

Contents

PREFACE

PRELUDE	1
I. Music and Copyright: The Search to Separate Idea from Expression	2
A. Idea and Expression in Music	2
B. <i>Vivaldi v. Bach</i> : A Paradigm for the Ages	4
II. The Rise of Copyright: A Brief Review	5
 CHAPTER 1 The Copyright Law: An Overview	 9
I. The Lawyer's Mission	11
II. Basic Principles: An Introduction	12
III. The Idea/Expression Dichotomy	14
A. <i>Arnstein v. Porter</i> and Its Legacy	15
B. The Reinterpretation of <i>Arnstein v. Porter</i>	17
1. <i>Sid & Marty Krofft Television Productions Inc. v. McDonald's Corporation</i>	17
2. Fine Tuning <i>Krofft</i> : <i>Litchfield, Berkic, Aliotti and Olson</i>	19
3. <i>Shaw v. Lindheim</i> and <i>Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Company, Inc.</i>	21
4. An Interim Stopgap: <i>Latman's Probative Similarity</i>	23
5. Expert Testimony and the Future of the Two-Prong Test	23
IV. Filtration	24
A. The Use of Filtration to Separate Unprotectable Elements from Protected Expression: Two Early Formulations	24
B. Filtration: Contemporary Formulations	25
V. Expert Testimony under the Two-Prong Test: Suggested Alternatives	27
A. Combine the Two Tests	27
1. To Eliminate the Inherent Confusion Regarding Use of Expert Testimony	27
2. The Necessity for Musicology Experts: Recognition of the Complexity of Musical Language and the Public's Unfamiliarity with That Language	28

B. Recognition of Current Practice	28
1. Burden of Proof: Components and Responsibilities	28
2. Ritualized Procedures	29
C. The Copyright Registration Certificate and the Rebuttable Presumption	30
D. Music's Need for a Translator and Educator: Two Scenarios	30
1. Scenario Number One	31
2. Scenario Number Two	31
VI. Legal and Equitable Defenses	33
A. Statute of Limitations	33
1. Accrual	33
2. Tolling	36
B. Laches and Estoppel	38
1. The Two Defenses Compared	38
2. Laches	38
3. Estoppel	42
C. Other Defenses	44
1. Abandonment	45
2. Innocent Intent	45
3. <i>Res Judicata</i> and Collateral Estoppel	47
4. Unclean Hands and Misuse of Copyright	54
VII. Lack of Jurisdiction: Extraterritorial Acts	61
VIII. Conclusion: The Lawyer's Mission Redux	61
 CHAPTER 2 Remedies	 63
I. Actual Damages and Profits	66
A. Actual Damages	68
1. Lost Sales	69
2. Value of Use of the Copyrighted Work (The Imputed License Fee) The Deltak/Business Trends/Davis Trilogy	72
B. Profits	76
1. Profits and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles	77
2. <i>Sheldon v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures Corporation</i> : A Case Study	77
C. Indirect Profits	80
D. Apportionment of Profits	83
E. The Prohibition Against Double-Counting: The Courts Speak	83
F. Double-Counting and Statutory Damages	86
II. Statutory Damages: An Overview	88
A. Theory and Practice: The Need for Statutory Damages	88
B. Statutory Damages: Parsing the Statute	90
1. Section 504(c)(1)	90

