

1 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.
2 Nevada Bar No. 000116
3 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.
4 Nevada Bar No. 004762
5 CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.
6 Nevada Bar No. 009166
7 OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY
8 & DESRUISSEAUX
9 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue
10 Las Vegas, NV 89129
11 (702) 384-4012
12 FAX: (702) 383-0701
13 jolson@ocgd.com
14 mstoberski@ocgd.com
15
16 Attorneys for Defendants
17 KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and
18 CENTER FOR INTERCULTURAL ORGANIZING

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

19 Righthaven, LLC, a Nevada limited) CASE NO. 2:10-cv-01322-JCM-LRL
20 liability company)
21 Plaintiff,)
22 vs.)
23 KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and) ERRATA
24 CENTER FOR INTERCULTURAL)
25 ORGANIZING, a Non-Profit Organization,)
26 Defendant.)
27
28

21 COME NOW, Defendants KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and CENTER FOR
22 INTERCULTURAL ORGANIZING, by and through their attorneys, OLSON, CANNON,
23 GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX, and hereby submit this Errata to their ORDER GRANTING
24 JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANTS erroneously titled "DEFENDANTS'
25 OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND,
26 ALTERNATIVELY, REQUEST FOR A CONTINUANCE TO CONDUCT DISCOVERY

27
28
...

1
2 PURSUANT TO FRCP 56(f)", which Order was filed on March 25, 2011 [Dkt. #34]. The
3 corrected Order is attached hereto for the Court's consideration.
4

DATED this ____ day of April, 2011.

5 OLSON, CANNON,
6 GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX
7
8

9 By: _____
10 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.
11 Nevada Bar No. 000116
12 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.
13 Nevada Bar No. 004762
14 CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.
15 Nevada Bar No. 009166
16 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue
17 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
18 Attorneys for Defendants
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDER

15 Presently before the Court is the Order to Show Cause why the Case should not be
16 Dismissed pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 107. The Court issued the Order to Show Cause why the
17 Case should not be Dismissed pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 107. (Dkt. #12). Plaintiff, Righthaven,
18 LLC ("Righthaven") filed a Response to Order to Show Cause, and Alternatively Request for
19 Continuance to Conduct Discovery Pursuant to FRCP 56(f). (Dkt. #14). Defendants, Kayse
20 Jama and Center for Intercultural Organizing ("Defendants") filed an Opposition to the Response
21 to Order to Show Cause, and Alternatively Request for Continuance to Conduct Discovery
22 Pursuant to FRCP 56(f). (Dkt. #18). Professor Jason Schultz filed Brief of Amicus Curiae.
23 (Dkt. #21). Righthaven filed its Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Response to Order to Show
24 Cause. (Dkt. #22). Righthaven filed an Opposition to Professor Jason Schultz filed Brief of
25 Amicus Curiae. (Dkt. #24). Righthaven filed Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of
26 Material Fact that Require Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #28).
27 Defendants filed an Opposition to Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact
28 that Require Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #29). Professor Schultz

1 filed Brief of Amicus Curiae Professor Jason Schultz in Response to Plaintiff's Identification of
2 Genuine Issues of Material Fact that Require Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing.
3 (Dkt. #30). Thereafter, the Court reset the hearing for oral argument on the Order to Show Cause
4 for March 18, 2011.

5 The Court, having considered the papers and pleadings submitted and oral arguments of
6 the parties present, finds there are no issues of material fact precluding the entry of judgment
7 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f)(3).

8 Accordingly,


9 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that summary judgment be
10 GRANTED in favor of Defendants.

11 DATED this ____ day of April, 2011.

12
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14

15 Submitted by:

16
17 OLSON, CANNON,
18 GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX

19 By: 

20 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.
21 Nevada Bar No. 000116
22 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.
23 Nevada Bar No. 004762
24 CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.
25 Nevada Bar No. 009166
26 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue
27 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
28 Attorneys for Defendants

1
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

2 I hereby certify that on this 1st day of April, 2011, I did serve, via the Court's CM/ECF
3 System, a copy of the above and foregoing ERRATA.

4
5 An Employee of OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY
6 & DESRUISSEAUX
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.
2 Nevada Bar No. 000116
3 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.
4 Nevada Bar No. 004762
5 CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.
6 Nevada Bar. No. 009166
7 OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY
8 & DESRUISSEAX
9 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue
10 Las Vegas, NV 89129
(702) 384-4012
FAX: (702) 383-0701
jolson@ocgd.com
mstoberski@ocgd.com
11 Attorneys for Defendants
12 KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and
13 CENTER FOR INTERCULTURAL ORGANIZING

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

16 Righthaven, LLC, a Nevada limited) CASE NO. 2:10-cv-01322-JCM-LRL
17 liability company,)
18 Plaintiff,)
19 vs.)
20 KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and)
21 CENTER FOR INTERCULTURAL)
22 ORGANIZING, a Non-Profit)
23 Organization,)
24 Defendant.)
25)
26)
27)
28)

) DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND,
ALTERNATIVELY, REQUEST
FOR A CONTINUANCE TO
CONDUCT DISCOVERY
PURSUANT TO FRCP 56(f)

Presently before the Court is the Order to Show Cause why the Case should not be Dismissed pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 107. The Court issued the Order to Show Cause why the Case should not be Dismissed pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 107. (Dkt. #12). Plaintiff, Righthaven, LLC ("Righthaven") filed a Response to Order to Show Cause, and Alternatively Request for Continuance to Conduct Discovery Pursuant to FRCP 56(f). (Dkt. #14). Defendants, Kayse Jama and Center for Intercultural Organizing ("Defendants") filed an Opposition to the Response to

1 Order to Show Cause, and Alternatively Request for Continuance to Conduct Discovery Pursuant
2 to FRCP 56(f). (Dkt. #18). Professor Jason Schultz filed Brief of Amicus Curiae. (Dkt. #21).
3 Righthaven filed its Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Response to Order to Show Cause. (Dkt. #22).
4 Righthaven filed an Opposition to Professor Jason Schultz filed Brief of Amicus Curiae. (Dkt.
5 #24). Righthaven filed Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact that Require
6 Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #28). Defendants filed an Opposition to
7 Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact that Require Resolution Prior to
8 Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #29). Professor Schultz filed Brief of Amicus Curiae
9 Professor Jason Schultz in Response to Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact
10 that Require Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #30). Thereafter, the Court
11 reset the hearing for oral argument on the Order to Show Cause for March 18, 2011.
12

13 The Court, having considered the papers and pleadings submitted and oral arguments of
14 the parties present, finds there are no issues of material fact precluding the entry of judgment
15 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f)(3).

16 Specifically, as to the first fair use factor – the purpose and character of the use – the Court
17 finds there is no dispute as to Defendants' non-profit status and the fact that Defendants did not
18 sell, license, or publish the work commercially. *See Affidavit of Kayse Jama* (Dkt. #7-2) and
19 *Complaint, Exhibit 2* (Dkt. #1-1). The Court further finds that no reasonable jury could conclude
20 that any general donation or solicitation for donations to Defendants' mission would constitute
21 using the work for a commercial purpose. Moreover, the Court finds that Defendants have made a
22 transformative use by targeting a different audience for a different purpose than the original
23 publisher, the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. *See Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 487 F. 3d 701,
24 722 (9th Cir. 2007) (finding fair use where defendant used a copyrighted work "in a new context
25 to serve a different purpose"). The Court also finds that because Righthaven does not exploit or
26 offer the work to the public in any form, there can be no substitution of the Defendants' use for
27
28

1 Righthaven's use of the work under the first fair use factor. *See Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 508 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2007). This factor weighs in favor of Defendants.

2 As to the second fair use factor – the nature of the work – the Court finds no genuine issue
3 of material fact, because the nature of the work can be determined by examination of the article.
4 Complaint Exhibit 1 (Dkt. #1-1). The news story at issue is largely factual and thus deserving of
5 minimal copyright protection. This factor weighs heavily in favor of Defendants. *See Los Angeles*
6 *News Serv. v. KCAL-TV Channel 9*, 108 F.3d 1119, 1122 (9th Cir. 1997).

7 As to the third factor – the amount and substantiality of the use – the Court finds that while
8 Defendants posted the entirety of the work, this was reasonable in light of the purpose and
9 character of the use under the first factor – to inform its members of important social and political
10 information about immigrant issues. *See Amazon*, 508 F.3d at 1165; *Kelly v. Ariba Soft Corp.*, 336
11 F.3d 811, 820-21 (9th Cir. 2003). *See also A.V. v. iParadigms, LLC*, 562 F.3d 630, 642 (4th Cir.
12 2009); *Bond v. Blum*, 317 F.3d 385, 393 (4th Cir. 2003); *Nuñez v. Caribbean Int'l News Corp.*,
13 235 F.3d 18, 24 (1st Cir. 2000); *Field v. Google Inc.*, 412 F. Supp. 2d 1106 (D. Nev. 2006).
14 Because the amount copied was reasonable in relation to the purpose of the copying, this factor
15 favors neither party. *See Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 US 569, 586 (1994).

16 Righthaven's reliance on *Worldwide Church of God v. Philadelphia Church of God, Inc.*,
17 227 F.3d 1110 (9th Cir. 2000) is misplaced. As an initial matter, that case does not stand for the
18 broad proposition that use of an entire work precludes a fair-use finding. *Id.* at 1118 (recognizing
19 that "'wholesale copying does not preclude fair use per se'") (quoting *Hustler Magazine, Inc. v. Moral Majority, Inc.*, 796 F.2d 1148, 1155 (9th Cir. 1986)).

