1 2 3 4	RUSSELL J. FRACKMAN (State Bar No JEFFREY D. GOLDMAN (State Bar No MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP I 11377 West Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90064-1683 Telephone: (310) 312-2000 Facsimile: (310) 312-3100	o. 49087) . 155589) .LP	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JEFFREY N. MAUSNER (State Bar No. BERMAN, MAUSNER & RESSER 11601 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 600 Los Angeles, California 90025-1742 Telephone: (310) 473-3333 Facsimile: (310) 473-8303  DANIEL J. COOPER (State Bar No. 198 PERFECT 10, INC. 72 Beverly Park Dr. Beverly Hills, California 90210 Telephone: (310) 205-9817 Facsimile: (310) 205-9638  Attorneys for Plaintiff		
13			
14	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
15	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
16	PERFECT 10, INC., a California	CASE NO. CV 04-9484 AHM (SHx)	
17 18	corporation,  Plaintiff,  v.	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION OF PLAINTIFF PERFECT 10, INC. FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION; MEMORANDUM OF	
19	GOOGLE, INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	POINTS AND AUTHORITIES  Data: Santambar 10, 2005	
20	Defendants.	Date: September 19, 2005 Time: 10:00 a.m. Ctrm: The Honorable A. Howard Matz	
21	Defendants.	Cum. The Honorable A. Howard Watz	
22			
23	TO DEFENDANT GOOGLE, IN	C. AND ITS ATTORNEYS OF	
24	RECORD:		
25		·	
26		September 19, 2005, at 10:00 a.m., or as	
27	soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the courtroom of the Honorable A.		
28	Howard Matz, located at 312 N. Spring St	reet, Los Angeles, California, plaintiff	

0839648.

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP 1 | 1 | 2 | i | 3 | 4 | [ 5 | s

Perfect 10, Inc. ("Perfect 10") will and hereby does move for a preliminary injunction enjoining Google, Inc. ("Google") from engaging in continuing acts of copyright infringement. Specifically, Perfect 10 seeks an order in the form of the [Proposed] Preliminary Injunction lodged herewith and which provides in substance that:

Google, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, officers, agents, servants, employees, and any persons acting in concert or participation with them are preliminarily enjoined from:

(a) Copying, reproducing, distributing, publicly displaying, adapting or otherwise infringing, or contributing to the infringement of any copyrighted image owned by Perfect 10 which has been or will be identified in notices to Google ("PERFECT 10 COPYRIGHTED IMAGES"). Perfect 10 will provide to Google notice of PERFECT 10 COPYRIGHTED IMAGES within ten (10) business days of the issuance of this Order, and may supplement that notice once each month. Within ten (10) business days of the receipt of notice of PERFECT 10 COPYRIGHTED IMAGES, Google shall delete and disable its display of all such images, including without limitation, deletion from any database owned or controlled by Google, and shall not display such images in the future.

(b) Linking to websites which display or make available PERFECT 10 COPYRIGHTED IMAGES, for which Google has received notice ("Infringing Websites"). Infringing Websites are (i) websites which were linked to by Google as identified in any notice of infringement from Perfect 10 to Google prior to June 20, 2005 (Exhs. 40-73 of the Declaration of Norman Zada filed herein) and which as of July 11, 2005, continued to display or make available PERFECT 10 COPYRIGHTED IMAGES on any of their web pages, or (ii) websites that in the

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 |

future continue to display or make available PERFECT 10 COPYRIGHTED IMAGES on any of their web pages three (3) weeks after notice of such infringement to Google. Within ten (10) business days of the receipt of each notice of Infringing Websites, Google shall delete and disable all links to such Infringing Websites from any website owned or controlled by Google and shall not link to such Infringing Websites in the future.

(c) Copying, reproducing, distributing or publishing any username/ password combinations to perfect10.com or linking to any websites that provide username/password combinations to perfect10.com which have been or will be identified in notices to Google. Within ten (10) business days of the receipt of notice, Google shall delete all username/password combinations to perfect10.com and disable all links to any website that provides username/password combinations to perfect10.com from any website owned or controlled by Google and shall not publish such username/password combinations or link to such websites in the future.

This Motion is made on the grounds that Perfect 10 has a probability of success on the merits of its copyright infringement claims and there is the possibility of irreparable harm and, alternatively, that serious questions are raised by this Motion and the balance of hardships tilt in Perfect 10's favor.