2. " . . . all infringements involved in the action, with respect to any <i>one work</i> "	91
3. " . . . for which any one infringer is liable individually, or for which any two or more infringers are liable jointly and severally"	92
III. Multiple Infringements and Statutory Damages: The Courts	
Construe the Statute	93
A. The Predecessor to Section 504(c): The Supreme Court and Section 101(b) of the 1909 Act	93
B. The <i>Feltner/Columbia</i> Trilogy	94
1. <i>Columbia Pictures Television v. Krypton Broadcasting of Birmingham, Inc.</i>	95
2. <i>Feltner v. Columbia Pictures Television, Inc.</i> : Feltner Seeks a Jury Trial	96
3. <i>Columbia Pictures Television, Inc. v. Krypton Broadcasting of Birmingham, Inc.</i> : Feltner Gets His Jury Trial	97
4. Post- <i>Feltner</i> and Summary Judgments	98
C. Compilations and Their Constituent Elements	99
1. The Definition and Nature of Compilations	99
D. Derivative Works	102
1. The Statutes: Sections 504(c)(1), 101, 102 and 103	102
2. A Case in Point: <i>Gamma Audio & Video, Inc. v. Ean-Chea</i>	102
IV. Statutory Damages: Willful and Innocent Infringement	103
A. Section 504(c)(2): Enhanced and Remitted Statutory Damages	103
B. A Sampling of Statutory and Case Authorities	104
1. Willfulness	104
2. Innocence	108
V. Coda to Statutory Damages: Five Scenarios	109
1. Scenario No. 1	109
2. Scenario No. 2	110
3. Scenario No. 3	110
4. Scenario No. 4	110
5. Scenario No. 5	110
VI. Attorney's Fees	111
A. The Landscape Pre- <i>Fogerty v. Fantasy</i>	111
1. The Conflict Among the Circuits	111
2. A Sampling of Case Authorities on Opposite Sides of the "Dual" and "Evenhanded" Approaches	112
B. <i>Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.</i> : The Evenhanded Rule Prevails	114
1. The Supreme Court Speaks	114
2. The Ninth Circuit Converts	115
3. <i>Fantasy, Inc. v. Fogerty</i>	116

C. The “Prevailing Party”	117
1. Who Is the Prevailing Party?	117
2. A Sampling of Judicially Created Guidelines	118
VII. Costs	121
VIII. Arbitration	123
A. The Availability of Arbitration to Resolve Infringement Claims	123
B. <i>Kamakazi Music Corporation v. Robbins Music Corporation</i>	123
C. <i>The Federal Court v. The Arbitration Tribunal</i> : Advantages and Disadvantages	125
D. Practice Point: Whether to Choose Arbitration as a Remedy	126
IX. Injunctive Relief	129
A. General Principles	129
B. Temporary Restraining Orders	133
C. Preliminary Injunctions	134
1. General Considerations and Procedure	134
2. Elements for Obtaining Preliminary Injunction	135
D. Permanent Injunctions	140
X. Impoundment	141
A. Requirements and Court Discretion	141
B. Constitutionality of the Impoundment Procedure	143
C. Practical Considerations of an Impoundment Order	146

CHAPTER 3 The Basic Elements of Musical Language and Ideas: The Copyright Perspective 149

I. Music as Language	151
II. Copyright and the Components of Musical Language and Ideas	152
A. The Trinity: Melody, Harmony and Rhythm	152
1. Melody	153
2. Harmony	153
3. Rhythm	153
B. Supplementing the Trinity	154
C. The Building Blocks of Music	157
1. The Phrase	157
2. Motive (Motif)	157
3. Counterpoint	158
4. Tempo and Expression Marks	158
5. Meter	158
6. Two Basic Forms: Binary and Ternary Form	159
III. Musical Ideas and Expression: A Sampling	159
A. <i>Bach v. Mozart</i> and Chicago, Their Contemporary Colleagues: Using and Exploiting the Triad	159

B. Equal Temperament and <i>Scènes à Faire</i> : The Harmonic Imperative	162
1. Equal Temperament	162
2. <i>Scènes à Faire</i>	163
C. Musical <i>Scènes à Faire</i> : Two Examples	164
1. Progressions	164
2. Cadences: Two Examples	166
D. Comment: Harmony and <i>Scènes à Faire</i>	167
IV. Form/Structure and “Forms”	168
A. The Issue: A Question of Terminology and Context	168
B. § 102(b) of the Copyright Act: “Procedures, Processes, Systems”	169
C. Musical Form/Structure and “Procedures, Processes, Systems”	170
D. Conclusion: Original Musical Works and the Vast Storehouse of Musical Ideas and Building Blocks	171
 CHAPTER 4 Infringement and the Commencement of Litigation	 173
I. Pragmatism and Ethics: Initial Considerations	174
II. Pre-Meeting Tasks for the Parties	175
A. The Plaintiff	175
B. The Lawyer for the Plaintiff	175
C. The Lawyer for the Defendant	176
III. The Initial Office Conference	176
A. Clarifying the Plaintiff’s Perspective	176
B. Clarifying the Defendant’s Perspective	177
IV. The Demand Letter and the Response	177
A. The Demand Letter	177
B. The Response	178
V. Pleading: The Complaint and Answer	179
A. Theory and Practice	179
B. Preparation of the Complaint	181
1. Appendix of Forms, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	181
2. Complaint for Copyright Infringement (Basic Allegations in Compliance with Rule 8 of Federal Rules of Civil procedure)	182
3. Complaint for Infringement of Copyright and Unfair Competition (More Detailed Allegations)	186
C. Preparation of the Answer	192
VI. The Litigation Plan	196
A. The Need for a Litigation Plan	196
B. The Litigation Plan: A Suggested Format	196
VII. Final Thoughts	199