20 In *Worldwide Church of God*, a church owned the copyright in a 380-page book written by
21 its founder entitled "Mystery of the Ages." 227 F. 3d at 1112. The church stopped distributing the
22 book when certain of its doctrines changed. *Id.* at 1113. A splinter group countermanded that
23 directive by printing and distributing 30,000 copies of "Mystery of the Ages." *Id.* When the new
24 group ignored the church's cease-and-desist letter, the church filed a copyright infringement
25
26
27
28

1 action. *Id.* The splinter group made no attempt to claim that its use was transformative or served
2 some different purpose than the original work. Instead, the group merely relied on its non-profit
3 status as a defense. That was unavailing. By distributing “Mystery of the Ages” in bulk, the
4 splinter group was able to draw thousands to its congregation, and those members tithed 10% of
5 their income to the new church. *Id.* at 1118.

6 *Worldwide Church of God* is distinguishable. First, Defendants’ use of the short news
7 article at issue serves a different purpose than the original work by providing information to its
8 members concerning the specialized topic of immigrant and refugee rights. *See Amazon*, 508 F.3d
9 at 1165 (“making an exact copy of a work may be transformative so long as the copy serves a
10 different function than the original work”). Second, as discussed above, Defendants’ use was not
11 competitive with either Righthaven’s use or even the use of the original copyright owner, the
12 Review-Journal. By contrast, the parties in *Worldwide Church of God* were directly competing for
13 same tithing members.

14 As to the fourth factor – the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the
15 original work – the Court finds that Defendants use was socially beneficial in that it informed its
16 members of important social and political information. *Amazon*, 487 F.3d at 724-25; *Field*, 412 F.
17 Supp. 2d at 1119 (finding fair use where Google’s cache of works served “different and socially
18 important purposes” than the original works). Furthermore, Righthaven has failed to produce any
19 evidence that there is a potential market for the work in this case, as it does not make any
20 commercial use of the work. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d)* Declaration of Shawn Mangano (Dkt. #15)
21 and Righthaven’s Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact that Require Resolution Prior
22 to Continued Fair Use Hearing (Dkt. #28). *See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1)* (“A party asserting
23 that a fact . . . is genuinely disputed must support the assertion by . . . citing to particular parts of
24 materials in the record.”); *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574,
25 587 (1986) (“the nonmoving party must come forward with ‘specific facts showing that there is a
26 *genuine issue for trial.*’”) (quoting former Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)) (emphasis in *Matsushita*);
27
28

Precision Airmotive Corp. v. Rivera, 288 F.Supp.2d 1151, 1154 (W.D. Wash. 2003) (“A continuance is not justified when all the information and knowledge is already in Plaintiff’s possession.”).

Moreover, in light of *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC*, 547 U.S. 388 (2006), where the Supreme Court held that there should be no presumption of harm where the holder of a patent does not commercially exploit the patented invention, this Court finds that the same reasoning should apply under the fourth fair use factor where a copyright holder does not commercially exploit a copyrighted work. *See Salinger v. Colting*, 607 F.3d 68 (2nd Cir. 2010) (applying *eBay*'s reasoning to copyright law); *Blanch v. Koons*, 467 F. 3d 244, 258 (2d Cir. 2006) (fourth factor "greatly favors" a fair use finding where the copyright holder was not commercially exploiting photograph); *Field*, 412 F. Supp. 2d at 1121 (fourth factor favored defendant where there was "no evidence of any market for [the copyright holder's] works."); NIMMER ON COPYRIGHT § 13.05[A][4] (2010) ("On occasion, the lack of market harm is apparent."). This factor also weighs in favor of defendants.

Finally, the four factors must be considered “in light of the purposes of copyright,” which are “[t]o promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts and to serve the welfare of the public.” *Perfect 10 v. Amazon.com*, 508 F.3d at 1163 (internal citations omitted). In light of the above findings, the Court concludes that Defendants’ use advances the Copyright Act’s purpose.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that summary judgment be GRANTED in favor of Defendants.

DATED this ____ day of March, 2011.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Submitted by:

1 OLSON, CANNON,
2 GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX
3

4 By: James R. Olson ^{9/16/09}
5

6 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.
7 Nevada Bar No. 000116
8 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.
9 Nevada Bar No. 004762
10 CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.
11 Nevada Bar No. 009166
12 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
14 Attorneys for Defendants
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 25th day of March, 2011, I served the foregoing,
**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE AND, ALTERNATIVELY, REQUEST FOR A CONTINUANCE TO CONDUCT
DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO FRCP 56(f), on:**

Shawn A. Mangano, Esq.
RIGHHAVEN LLC
9960 West Cheyenne Avenue, Suite 210
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129-7701
shawn@manganolaw.com

Anne Pieroni, Esq.
Righthaven LLC
9960 West Cheyenne Avenue, Suite 210
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129-7701
ccoons@righthaven.com
jchu@righthaven.com

through the CM/ECF system of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada (or, if necessary, by U.S. Mail, first class, postage prepaid), upon the following:

Barbara Abbott

AN EMPLOYEE OF OLSON, CANNON,
GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX