

1 Charles S. Baker (*pro hac vice*)
2 Lance T. Lackey (*pro hac vice*)
3 BROBECK, PHLEGER & HARRISON
4 LLP
5 4801 Plaza on the Lake
6 Austin, TX 78746
7 Telephone: (512) 330-4000
8 Facsimile: (512) 330-4001

9 Debra E. Pole (SBN 97816)
10 Sarah J. Barney (SBN 183910)
11 BROBECK, PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP
12 550 South Hope Street
13 Los Angeles, CA 90071
14 Telephone: (213) 489-4060
15 Facsimile: (213) 745-3345

16 John M. Benassi (SBN 74137)
17 Colbern C. Stuart, III (SBN 177897)
18 Matthew C. Lapple (SBN 193546)
19 BROBECK, PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP
20 12390 El Camino Real
21 San Diego, CA 92130
22 Telephone: (858) 720-2500
23 Facsimile: (858) 720-2555

24 Cindy A. Cohn (SBN 145997)
25 Fred Von Lohmann (SBN 192657)
26 Robin D. Gross (SBN 200701)
27 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER
28 FOUNDATION
454 Shotwell Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
Telephone: (415) 436-9333
Facsimile: (415) 436-9993

Joseph R. Taylor (SBN 129933)
Jeffrey K. Compton (SBN 142969)
Max J. Sprecher (SBN 169285)
LINER YANKELEVITZ
SUNSHINE & REGENSTREIF
3130 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 200
Santa Monica, CA 90403
Telephone: (310) 453-5900
Facsimile: (310) 453-5901

Attorneys for Defendants
MusicCity.com, Inc. (now known
as StreamCast Networks, Inc.)
and MusicCity Networks, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

GROKSTER, LTD., et al.,

Defendants.

[Continued on Next Page]

Case No. CV 01-09923 SVW (PJWx)
(Consolidated with CV 01-08541 SVW (PJWx))

~~CONFIDENTIAL - FILED UNDER SEAL~~

**REPLY OF DEFENDANTS
MUSICCITY.COM, INC. (NOW KNOWN
AS STREAMCAST NETWORKS, INC.)
AND MUSICCITY NETWORKS, INC. IN
SUPPORT OF MOTIONS FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

[Compendium of Reply Declarations of Steven
D. Gribble, Matthew Lapple and Darrell Smith
Filed Herewith]

1 JERRY LEIBER, et al.,
2 Plaintiffs,
3 v.
4 CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT
BV a/k/a FASTTRACK, et al.,
5 Defendants.
6
7

Date: December 2, 2002
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Ctvm: 6 (Spring Street)
Hon. Stephen V. Wilson

8 AND COUNTERCLAIMS.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page #</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. Plaintiffs’ Contributory Infringement Claim is Foreclosed By <i>Sony-Betamax</i>	2
1. Plaintiffs’ Cannot Show that StreamCast Had Both Specific Knowledge of, and the Capacity to Prevent Acts of Direct Infringement.	2
2. Plaintiffs have Failed to Come Forward with Any Knowledge Evidence Sufficient to Trump <i>Sony-Betamax</i>	6
3. Plaintiffs Recitation of “Many Additional Reasons” to Ignore the Supreme Court’s Binding Precedent of <i>Sony-Betamax</i> are Unavailing.	7
4. Because Morpheus is Capable of Substantial Noninfringing Uses, Partial Summary Judgment on Contributory Infringement is Appropriate.....	8
B. Plaintiffs’ Vicarious Liability Claim Fails Because StreamCast Lacks the Ability to Control the Allegedly Infringing Activities of Morpheus Users.....	9
C. The Ability to Redesign a Product Does not Constitute Control over the Activities of Users.	11
III. CONCLUSION	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page #

Cases

A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.,
239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2001) 1

Adobe Systems Inc. v. Canus Prods.,
173 F. Supp.2d 1044, 1053 (C.D. Cal. 2001) 9, 12

Artists Music v. Reed Publishing,
31 U.S.P.Q.2d 1623, 1627 (S.D.N.Y. 1994)..... 12

Cybiotronics, Ltd. v. Golden Source Elec., Ltd.,
130 F. Supp. 2d 1152, 1155-56 (C.D. Cal. 2001) 8