CHAPTER 5 The Importance of the Expert: The Musicological Expert	201
I. Infringement of Musical Works: The Importance of Expert Opinion and Guidance	202
A. The Dilemma of Explanation	203
B. Functions and Tasks of the Musical Expert	204
1. The <i>Daubert/Kumho Tire/Joiner</i> Trilogy and the "Gatekeeper" Function	204
2. Initial Considerations Before Retaining an Expert	206
II. Music Infringement: The Courts and the Search for Answers	207
A. <i>Arnstein v. Porter</i> and Progeny	207
B. The Survival and Modification of the Two-Step Analysis	210
1. The Intrinsic Test and the Expanded Role of Expert Opinion	211
2. <i>Swirsky v. Carey</i> : Another Misstep?	212
III. Selecting the Expert	215
A. Preliminary Tactical Considerations	215
B. Initial Steps In Selecting the Expert: Due Diligence and Research	216
C. The Initial Approach to the Expert	217
D. After the Expert Is Hired: The Next Steps	218
IV. The Gatekeeper Role of the Court: The <i>Daubert</i> Hearing	218
A. Qualifications of Experts: Four Scenarios	218
B. Determining What Will Be Played	222
V. The Musicological Expert: Translator and Teacher of Musical Language	223
VI. Rewriting to Avoid Claims	223
A. Preventive Law Explained	223
B. Musical Works and Preventive Law	226
 CHAPTER 6 The Importance of the Expert: The Apportionment Expert	 229
I. Historical Background and Rationale Underlying Apportionment	230
A. <i>Sheldon v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures Corporation</i>	
The Birth of Apportionment of Profits	231
B. The Progeny of <i>Sheldon</i> : A Brief History	233
II. The Apportionment Expert	242
A. Selecting the Expert(s)	242
1. The Industry Professional	243
2. The Pollster	243
3. The Disc Jockey ("DJ")	244
4. The Consumer Psychologist	244
5. The Academic	244
B. Suggested Criteria for Apportionment of Profits	245
1. The Value of the Infringed Work	245

2. Persona and Star Power	246
3. Customer Awareness	246
4. Awards and Award Shows	247
5. Value Attributed to Place or Position of Songs Appearing on CD Albums	247
C. Working with the Expert	248
1. Steps in Selecting the Expert	248
2. Initial and Follow-Up Contacts with the Expert	248
III. Final Thoughts: Apportionment and the Tolerance of Imperfection	249
 CHAPTER 7 Fair Use—Part One: An Introduction	 251
I. Fair Use: Background and Heritage	253
II. <i>Sony Corporation of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> : The Commercial Purpose Detour	257
A. New Technology: The <i>Betamax</i> Recorder	257
B. The District Court's Findings	258
C. Recording for Later Viewing: The Core Issues	259
1. Time-Shifting for Private Home Use	259
2. Contributory Infringement	259
D. The Importance of the Procedural Posture On Appeal	260
E. The Fair Use Factors	260
1. The First Factor: The Purpose and Character of the Use	260
2. The Second Factor: The Nature of The Copyrighted Work	261
3. The Third Factor: The Amount and Substantiality of the Portion Used In Relation to the Copyrighted Work As a Whole	261
4. The Fourth Factor: The Effect of the Use Upon the Potential Market for or Value of the Copyrighted Work	261
III. <i>Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises</i> : The Unpublished Work Detour	262
A. The Fair Use Factors:	264
1. The First Factor	264
2. The Second Factor	264
3. The Third Factor	265
4. The Fourth Factor	265
IV. Carrying the Torch; The Lower Courts Follow <i>Sony</i> and <i>Harper & Row</i>	266
A. <i>Salinger v. Random House, Inc.</i>	266
B. <i>Acuff-Rose Music, Inc. v. Campbell</i>	267
V. <i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i> : The Restoration of the Transformative/ Superseding Analysis	268

