

04-480

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

METRO-GOLDWYN-MAYER STUDIOS INC., *et al.*,

Petitioners,

v.

GROKSTER, LTD., *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF THE
AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION
IN SUPPORT OF VACATUR AND REMAND**

MELVIN C. GARNER,
President-Elect
AMERICAN
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW ASSOCIATION
2001 Jefferson Davis Hwy.
Suite 203
Arlington, Virginia 22202
(703) 415-0780

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Counsel of Record
DAVID R. TODD
WORKMAN NYDEGGER
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 533-9800

January 24, 2005

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT	8
I. The Ninth Circuit Failed To Recognize That “Contributory Infringement” After <i>Sony</i> Properly Includes “Active Inducement” And Thus Too Narrowly Identified The Circumstances Under Which <i>Sony</i> Allows For “Contributory Infringement” When There Has Been A Showing of “Substantial Noninfringing Uses”	8
II. “Active Inducement” Is A Proper Basis For “Contributory Infringement” After <i>Sony</i> , Even When There Has Been A Showing of “Substantial Noninfringing Uses”	10
A. Patent Law, From Which <i>Sony</i> Derived Its Standard, Demonstrates That A Showing of “Substantial Noninfringing Uses” Is Not A Defense When There Is “Active Inducement”.....	13
B. Recognizing “Active Inducement” As A Form of “Contributory Infringement” Is Substantiated By Pre-1952 Patent Law.....	16
C. Recognizing “Active Inducement” As A Form of “Contributory Infringement” Is Fully Consistent With <i>Sony</i>	19
III. Vacatur And Remand Are Appropriate Because The Lower Courts Did Not Consider “Active Inducement”	21
CONCLUSION	24

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CASES

<i>Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.</i> , 377 U.S. 476 (1964).....	14
<i>Henry v. A.B. Dick Co.</i> , 224 U.S. 1 (1912).....	17, 18, 20, 21
<i>Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg. Co.</i> , 243 U.S. 502 (1917).....	17
<i>Sony Corp. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> , 464 U.S. 417 (1984).....	passim

OTHER CASES

<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Systems, Inc.</i> , 911 F.2d 670 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	13
<i>Gershwin Publishing Corp. v. Columbia Artists Mgmt., Inc.</i> , 443 F.2d 1159 (2d Cir. 1971)	11, 12, 15
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	passim
<i>In re Aimster Copyright Litigation</i> , 334 F.3d 643 (7th Cir. 2003)	4
<i>Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster Ltd.</i> , 380 F.3d 1154 (9th Cir. 2004)	4, 9, 10
<i>Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.</i> , 259 F.Supp.2d 1029 (C.D. Cal. 2003)	10

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 271(b)..... 5, 14
35 U.S.C. § 271(c)..... 5, 13, 14

OTHER AUTHORITIES

CHISUM ON PATENTS § 17.03[3] (2004)..... 5
CHISUM ON PATENTS § 17.04[3] (2004)..... 15
CHISUM ON PATENTS § 17.04[4][f] (2004)..... 21
NIMMER ON COPYRIGHT § 12.04[A][2][a] (2004)..... 11

***AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF OF THE
AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION
IN SUPPORT OF VACATUR AND REMAND**

The American Intellectual Property Law Association (“the AIPLA”) respectfully submits this brief as *amicus curiae* in support of vacatur and remand.

INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE*

The AIPLA is a national bar association of more than 16,000 members with interests and practices primarily in the areas of patent, trademark, copyright, and trade secret law. Unlike areas of practice in which separate and distinct plaintiffs’ and defendants’ bars exist, most intellectual property lawyers represent both intellectual property owners and alleged infringers.

The AIPLA has no interest in any party to this litigation or stake in the outcome in this case, other than its interest in seeking a correct interpretation and application of the copyright laws.

In accordance with Supreme Court Rule 37.3(a), the AIPLA has obtained written consent to the filing of this brief from the counsel of record for the parties. The letters of consent have been filed with the Clerk of the Court.¹

¹ In accordance with Supreme Court Rule 37.6, *amicus curiae* states that this brief was not authored, in whole or in part, by counsel to a party, and that no monetary contribution to the preparation or submission of this brief was made by any person or entity other than the *amicus curiae* or its counsel.