Ellison v. Robertson,
189 F. Supp.2d 1051 (C.D. Cal. 2001) 2, 9, 12

Fonovisa, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.,
2002 WL 398676 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2002)..... 4, 9

In re Aimster Copyright Litigation,
2002 WL 31006142 (N.D.Ill. Sept. 4, 2002) 5, 7, 8, 9

*Religious Technology Center v. Netcom On-Line Communication
Services, Inc.*,
907 F. Supp. 1361 (N.D. Cal. 1995)..... 3

Universal City Studios, Inc. v. Sony Corp. of Amer.,
480 F. Supp. 429, 459 (C.D. Cal. 1979) 1, 3, 5, 12

Vault Corp v. Quaid Software, Ltd.,
847 F.2d. 255 (5th Cir. 1988)..... 3, 7

Statutes

17 U.S.C. 512(l)..... 12

Other Authorities

S. Rep. 105-190, 105th Cong., 2d Sess. (May 11, 1998) at 55..... 12
Senator Hollings’ Consumer Broadband and Digital Television
Promotion Act,
S. 2048, 107th Cong., 2d Sess. (introduced March 21, 2002) 12

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

2 As the Supreme Court recognized in *Sony Corp. v. Universal City Studios*, 464
3 U.S. 417 (1984) (“*Sony-Betamax*”), every expansion of copyright’s secondary
4 liability doctrines in the technology context effectively expands copyright’s statutory
5 monopoly, granting to copyright owners exclusive dominion over the technology in
6 question. *See id.* at 441 n.21. Called upon to apply judge-made doctrines of
7 secondary copyright liability to a new technology, the Court counseled restraint.
8 “The judiciary’s reluctance to expand the protections afforded by the copyright
9 without explicit legislative guidance is a recurring theme. Sound policy, as well as
10 history, supports our consistent deference to Congress when major technological
11 innovations alter the market for copyrighted works.” *Id.* at 431 (internal citations
12 omitted). In opposing the motions for partial summary judgment brought by
13 Defendants StreamCast Networks, Inc. and MusicCity.com (collectively,
14 “StreamCast”), by contrast, Plaintiffs urge this Court to expand dramatically the
15 reach of copyright’s secondary liability doctrines in their effort to stamp out a
16 technology that has, unfortunately, been used by some to infringe their copyrights.

17 **Contributory liability**: Plaintiffs argue that the “staple article of commerce”
18 doctrine set out in *Sony-Betamax* evaporates in the face of “[g]eneral knowledge that
19 users are engaged in infringement.” Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to
20 Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment (“Pls. Opp.”) at 10:20-21.¹ *A&M*
21 *Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2001) (“*Napster II*”) and *Sony-*
22 *Betamax* reject this standard and make it clear that, where a technology capable of
23 substantial noninfringing uses is involved, a copyright owner must demonstrate that
24 the defendant had **both** *specific knowledge* of the infringing activities of end-users
25 **and** *the capacity to act* on such knowledge to prevent the infringement.

26 ¹ Plaintiffs’ contend that “where the defendant’s knowledge of infringement is
27 shown by evidence other than the mere capacity of its technology for infringing use, it
28 does not matter how substantial the noninfringing uses are or may someday be.” Pls.
Opp. p. 12:7-9. The *Sony Betamax* itself could not have survived under such a rule, nor
could myriad other technologies, including photocopiers, CD burners, audio cassette
recorders, digital scanners, email software and even the pencil.

1 **Vicarious liability**: Unable to produce any evidence that StreamCast is able to
2 control or supervise the searching, sharing and downloading activities of Morpheus
3 users, Plaintiffs ask this Court to be the first to hold that the “control” element of
4 vicarious liability is satisfied whenever a technology vendor could have designed the
5 accused technology differently. Such an interpretation would effectively empower
6 copyright owners to demand that any technology capable of infringing a copyright be
7 redesigned to their specifications. Plaintiffs’ expansive view of “control” for
8 vicarious liability is foreclosed by *Napster II*, *Ellison v. Robertson*, 189 F. Supp.2d
9 1051 (C.D. Cal. 2001) and other authorities that require that Plaintiffs show that the
10 *existing* versions of Morpheus afford StreamCast the right and ability to control *the*
11 *allegedly infringing activities* – the searching, sharing and downloading Plaintiffs’
12 works – of Morpheus users.