A. Fair Use Factors	268
1. First Factor	268
2. Second Factor	269
3. Third Factor	270
4. Fourth Factor	270
B. A Colleague's Comment on the Court's Holdings: Kennedy's Concurrence	271
VI. Purpose and Character of the Use: Additional Thoughts on the Transformative/Superseding Analysis and What Constitutes "Transformation"	271
A. Fair Use and Intrinsic Purpose of the Work Used by the Alleged Infringer	271
B. The Grateful Dead and the Expanding Reach of Fair Use	273
1. <i>Bill Graham Archives v. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.</i> : The Extended Limits of Fair Use	273
2. <i>Blanch v. Koons</i> : Satire Has Its Day in Court	275
3. <i>Clean Flicks of Colorado, LLC v. Soderbergh</i> : <i>Bill Graham Archives</i> Distinguished	278
4. <i>Ty, Inc. v. Publications International Ltd.</i>	280
VII. Conclusion	282

CHAPTER 8 Fair Use—Part Two: Borrowing, the Art of Parody and Other Exercises in Fair Use	285
I. The Origins and Uses of Parody and Satire	287
A. Parody: Traditional Languages and Music	287
B. Parody and Satire Defined	288
1. Parody	288
2. Satire	289
C. Parody and Satire: Fair Use under Copyright Law	289
1. Definition: A Point of Departure	289
2. Parody and Satire in Practice: The Struggles and Missteps	290
D. Parody and Its Targets	294
II. Common Sense and Clarification: <i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i>	294
III. Parody in Literature, Motion Pictures and the Visual Arts	299
IV. Musical Parody	303
A. Music and Lyrics	303
B. Music Only	305
V. Satire in Literature and the Theatre	309
A. The Satirist's Targets	309
B. Satire: A Form of Criticism	310
VI. Satire In Music: <i>Don Quixote</i> , Richard Strauss and Mozart	311
VII. The Convergence of Parody and Satire	312

VIII. The Quotation	314
A. Critics and Quotations	314
B. Quotations from Musical Works	314
C. The Conflict: Quotations from Copyrighted Musical Works	315
IX. Soundalikes: Their Uses and Abuses	319
A. Impressions/Imitations	319
B. The Violation of Rights of Publicity	320
C. State versus Federal Law: A Sampling from The Judiciary	321
1. The Federal Statutes: Applicable Provisions	321
2. The State Statute[s]: California Civil Code Section 3344	322
3. Reported Authorities	323
D. Analysis and Conclusions	329
E. Coda: An Alternative Approach	330
X. The Indirect Suppression of Parody, Satire, and Quotation	331
A. P.D.Q. Bach and "Safe Parody"	332
B. Indirect Suppression of Comment: A Case in Point	332
XI. Non-Musical and Musical Equivalents—A Brief Cadenza	333
XII. Coda: The Obscenity/Pornography Syndrome	334
 CHAPTER 9 Discovery	 337
I. Discovery Tools and Their Uses	339
II. The Discovery Plan: Ultimate Facts and Controlling Authorities	340
III. A Hypothetical Case Study: <i>Tunesmith v. Crater</i>	341
IV. Interrogatories	343
A. The Use and Abuse of Interrogatories	343
B. Objectives and Types of Interrogatories	344
C. Types of Interrogatories: Examples	344
1. Allegation Interrogatories: Plaintiff	344
2. Allegation Interrogatories: Defendant	345
3. Contention Interrogatories: Plaintiff	345
4. Contention Interrogatories: Defendant	345
5. Access Interrogatories: Plaintiff	345
6. Access Interrogatories: Defendant	345
7. Interrogatories Regarding Commonplace Building Blocks of Music (or standard Musical Devices Available to all Composers), Public Domain Material, Prior Art and Other Unprotectables: Defendant	345
8. Substantial Similarity Interrogatories: Defendant	346
D. Interrogatories	346
1. Plaintiff's Interrogatories	346
2. Defendant's Interrogatories	354

E. Requests for Production of Documents and Things	357
1. Defendant's Requests	357
2. Plaintiff's Requests	367
V. Requests for Admission	377
A. Practice Point	377
B. Defendant's Requests for Admission	378
C. Plaintiff's Requests for Admission	378
VI. The Taking of Depositions	378
A. Direct Questions	379
B. Open Questions	380
C. Oblique Questions	382
D. Protecting the Witness—An Imperative for Both Plaintiffs and Defendants	386
 CHAPTER 10 Music and Summary Judgment	387
I. Early History and the Anti-Summary Judgment Bias	389
II. <i>Celotex, Anderson, and Matsushita</i> : Clearing the Air	393
III. Specific Grounds for Summary Judgment in Copyright Litigation	394
A. Ownership and Access	394
1. Lack of Ownership	394
2. Lack of Access	394
B. Lack of Substantial Similarity of Protectable Expression	396
1. <i>Shaw v. Lindheim</i> : A Perplexing Detour	398
2. <i>Brown Bag Software v. Symantec Corporation</i> : The Retreat from <i>Shaw v. Lindheim</i>	399
IV. A Sampling of Unprotected Elements: Non-Musical Analogies	400
A. Ideas and Standard Literary Devices	400
B. Common Antecedent Sources and the Public Domain	401
C. Logic and the Doctrine of <i>Scènes à Faire</i>	402
D. Facts and Products of Research	403
V. The Merger of Idea and Expression	404
VI. A Sampling of Unprotected Musical Elements	405
VII. Music, the Judiciary and Summary Judgment: An Evolving Body of Authorities	406
A. <i>Baxter v. MCA, Inc.</i> : The "No-Bright-Line" Rule	406
B. <i>Smith v. Jackson</i>	407
C. <i>Newton v. Diamond</i>	407
D. <i>Bridgeport Music, Inc. v. Dimension Films</i>	408
E. <i>Swirsky v. Carey</i>	408
F. <i>Tisi v. Patrick</i>	409
1. Structure	410
2. Harmony	411

3. Melody	411
4. The Court's Holding	411
G. <i>Johnson v. Gordon</i>	412
H. <i>Tempo Music Inc. v. Famous Music Corporation</i>	413
I. <i>Intersong-USA v. CBS, Inc.</i>	414
VIII. Preparing a Summary Judgment Motion: An Overview	414
A. Initial Planning	414
1. The Question	414
2. The Answer	415
B. To File or Not to File: The Fixed Form of the Works at Issue	415
1. Scenario 1—The Law Driven Case: Copyright Infringement	416
2. Scenario 2—The Fact-Driven Case: Sexual Harassment	417
3. Copyrighted Works in Final Form: A Conglomeration of Stipulated Facts	417
IX. Strategy and Tactics: The Use of Expert Testimony in Support of a Motion for Summary Judgment	418
A. Two Schools of Thought	418
B. The Mandates of Rule 56	419
1. Genuineness and Materiality	419
2. Burden	420
C. Rule 702 and the <i>Daubert</i> Trilogy: The Basic Qualifications for Experts	420
D. Expert Testimony: Weighing the Balance in Music Infringement Litigation	421
1. The Benefits of Using Expert Witnesses	421
2. The Decision Not to Present Expert Testimony: The Downside	423
E. Two Scenarios	424
1. Scenario Number One	424
2. Scenario Number Two	425
X. Forms	426
A. Plaintiff's Motion	426
B. Defendants' Motion	426
C. Comment on Forms	427
D. Form: Plaintiff's Motion	427
E. Form: Defendant's Motion	440
Appendix 10-A. "Slip Opinion" and Official Published Opinion	466
 CHAPTER 11 Copyright and Music in the Courtroom	 479
I. The Copyright Act and the Judiciary	481
II. The Composers and the Works at Issue	482
III. Baxter's Claims	483
A. "Joy"'s Resurrection	483

B. The Claims of Williams's Access to "Joy"	483
C. The Commonplace Building Block	483
IV. The Defendants' Trial Strategy	488
A. An Initial Concern: The Reversal of Defendants' Summary Judgment	488
B. Following the Lead of the Ninth Circuit: The Audience Test and the Jury	489
V. The Trial: First Phase (The Audience Test)	490
A. Prelude: Determining What Would Be Played for the Jury	490
B. The "Audience" Test	490
VI. A Note on Direct and Cross-Examination: A Brief Refresher before Proceeding to the Trial	491
A. Direct Examination	491
B. Cross-Examination	492
C. Scenario Number One: A Non-Musical Analogy	492
D. Scenario Number Two: The Aggrieved Plaintiff/Composer	492
E. Closed Questions	494
F. Oblique Questions	494
VII. The Trial: Second Phase	494
A. Transformation of a Courtroom	494
B. The Plaintiff's Experts and Their Testimony	495
1. Cross-Examination Designed to Elicit Answers Favoring the Adverse (Cross-Examining) Party	495
2. Cross-Examination Calculated to Prove Independent Creation of the "E.T. Theme"	497
3. A Musicological <i>Scène à Faire</i>	499
C. The Plaintiff's Testimony	502
1. Direct Examination	502
2. Cross-Examination of Baxter	509
D. Defendants' Expert Testimony: Direct Examination	527
1. Prior Art and Its Uses	527
2. Comparison and Analysis of "Joy" and the "E.T. Theme"	528
3. Testimony and Demonstrative Evidence: Color Charts and Numbering	529
4. Playing and Explaining Examples of Prior Art	532
E. A Brief and Effective Extract From Williams's Testimony on Direct Examination	535
F. Reacting to the Screen: The Role of Motion Picture Composer and a Private Screening for the Jury	541
G. The Defense Rests and the Case Goes to the Jury	542
Conclusion	543
Appendix 11-A. Instruction No. 16 and Special Verdict	545

CHAPTER 12 Music, Copyright and the Impact of New Technology	547
I. Introduction	549
II. Secondary Liability: General Principles Established Before the Advent of File-Sharing	550
A. Vicarious Infringement and Contributory Infringement	550
B. Reported Authorities: A Brief Overview	551
1. <i>Shapiro, Bernstein & Co., Inc. v. H. L. Green Company, Inc.</i>	551
2. <i>Gershwin Publishing Corporation v. Columbia Artists Management, Inc.</i>	553
3. <i>Famous Music Corporation v. Bay State Harness Horse Racing and Breeding Association, Inc.</i>	554
4. <i>Fonovisa, Inc. v. Cherry Auction, Inc.</i>	554
III. The File-Sharing Craze: Secondary and Direct Liability	555
A. Section 106 of the Copyright Act	555
B. Secondary Liability From <i>Sony to Grokster</i> : Betamax, File-Sharing and the Courts	556
1. <i>Sony Corporation of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i>	556
2. <i>A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.</i>	559
3. <i>In re Aimster Copyright Litigation</i>	561
4. <i>Grokster</i> and a New Look at Inducement	563
C. File-Sharing and Infringement: Targeting the Downloaders	565
IV. The Reduced Role of Digital Rights Management ("DRM")	567
A. The Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA")	567
B. The Current State of DRM	567
C. A Demonstration of Civil Disobedience	568
1. Background: Sampling and Mashups	568
2. Sampling and Mashups	568
D. Lower Prices, Convenience and The "Price" of Free Downloads: Their Impact on Unauthorized Copying	573
1. The Hidden "Price" of Free Downloads	573
2. The Convenience of Purchasing On-Line	573
E. Another Invitation to Look Further and Probe Deeper	574
 POSTLUDE	 575
INDEX	579