

1 Andrew P. Bridges (SBN: 122761)
2 Jennifer A. Golinveaux (SBN: 203056)
3 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
4 101 California Street, 39th Floor
5 San Francisco, CA 94111-5894
6 Telephone: 415-591-1000
7 Facsimile: 415-591-1400

8 Attorneys for Defendant
9 GOOGLE INC.

10
11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 PERFECT 10, INC., a California
14 Corporation

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 GOOGLE INC., a corporation; and
18 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive

19 Defendant.

20 Case No. CV04-9484 AHM (SHx)

21 **GOOGLE'S OPPOSITION TO**
22 **PERFECT 10'S MOTION FOR**
23 **PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

24 Date: November 7, 2005
25 Time: 10:00 a.m.
26 Location: Courtroom 14

27
28
Winston & Strawn LLP
101 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-5894

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....1

A. GOOGLE'S SEARCH ENGINE AND RELATED ACTIVITIES1

1. Web And Image Search Engine.....1

2. Google's Advertising Programs.....3

3. Google's Copyright Policy.....5

B. PERFECT 10'S BUSINESS ACTIVITIES6

C. GOOGLE'S INTERACTIONS WITH PERFECT 106

III. ARGUMENT.....9

A. PERFECT 10 HAS FAILED TO JUSTIFY A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION BECAUSE IT HAS NOT ESTABLISHED PROBABLE SUCCESS OR SERIOUS QUESTIONS, IT HAS NOT SHOWN IMMEDIATE IRREPARABLE HARM, IT DRAGGED ITS FEET, THE BALANCE OF HARMS IS UNFAVORABLE, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST OPPOSES AN INJUNCTION.....9

B. PERFECT 10 CANNOT ESTABLISH PROBABLE SUCCESS OR SERIOUS QUESTIONS ON THE MERITS.....10

1. Google's Search Engine Operations Are Fair Use.....10

a. The Purpose And Character Of The Use10

b. The Nature Of The Copyrighted Work.....13

c. The Amount And Substantiality Of The Portion Used In Relation To The Copyrighted Work As A Whole13

d. The Effect Of The Use Upon The Potential Market For And Value Of The Copyrighted Work.....14

e. The Public Interest15

2. Perfect 10 Is Not Likely To Prevail On Its Claims That Google Is Secondarily Liable For Copyright Infringements.15

a. Perfect 10 Is Not Likely To Succeed On Its Claim of Contributory Copyright Infringement.....16

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

b. Perfect 10 Is Not Likely To Succeed on Its Claim of
Vicarious Copyright Infringement.18

3. Section 512(j) Limits The Scope of Any Injunctive Relief. .20

C. PERFECT 10 CANNOT SHOW IRREPARABLE HARM.22

D. THE BALANCE OF HARDSHIPS DISFAVORS AN
INJUNCTION.....23

E. THE PUBLIC INTEREST OPPOSES AN INJUNCTION.24

F. A MASSIVE BOND IS REQUIRED FOR ANY
INJUNCTION.....25

IV. CONCLUSION25