13 **II. ARGUMENT**

14 **A. Plaintiffs’ Contributory Infringement Claim is Foreclosed By *Sony-*** 15 ***Betamax*.**

16 **1. Plaintiffs’ Cannot Show that StreamCast Had Both Specific** 17 **Knowledge of, and the Capacity to Prevent Acts of Direct** 18 **Infringement.**

19 Plaintiffs’ effort to resist summary judgment on contributory infringement
20 rests on a single mistaken legal premise: that the *Sony-Betamax* “staple article of
21 commerce” doctrine is to be brushed aside whenever a technology vendor has
22 knowledge, however general and from whatever source, of infringing activity by
23 users of its products and regardless of its capability to act on that knowledge. *See* Pls.
24 *Opp.* at 11-12.

25 Plaintiffs’ view can neither be squared with *Sony-Betamax*, nor with
26 subsequent precedents. If tested against Plaintiffs’ proposed standard, Sony itself
27 would have been held contributorily liable in *Sony-Betamax*, as its own executives
28 admitted to having *actual* knowledge of infringing activity by Betamax owners. *See*
Universal City Studios, Inc. v. Sony Corp. of Amer., 480 F. Supp. 429, 459 (C.D. Cal.

1 1979); *see also Vault Corp v. Quaid Software, Ltd.*, 847 F.2d. 255 (5th Cir. 1988)
2 (defendant had actual knowledge²). Indeed, Sony included a caution against
3 infringing use in the owner’s manual for the device. *See Universal*, 480 F. Supp. at
4 429, 436. Under Plaintiffs’ distortion of *Sony-Betamax*, moreover, the motion picture
5 studios would be entitled to refile their contributory infringement claim against Sony
6 at any time, so long as they included in their complaint a few news reports and user
7 surveys regarding the infringing activities of VCR users. *See Pls. Opp.* at 12:7-9
8 (general knowledge from any source is enough to defeat *Sony-Betamax*). This
9 reading of *Sony-Betamax* is entirely inconsistent with common sense and the breadth
10 of both the majority and minority opinions. *See Sony-Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 421
11 (“Given these findings, there is *no basis* in the Copyright Act upon which
12 respondents can hold petitioners liable for distributing VTRs to the general public.”)
13 (emphasis added); *id.* at 486-93 (Blackmun, J., dissenting).

14 Plaintiffs’ diminution of the *Sony-Betamax* ruling also cannot be squared with
15 the Ninth Circuit’s ruling in *Napster II*, where the court went out of its way to
16 recognize and uphold the central tenets of *Sony-Betamax*. *See Napster II*, 239 F.3d at
17 1020-22. Although the court affirmed the district court’s findings regarding the
18 varied forms of general knowledge possessed by Napster, it did not end its analysis
19 of contributory infringement there (as Plaintiffs would have this Court do). Rather,
20 the Ninth Circuit specifically reprimanded the district court for failing to take the
21 “staple article of commerce” doctrine adequately into account. *See id.* After
22 discussing *Sony-Betamax* and *Religious Technology Center v. Netcom On-Line*
23 *Communication Services, Inc.*, 907 F. Supp. 1361 (N.D. Cal. 1995), the court
24 concluded that a plaintiff must show more than general knowledge of infringing

25 _____
26 ² Plaintiffs attempt to distinguish *Vault* by arguing that the defendant’s actual
27 knowledge in that case was merely that its product was being used to make
28 “unauthorized” (rather than infringing) copies of copyrighted software. *See Pls. Opp.* p.
12, fn. 8. As the remainder of the opinion makes clear, however, the court’s application
of the staple article of commerce doctrine did not depend on a prior conclusion that the
defendant’s knowledge was limited solely to noninfringing unauthorized uses. *See*
Vault, 847 F.2d at 264.

1 activity. *See id.* In the end, the Ninth Circuit expressly conditioned Napster’s
2 contributory liability on the conjunction of *specific knowledge* and *a capacity to act*:
3 “Napster has *actual* knowledge that *specific* infringing material is available using its
4 system, that it could block access to the system by suppliers of the infringing
5 material, and that it failed to remove the material.” *Id.* at 1022 (emphasis in original).

6 The district court’s later ruling in *Fonovisa, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, 2002 WL
7 398676 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2002)(“*Napster IV*”) is not to the contrary. That ruling
8 involved a motion to dismiss, in which Napster argued that evidence of actual
9 knowledge was necessary to pierce the protection of the *Sony-Betamax* shield. The
10 district court disagreed, noting that either actual or constructive knowledge can be
11 enough for contributory infringement. *See id.* at *7. StreamCast here does not
12 challenge this ruling. The crucial question raised by StreamCast’s motion for
13 summary judgment is not whether the relevant knowledge standard is subjective or
14 objective, but rather whether Plaintiffs have presented any evidence that StreamCast
15 had *any* knowledge (whether actual or constructive) *of the relevant sort* – that a
16 particular Morpheus user was engaging in infringing activity – *at the relevant time*
17 (when it had the capacity to act upon it). This was precisely the sort of knowledge
18 that Napster had. Because its centralized file index processed users’ search requests
19 and kept a real time record of what files were being offered for downloading,
20 Napster had actual knowledge that particular users were engaged in infringement
21 when it could prevent it.

22 In other words, Judge Patel’s ruling in *Napster IV* supports StreamCast’s
23 position: Plaintiffs have the burden of showing that StreamCast knew (actual
24 knowledge), or reasonably should have known (constructive knowledge), that a
25 particular Morpheus user was engaging in infringing activities (specific knowledge)
26 at a time when it could have taken steps to prevent such activities (capacity to act).
27 Nowhere does the opinion suggest that generalized knowledge that Napster was

28 ///

1 being used for infringement was enough to trump *Sony-Betamax*.³ See also
2 *Universal*, 480 F. Supp. at 459-60 (rejecting movie studios’ suggestion that general
3 knowledge could be basis for contributory infringement liability). Rather, Judge
4 Patel specifically noted that, where a technology capable of substantial noninfringing
5 uses is concerned, the Ninth Circuit had made it clear that liability requires both
6 *specific knowledge* and a *capacity to act*. See *id.* at *7 (“This combination of
7 knowledge and failure to act trumped *Sony-Betamax* concerns.”).

8 Plaintiffs’ extensive reliance on *In re Aimster Copyright Litigation*, 2002 WL
9 31006142 (N.D.Ill. Sept. 4, 2002), is also misplaced. There, the court expressly
10 noted it did not treat the *Napster* decisions as binding precedent. See *Aimster*, at *2
11 fn.3. This may explain the court’s mistaken view of the kind of knowledge required
12 in the contributory infringement context. See *id.* at *13. (“[T]here is absolutely no
13 indication in the precedential authority that such specificity of knowledge is required
14 in the contributory infringement context”) (first emphasis added). Notwithstanding
15 the *Aimster* court’s attitude toward the *Napster* opinion, however, it would appear
16 that *Aimster* had specific knowledge, in the form of individual users being identified
17 by “buddy” name, and because *Aimster* actively assisted its users in locating top 40
18 hits. See *id.* at *13. Furthermore, because *Aimster* could effectively block users from
19 accessing the *Aimster* network, *Aimster* also had the capacity to act on the
20 knowledge. See *id.* at *16. Accordingly, the ruling in *Aimster* addressed a set of facts
21 far more similar to those in *Napster* (where all infringing traffic went through
22 *Napster*’s servers) than those of the instant case.⁴

23 _____
24 ³ Judge Patel’s example of the kind of evidence that might show constructive
25 knowledge sufficient to trump *Sony-Betamax* is also instructive. The court opined that if
26 *Napster* extended *an individual invitation to a specific individual* with a large collection
27 of music in order to supplement the stock of files available, such conduct could support
28 a finding of constructive knowledge sufficient to overcome *Sony-Betamax*. *Napster IV*
at *7. The constructive knowledge in the court’s example is both *specific* as to a
particular individual’s infringing conduct, and admits of *Napster*’s capacity to act upon
such knowledge in the form of blocking the user from accessing the network.

⁴ Additionally, the *Aimster* opinion was a determination of a preliminary
injunction motion under a surprisingly low standard. In the Seventh Circuit the plaintiff
need only demonstrate “some likelihood of success on the merits.” *Id.* at *9.

1 **2. Plaintiffs have Failed to Come Forward with Any Knowledge**
2 **Evidence Sufficient to Trump *Sony-Betamax*.**

3 Plaintiffs have failed to come forward with any evidence showing that
4 StreamCast had specific knowledge of infringing activity together with the capacity
5 to do something about it. Instead, much as in their opening brief seeking summary
6 judgment, Plaintiffs cite to a large collection of irrelevant evidence, none of which
7 establishes specific knowledge or failure to act with respect to any allegedly
8 infringing activities by users of the Gnutella-based versions of Morpheus.