This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the declarations of Norman Zada, Dave Moreau, Jeffrey Mausner, and Patrick Swart, the Request for Judicial Notice and Declaration of Russell J. Frackman, all records presently on

Mitchell Silberberg & 28
Knupp LLP

1	file with the Court, any reply Perfect 10 may make, and any argument that may be				
2	advanced at or prior to the hearing on this Motion.				
3					
4	Dated: August 24, 2005	RUSSELL J. FRACKMAN			
5		JEFFREY D. GOLDMAN MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP			
6	·	<b>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</b>			
7	·	By (Currell ) Fruhman			
8		Russell J. Frackman Attorneys for Plaintiff			
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14	<del>.</del>				
15					
16		• •			
17					
18					
19					
20					
21 22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
~ ,					

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

2				Page(s	
3	PRE	LIMIN	NARY STATEMENT	1	
4 5	I.	I. SUMMARY OF FACTS			
6		A. <sup>1</sup>	Perfect 10's Business and Intellectual Property		
7		B.	Google's Business and Its Infringement of Perfect 10 Images	2	
8		•	1. Google Copies Perfect 10 Images.	3	
9		٠.	2. Google Displays and Distributes Perfect 10 Images	3	
10 11			3. Google Links Perfect 10 Images To Infringing Websites F Which Google Receives Revenue.	`rom 5	
12			4. Google Provides Perfect 10 Passwords	6	
13		C.	Google's Refusal to Respond to Notices of Infringement	6	
14 15	II.	PERFECT 10 HAS A HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS			
16		A.	Google Is Liable For Direct Copyright Infringement	8	
17			1. Perfect 10 Owns The Copyrights in Its Photographs	8	
18			2. Google is Reproducing Perfect 10 Reduced Size Images	8	
19			3. Displaying Perfect 10's Copyrighted Images	9	
20		B.	The Fair Use Defense Is Not Available to Google.	10	
21		v	1. Google's Use of Full Size Images Is Not Fair Use	10	
22			2. Google's Use of Reduced Size Images Is Not Fair Use	13	
23				ť	
24	III. GOOGLE ALSO IS SECONDARILY LIABLE		GLE ALSO IS SECONDARILY LIABLE	19	
25		A.	Google Is Contributorily Liable Because It Has Knowledge of an Contributes to Direct Infringement	nd 20	
26		B.	Google Is Vicariously Liable Because It Derives a Financial Ben	efit	
27			From And Has The Ability to Control Infringement.	22	
28					

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

1

1	(continued)
2	Page(s
3	IV. PERFECT 10 IS SUFFERING IRREPARABLE INJURY24
4	
5	V. AT A MINIMUM, SERIOUS QUESTIONS ARE RAISED AND THE BALANCE OF HARDSHIPS TIPS IN FAVOR OF PERFECT 1024
6	BALANCE OF HARDSHIPS TIPS IN FAVOR OF PERFECT 1024
, <b>7</b>	CONCLUSION25
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2	Page(s)
3	
4	FEDERAL CASES
5	A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.,
6	114 F. Supp. 2d 896 (N.D. Cal. 2000)21
7	A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.,
8	239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2001)
	A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.,
9	284 F.3d 1091 (9th Cir. 2002)25
10	American Geophysical Union v. Texaco Inc.,
11	60 F.3d 913 (2d Cir. 1994)13, 18
12	Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of America, Inc.,
13	975 F.2d 832 (Fed. Cir. 1992)
14	Cadence Design Systems, Inc. v. Avant! Corp.,
15	125 F.3d 824 (9th Cir. 1997)24
16	Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.,
17	510 U.S. 569 (1994)11, 13
18	Dr. Seuss Enters., L.P. v. Penguin Books USA, Inc.,
	109 F.3d 1394 (9th Cir. 1997)10
19	Elvis Presley Enters., Inc. v. Passport Video,
20	349 F.3d 622 (9th Cir. 2003)
21	Ets-Hukin v. Skyy Spirits, Inc.,
22	225 F.3d 1068 (9th Cir. 2000)
23	Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Tele. Serv. Co., Inc.,
24	499 U.S. 340 (1991)8
25	Fonovisa, Inc. v. Cherry Auction, Inc.,
26	76 F.3d 259 (9th Cir. 1996)10, 19, 20, 22, 23
27	Gershwin Publishing Corp. v. Columbia Artists Mgmt., Inc.,
28	443 F.2d 1159 (2d Cir. 1971)23
-	

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

0841742.

