provides the following preliminary and non-binding statement of issues on appeal:

I. Statement of Issues to be Raised

1. Did the district court err by enjoining Public.Resource.Org?
2. Did the district court err in holding that Plaintiff-Appellees can assert copyright in, and thus limit the ability of people to read and communicate, the text of standards that are legally binding due to incorporation into state and federal laws and regulations?
3. Did the district court err in holding that Public.Resource.Org's posting of standards that are legally binding due to incorporation into state and federal laws and regulations, in the course of building a publicly accessible archive of government edicts, was not a fair use?

4. Did the district court err in holding that Plaintiff-Appellees own copyrights in standards that are legally binding due to incorporation into state and federal laws and regulations, despite undisputed evidence showing that Plaintiff-Appellees were not the authors of those standards?
5. Did the district court err by declining to strike a purported expert report of Dr. Kurt Geisinger that applied no specialized knowledge, experience, or expertise, but merely repeated the subjective opinions of Plaintiff-Appellees' employees and officers, and who failed to disclose his opinions in his expert report, and submitted unreliable conclusions?
6. Did the district court err by making evidentiary rulings against Public.Resource.Org, and failing to sustain Public.Resource.Org's evidentiary objections regarding Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment?

II. Underlying Decision from Which Appeal Arises

The rulings under review (attached hereto) are the district court's Order of February 2, 2017 granting Plaintiff-Appellees' Motion for Summary Judgment, granting Plaintiff-Appellees' Motion for Permanent Injunction, and denying Defendant-Appellant Public.Resource.Org's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 118) and Memorandum Opinion (ECF No. 117), and the district court's Order of September 21, 2016 denying Defendant-Appellant Public.Resource.Org's Motion to Strike the expert report of Dr. Kurt Geisinger (ECF No. 115).

Dated: March 3, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Andrew P. Bridges

Andrew P. Bridges (admitted)

abridges@fenwick.com

Sebastian E. Kaplan (admitted *pro hac vice*)

skaplan@fenwick.com

Matthew B. Becker (admitted *pro hac vice*)

mbecker@fenwick.com

FENWICK & WEST LLP

555 California Street, 12th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104

Telephone: (415) 875-2300

Facsimile: (415) 281-1350

Mitchell L. Stoltz (D.C. Bar No. 978149)

mitch@eff.org

Corynne McSherry (admitted *pro hac vice*)

corynne@eff.org

ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION

815 Eddy Street

San Francisco, CA 94109

Telephone: (415) 436-9333

Facsimile: (415) 436-9993

David Halperin (D.C. Bar No. 426078)

davidhalperindc@gmail.com

1530 P Street NW

Washington, DC 20005

Telephone: (202) 905-3434

Attorneys for Defendant-Counterclaimant

Public.Resource.Org, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court for the District of Columbia and served on all counsel of record via the CM/ECF system on March 3, 2017.

/s/ Andrew P. Bridges

Andrew P. Bridges