9 First, Plaintiffs cite to evidence relating to users of earlier StreamCast
10 products.⁵ Pls. Opp. at 6-7. Such evidence, even if admissible⁶, cannot give rise to
11 specific knowledge with respect to infringing activity on the part of particular
12 Morpheus users after the transition to the Gnutella-based version in March 2002.⁷

13 Second, Plaintiffs invoke precisely the sorts of general knowledge evidence
14 that the Ninth Circuit in *Napster II* found insufficient to overcome *Sony-Betamax*.
15 Pls. Opp. at 7-8. The sophistication of StreamCast executives, the fact that they have
16 acted to protect StreamCast's own intellectual property, and the existence of press
17 reports comparing Morpheus to Napster—none of these categories of evidence create
18 any specific knowledge of infringing activity by any particular user of the Gnutella-
19 based Morpheus software. *See Napster II*, 239 F.3d at 1020-21 (after affirming
20 district court's finding regarding knowledge, going on to require specific knowledge

21 _____
22 ⁵ This applies to Plaintiffs' evidence regarding OpenNap, Pltfs. SUF 3(c)-(e), the
23 inadvertent collection of the search requests of some users of Morpheus v. 1.2, Pltfs.
24 SUF 3(h), messages posted to bulleting boards prior to March 2002, Pltfs. SUF 3(j),
email sent to users prior to March 2002, Pltfs. SUF 3(p), promotional efforts prior to
March 2002, Pltfs. SUF 3(l) & 3(n), and use of earlier versions of the software by
StreamCast employees and executives, Pltfs. SUF 3(i).

25 ⁶ StreamCast has disputed the majority of this evidence in its Statement of
Genuine Issues, and also intends to file evidentiary objections prior to the hearing.

26 ⁷ Contrary to Plaintiffs' suggestion, StreamCast does not contend that the shift to
27 the Gnutella-based product "magically cleanse[d]" it of knowledge. Pls. Opp. at 8. This
evidence, however, relates to liability (if any) that might arise from distribution of the
28 earlier versions of Morpheus, which is outside the scope of the instant motion for
summary judgment. Certainly it cannot be the case that knowledge of infringement
relating to an earlier product will forever taint an enterprise, making it liable for every
infringement by an end-user using any subsequent product.

1 and capacity to act after applying *Sony-Betamax*).

2 Plaintiffs, then, are left to establish knowledge with the “infringement notices”
3 delivered to StreamCast since March 2002. As discussed in StreamCast’s opening
4 brief, it is undisputed that these notices come too late, at a time when StreamCast had
5 no ability to act on them. *See*, StreamCast’s Contributory Motion at 14-18. Rather
6 than introduce contrary evidence, Plaintiffs merely reference their vicarious liability
7 argument. Pls. Opp. at 9.⁸ Nothing cited therein, however, demonstrates any capacity
8 on the part of StreamCast to prevent infringing activity by any Morpheus user
9 identified in Plaintiffs’ infringement notices either, absent redesigning the Morpheus
10 software. Plaintiffs’ own expert admits that StreamCast (unlike Napster or Aimster)
11 has no ability to “block” Morpheus users from joining the global Gnutella network,
12 nor to monitor, or control a Morpheus users’ ability to search for, share, or download
13 files.⁹

14 **3. Plaintiffs Recitation of “Many Additional Reasons” to Ignore**
15 **the Supreme Court’s Binding Precedent of *Sony-Betamax* are**
16 **Unavailing.**

17 Plaintiffs’ notion that defendants must first clear numerous “hurdles” before
18 invoking the *Sony-Betamax* doctrine lacks support in any of the leading cases
19 applying the doctrine. *See Sony-Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 434-42 (no discussion of
20 “prerequisites” in applying the “staple article of commerce” doctrine); *Vault*, 847
21 F.2d at 263-67 (same); *Napster II*, 239 F.3d at 1020-21 (same). For the reasons
22 discussed in StreamCast’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment,
23 Plaintiffs’ arguments should be rejected here as well. StreamCast’s Opposition at
24 ///

25 ⁸ To the extent Plaintiffs meant to suggest that StreamCast could redesign the
26 Morpheus software to enable somehow the ability to centrally police individual end-user
27 conduct, this argument fails for the reasons discussed below at pp. 9-13.

28 ⁹ *See* Horowitz Depo. 152:15-154:12; 155:11-156:18; 156:19-157:20; 158:10-
159:5; 159:7-162:1; 162:10-163:5; 163:13-19; 163:21-165:10; 129:7-132:15; 135:19-
136:14; 136:16-137:13; 137:18-138:13; 142:5-143:10; 143:25-146:11; 146:18-147:16;
147:22-148:19, attached to the Reply Declaration of Matthew Lapple as Ex. 1 (“Lapple
Reply Decl.”); *see also* Gribble Decl. ¶ 34, filed with StreamCast’s Vicarious Motion.

1 27-30; *see also* Brief of *Amicus Curiae* Consumer Electronics Association at 7-9.¹⁰

2 **4. Because Morpheus is Capable of Substantial Noninfringing**
3 **Uses, Partial Summary Judgment on Contributory**
4 **Infringement is Appropriate.**

5 Plaintiffs have the burden of proving that Morpheus is incapable of any
6 substantial noninfringing uses. *See Sony-Betamax*, 464 U.S. at 434. This is made
7 clear in the patent context, from whence the Supreme Court adopted the “staple
8 article of commerce” doctrine. *See Cybionics, Ltd. v. Golden Source Elec., Ltd.*,
9 130 F. Supp. 2d 1152, 1155-56 (C.D. Cal. 2001). Plaintiffs have not shouldered their
10 burden here.

11 Morpheus is plainly capable of (and is, in fact, being used for) substantial
12 noninfringing uses. *See* StreamCast’s Contributory Motion pp. 4-8. Contrary to
13 Plaintiffs’ gloss on the undisputed evidence, a number of the current noninfringing
14 uses of Morpheus are commercial in nature. *See* Ian Decl.¹¹ ¶ 8 (increase in revenue
15 to performer results from P2P distribution), Mayers Decl. ¶¶ 2, 6-8 (for profit
16 business built on promoting copyrighted content on P2P networks), Prelinger Decl.
17 ¶¶ 6, 12-18 (for-profit business generates leads from wide redistribution). Other
18 current noninfringing uses, while perhaps not narrowly “commercial,” are
19 nevertheless “substantial” insofar as they further important public policy goals, such
20 as dissemination of public domain works. *See* Kahle Decl. ¶¶ 7, 14-18, Newby Decl.
21 ¶¶ 4, 10-12. Although invocation of *Sony-Betamax* requires a showing of “mere
22 capability,” the undisputed evidence shows that a number of the noninfringing uses
23 are actual and already underway on the global Gnutella network. *See* Hoekmann
24 Decl. ¶¶ 4-6, 9 (verifying availability of Gutenberg, J!VE files, and certain NASA
25 video files).¹²

25 ¹⁰ To the extent that *Aimster* suggests otherwise, it does so in dicta (because
26 *Aimster* had specific knowledge of direct infringement and failed to act on it) and
represents an erroneous reading of the relevant precedents.

27 ¹¹ The cited declarations in this section were all originally filed as part of
StreamCast’s Contributory Motion.

28 ¹² Even record company executives acknowledge in the press that P2P has the
potential for substantial commercial noninfringing uses. *See* Lapple Reply Decl. Ex. 3.

1 **B. Plaintiffs’ Vicarious Liability Claim Fails Because StreamCast**
2 **Lacks the Ability to Control the Allegedly Infringing Activities of**
3 **Morpheus Users.**

4 To defeat StreamCast’s motion for partial summary judgment with respect to
5 vicarious liability arising from the Gnutella-based versions of Morpheus, Plaintiffs
6 must point to evidence demonstrating that StreamCast has “the right and ability to
7 supervise the infringing activities” of Morpheus users—in other words, the
8 searching, sharing and downloading of Plaintiffs’ copyrighted works. *Fonovisa, Inc.*
9 *v. Cherry Auction, Inc.*, 76 F.3d 254, 262 (9th Cir. 1996); *see* StreamCast’s
10 Vicarious Motion at 8-9.

11 Although Plaintiffs point to a mountain of irrelevant evidence, there is no
12 dispute that, within the existing architecture of Morpheus, StreamCast has no right or
13 ability to control what particular users search for, share or download.¹³ Plaintiffs’
14 own expert candidly admitted as much in his deposition. *See* Lapple Reply Decl. Ex.
15 1, cited *infra* at 7.

16 Rather than dispute this, Plaintiffs point to StreamCast’s ability to influence
17 certain characteristics of all instances of the Morpheus software generally. To the
18 extent much of this evidence is addressed in StreamCast’s Opposition Brief, those
19 arguments will not be reiterated here. *See* StreamCast’s Opp. pp. 9-16. In short, the
20 difficulty with this evidence is its irrelevance to the central issue—whether
21 StreamCast has the ability to control the activities of particular Morpheus users. *See*
22 *Adobe Systems Inc. v. Canus Prods.*, 173 F. Supp.2d 1044, 1053 (C.D. Cal. 2001)
23 (“control” element not met despite control over general characteristics of trade
24 show); *Ellison v. Robertson*, 189 F. Supp.2d 1051, 1062 (AOL’s control over general
25 characteristics of its newsgroup servers insufficient to satisfy “control” element).

26 In their Opposition Brief, however, Plaintiffs raise two new categories of
27 evidence in their effort to forestall partial summary judgment. First, Plaintiffs make

28 ¹³ This is stark contrast to the facts in both *Napster* and *Aimster*, where the
 defendants had the ability to control file sharing activities by blocking those users
 accused of infringement from “logging in” and accessing the network. *See Napster II*,
 239 F.3d at 1023; *Aimster* 2002 WL 31006142, at *16.

1 much of the “auto.xml” file, which is a text file stored on StreamCast’s servers that is
2 read by the Morpheus 2.0 software on a regular basis while it is running. In essence,
3 this file automatically imparts certain technical information when queried by the
4 Morpheus software. Plaintiffs claim that StreamCast “controls” its users through this
5 auto.xml file because StreamCast can cause the Morpheus software to act differently.
6 Plaintiffs’ own expert, however, admits that nothing in the functioning of the
7 “auto.xml” file affords StreamCast any ability to control what any particular user
8 searches for, shares or downloads. *See* Horowitz Depo. 130:11-14, Ex. 1 to Lapple
9 Reply Decl.; *see also* Gribble Reply Decl. ¶¶ 11-14.

10 In addition, Plaintiffs state that StreamCast can “force” an upgrade on existing
11 Morpheus users, and could thereby control infringing activity by altering the
12 software and forcing it upon users. The record incontrovertibly establishes that
13 Plaintiffs are mistaken.¹⁴ While it is true that StreamCast could, by using the
14 “auto.xml” file, download software to a user’s PC and invoke one of the standard
15 installer programs bundled with Windows, Plaintiffs’ own expert admits that the user
16 can abort the installation process prior to the full installation of this software. *See*
17 Horowitz Depo. 210:21-211:8, 215:17-20. As a result, the “auto.xml” file can require
18 that an upgrade be downloaded by an existing Morpheus user, and can begin the
19 installation process, but cannot *require* that a user actually complete the installation
20 process.¹⁵ *See* Gribble Reply Decl. ¶¶ 9-10.

21 Second, Plaintiffs contend that Morpheus somehow “takes control” of files
22 that reside in the Kazaa “shared folder” (for Morpheus users who have previously
23 installed Kazaa on the same PC), forcing users to share these files despite the setting
24

25 ¹⁴ As an initial matter, Plaintiffs have introduced no evidence to contradict
StreamCast’s assertion that this has never been done.

26 ¹⁵ StreamCast notes that the issue of whether StreamCast can force a download
27 and begin (but not complete) an installation has been muddied by the fact that
StreamCast’s witnesses, Darrell Smith and Dr. Gribble, examined and testified about
28 Morpheus version 2.0.1.6, whereas Plaintiffs’ expert opined regarding Morpheus
version 2.0.1.8. This apparent discrepancy is clarified in the accompanying reply
declaration of Darrell Smith. Smith Reply Decl. ¶¶ 5-12.

1 of contrary preferences in Kazaa. Pls. Opp. at 22. Even if true, this evidence would
2 fail to raise a material issue of fact, as it does not establish any ability on the part of
3 StreamCast to control what files users search for, share, and download. Gribble
4 Reply Decl. ¶¶ 11-15.