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

2	Pogo(s)
3	Page(s)
4	Hamil America, Inc. v. GFI, 193 F.3d 92 (2d Cir. 1999)8
5	Hard Rock Café International (USA) Inc. v. Morton,
6	1999 WL 717995 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)4
7	Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises,
8	471 U.S. 539 (1985)10, 13
9	Hotaling v. Church of Latter-Day Saints,
10	118 F.3d 199 (4th Cir. 1997)9
11	Hustler Magazine, Inc. v. Moral Majority, Inc.,
12	796 F.2d 1148 (9th Cir. 1986)19
13	<u>Infinity Broadcast Corp. v. Kirkwood,</u> 150 F.3d 104 (9th Cir. 1998)
14	130 F.3d 104 (9th Ch. 1998)10, 11, 13, 13
15	Intellectual Reserve, Inc. v. Utah Lighthouse Ministry, Inc., 75 F. Supp. 2d 1290 (D. Utah 1999)21, 24
16	73 1. Supp. 24 1250 (D. Otan 1777)21, 24
17	<u>Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.,</u> 280 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2002)
18	
Ì	<u>Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.,</u> 336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003)
9	336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003)passim
20	Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.,
21	77 F. Supp. 2d 1116 (C.D. Cal. 1999)14
22	Los Angeles News Service v. Reuters Television Int'l, Ltd.,
23	149 F.3d 987 (9th Cir. 1998)
24	Los Angeles Times v. Free Republic,
25	54 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1453 (C.D. Cal. 2000)12, 18, 19
26	MAI Systems Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc.,
27	991 F.2d 511 (9th Cir. 1993)
1	Marcus v. Rowley,
28	695 F.2d 1171 (9th Cir. 1983)16
11	

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

0841742.

1

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

2	<u>Teonamaen</u>
	Page(s
3	Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster Ltd.,
4	125 S.Ct. 2764 (2005)20, 21, 23, 24
5	Michaels v. Internet Entertainment Group, Inc.,
6	5 F. Supp. 2d 823 (C.D. Cal. 1998)
7	Perfect 10, Inc. v. Cybernet Ventures, Inc.,
8	213 F. Supp. 2d 1146 (C.D. Cal. 2002)
9	
	Pinkham v. Sara Lee Corp., 983 F.2d 824 (8th Cir. 1992)
10	
11	Playboy Enterprises, Inc. v. Netscape Communications, Inc., 354 F.3d 1020 (9th Cir. 2004)23
12	234 F.3d 1020 (9th Ch. 2004)23
13	Playboy Enterprises, Inc. v. Webbworld, 968 F. Supp. 1171 (N.D. Tex. 1997)
14	968 F. Supp. 1171 (N.D. Tex. 1997)
	Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Russ Hardenburgh, Inc.,
15	982 F. Supp. 503 (N.D. Ohio 1997)23
16	Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Webbworld, Inc.,
17	991 F. Supp. 2d 543 (N.D. Tex. 1997)
18	Princeton University Press v. Michigan Document Servs., Inc.,
19	99 F.3d 1381 (6th Cir. 1996)
20	
1	Religious Tech Center v. Netcom On-Line Comm., 907 F. Supp. 1361 (N.D. Cal. 1995)
21	
22	Search King, Inc. v. Google Tech., Inc.,
23	2003 WL 21464568 (W.D. Okla. 2003)
24	Sega Enters., Ltd. v. MAPHIA,
25	948 F. Supp. 923 (N.D. Cal. 1996)20
1	Sega Enters. Ltd. v. MAPHIA,
26	857 F. Supp. 679 (N.D. Cal. 1994)
27	Shapiro, Bernstein & Co. v. H.L. Green Co.,
28	316 F.2d 304 (2d Cir. 1963)

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

0841742.

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

2	(continued)
	Page(s
3	Sony Corp. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.,
4	464 U.S. 417 (1984)19
5	Storm Impact, Inc. v. Software of the Month Club,
6	13 F. Supp. 2d 783 (N.D. Ill. 1998)
7	Triad Sys. Corp. v. Southeastern Exp. Co.,
8	64 F.3d 1330 (9th Cir. 1995)25
9	Twin Peaks Prods. Inc. v. Publications Int'l, Ltd.,
10	996 F.2d 1366 (2d Cir. 1993)
11	UMG Recordings, Inc. v. MP3.com,
12	92 F. Supp. 2d 349 (S.D.N.Y. 2000)
13	Video Pipeline, Inc. v. Buena Vista Home Entertainment, Inc., 192 F. Supp. 2d 321(D. N.J. 2002)
14	
15	Video Pipeline, Inc. v. Buena Vista Home Entertainment, Inc., 342 F.3d 191 (3d Cir. 2003)
16	
17	Worldwide Church v. Philadelphia Church, 227 F.3d 1110 (9th Cir. 2000)
18	FEDERAL STATUTES
19	
20	17 U.S.C. § 101
21	17 U.S.C. § 106
22	17 U.S.C. § 107(1)-(4)10
23	17 U.S.C. § 410(c)8
24	17 U.S.C. § 512
25	
26	
27	OTHER AUTHORITIES
28	M. & D. Nimmer, Nimmer On Copyright

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

1

vi

1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)	·
2	<u>(continueu)</u>	Dogo(s
3	U.D. Don No. 1476 O4th Cong. 2d Sogg	Page(s
4	H.R. Rep. No. 1476, 94th Cong., 2d Sess.	10
5		
6		
7		
8		•
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	·	
14		·
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		•
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
20		

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

vii

0841742.