5 Similarly, Plaintiffs’ claim that StreamCast’s “pervasive participation” is
6 sufficient to support the imposition of vicarious liability is built on a foundation of
7 irrelevancies. Nothing presented by Plaintiffs demonstrates that StreamCast
8 “participates” in the *infringing activities* of Morpheus users—namely, the searching
9 for, sharing, and downloading of files. In fact, all of the evidence supports the
10 opposite conclusion—it is undisputed that none of the search requests, search results,
11 or file transfers accomplished by Morpheus users ever traverses any StreamCast
12 servers. Gribble Decl. ¶ 34; Gribble Reply Decl. ¶¶ 11-14; Kleinrock Dep. 89:5-16,
13 Lapple Reply Decl. Ex. 2.

14 C. **The Ability to Redesign a Product Does not Constitute Control over**
15 **the Activities of Users.**

16 When shorn of irrelevant evidence, Plaintiffs are left with the argument that
17 StreamCast has the right and ability to control the allegedly infringing activities of
18 Morpheus users because StreamCast could redesign the software to enable such
19 control.¹⁶ This expansive reading of the vicarious liability doctrine unmoors it from
20 its respondeat superior foundations, transforming it into an affirmative duty on the
21 part of technology vendors to design technology so as to protect the interests of
22 copyright owners. This effort by Plaintiffs to obtain by judicial fiat what has been

23 ///

24 ///

25 _____
26 ¹⁶ In fact, Plaintiffs’ new expert, Dr. Horowitz, stated that simply having the
27 ability to modify a program’s source code, and then release an updated version of the
28 program to the public is, in his view, equivalent to the ability to control users of that
software program. Dr. Horowitz went so far as to agree that, under this view, Microsoft
has control over the browsing habits of users of Internet Explorer, simply because
Microsoft wrote Internet Explorer and could modify that program source code at will.
Horowitz Depo. 92:7-98:12.

1 denied to them in legislation¹⁷ runs counter to a variety of precedents. *See Napster II*,
2 239 F. 3d at 1024 (vicarious liability analyses must be “cabined by the system’s
3 current architecture); *Universal*, 480 F. Supp. at 462 (rejecting evidence offered to
4 show that Sony could have added a “jamming” system to the Betamax); *Ellison v.*
5 *Robertson*, 189 F. Supp.2d at 1060-62 (AOL did not have control over the infringing
6 activities of its subscribers, notwithstanding the fact that it had the ability to redesign
7 its system). *See also* StreamCast’s Opposition pp. 17-20; *Adobe v. Canus*, 173 F.
8 Supp.2d at 1054-55 (court evaluates “control” in light of the security force defendant
9 trade show had hired, notwithstanding the fact that trade show could have hired
10 more, better trained security staff); *Artists Music v. Reed Publishing*, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d
11 1623, 1627 (S.D.N.Y. 1994) (vicarious liability imposes no duty on trade show to
12 hire copyright-savvy security staff).¹⁸

13 III. CONCLUSION

14 For these reasons, StreamCast requests that the Court grant its Motions for
15 Partial Summary Judgment as to Contributory and Vicarious Liability.

16 Dated: November 4, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

17 BROBECK, PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP

18
19 By _____

Charles S. Baker

20 Attorneys for Defendants MusicCity.com, Inc. (now
21 known as StreamCast Networks, Inc.) and MusicCity
22 Networks, Inc.

23 _____
24 ¹⁷ Industry associations representing many of the Plaintiffs have publicly
25 supported legislative proposals, such as Senator Hollings’ Consumer Broadband and
26 Digital Television Promotion Act, S. 2048, 107th Cong., 2d Sess. (introduced March 21,
27 2002), that would have imposed exactly this obligation on digital technology vendors.
28 As yet, the measure has not made any progress in Congress.

¹⁸ Plaintiffs also press the rather puzzling argument that congress meant to
address the question of secondary liability for technology vendors in the “safe harbor”
provisions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (“DMCA”). Pls. Opp. at 31. This
argument is foreclosed by the plain language of the statute and accompanying
legislative history, where Congress made it quite plain that it did not intend to alter the
underlying law of secondary liability in any way. *See* 17 U.S.C. 512(i); S. Rep. 105-190,
105th Cong., 2d Sess. (May 11, 1998) at 55.

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