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This motion seeks to end massive ongoing copyright infringement by defendant Google, Inc. ("Google"). Under the guise of providing a "search function," Google is *directly copying*, *distributing*, *and displaying* thousands of Perfect 10 copyrighted images despite receiving extensive notice of infringement, and is linking those images to infringing third party websites that themselves display thousands of additional Perfect 10 images.

Google knows that neither it, nor other websites from which it copies images, are authorized to copy, display, or distribute Perfect 10 images. Indeed, just last week, Google retreated from its much-publicized plans to copy millions of books without the permission of the publishers, instead agreeing to allow publishers the option of prohibiting copying of their works. But despite receiving *thirty-four* detailed notices of infringement from Perfect 10, Google has continued to copy, display and distribute Perfect 10's images, in some cases for over *400 days* following notice.

Google's conduct far exceeds the necessary, accepted, and lawful functions of a search engine — to direct users to legitimate websites, through text or through the use of *unmarketable*, brief excerpts of *legitimate* copies of works. It is certainly not necessary for a search engine to provide *full and complete* copies of copyrighted images, and thereby to displace the copyright owner as the only authorized source of such images. Nor is it necessary for a search engine to display or distribute *infringing copies* or to direct users to *infringing* websites that, in many cases, display Google advertisements alongside Perfect 10 images. Google has, by design, become a hub, an aggregator, and a provider of images (in fact, infringing images), selecting and copying them and then displaying Perfect 10's images on Google's own website, thus supplanting Perfect 10 as the source of these images.

The relief Perfect 10 seeks is limited to stopping Google's giveaway of *specified* Perfect 10 copyrighted images. That relief will have no impact on the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

noninfringing operation of Google's search engine. But it is necessary to protect the foundation of Perfect 10's business – the copyrighted works it created and owns.<sup>1</sup>

#### SUMMARY OF FACTS I.

# Perfect 10's Business and Intellectual Property

Perfect 10 is the publisher of the well-known entertainment magazine "PERFECT 10" and operates a subscription website, perfect 10.com, which features high-quality, nude photographs of beautiful, "natural" models. Declaration of Norman Zada ("Zada Decl."), ¶¶ 9-14. Since 1996, Perfect 10 has invested over \$36,000,000, and substantial effort, to create its unique magazine (which sells for \$7.99 per issue), website (which charges \$25.50 per month for access), and videos. to produce about 6,000 high-quality copyrighted images, and to develop customer goodwill. Id., ¶¶ 11, 16. Perfect 10 also sells approximately 6,000 cellular phone downloads of reduced sized images per month. Id., ¶ 16. Other than the website of its cell phone distribution partner, Perfect 10 has not authorized any third party website to copy, display, or distribute copyrighted images it has created. Id., ¶ 17.

### В. Google's Business and Its Infringement of Perfect 10 Images

Google.com is the third most visited website on the Internet. Id., ¶ 18, Exh. 3. Google offers users both a "Web Search" and an "Image Search." Through "Web Search," Google provides text listings of web pages that it determines are related to search terms used. Through "Image Search," Google displays images it selects and copies from third party websites. Id., ¶¶ 19-21, 49-51, 95, 109, 144, 150, Exhs. 4-5.

22

those in its previously-filed motion against Amazon.com, Inc. While both Google and Amazon give away exactly what Perfect 10 sells, there are differences between them. For example, Google also violates Perfect 10's reproduction right, as it copies, onto its own website, Perfect 10's images from numerous infringing third party websites. (Amazon appears to obtain from Google some or all of the Perfect 10 images it displays and distributes.) And while both use Perfect 10's copyrighted works for commercial numbers, their business ands difference amazon is an Internet works for commercial purposes, their business ends differ: Amazon is an Internet retailer that uses images to drive traffic to its website to sell more goods; Google is in the advertising business and uses images to drive traffic to its website and sell more advertising at higher rates.

Much of the law (and many of the facts) supporting Perfect 10's motion parallel

Knupp LLP

<sup>23</sup> 

<sup>24</sup> 25

<sup>26</sup> 

<sup>27</sup> 

Silberberg & 28

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

26

27

19-21, 80, 92, 111, 116. Google makes most of its money from the sale of advertising. Zada Decl. ¶ 24, Exh. 6, page 99; Google, Inc., Annual Report (Form 10-K) [Request for Judicial Notice, Exh. A] at 2 (March 30, 2005) ("Google 10-K").

# 1. Google Copies Perfect 10 Images.

Google searches out and copies Perfect 10 copyrighted images from third party websites ("Infringing Sites") that have themselves stolen these images. Zada Decl. ¶¶ 21, 109, 144, Exhs. 5, 92, 111. Google obtains the specific images it provides through a sophisticated, proprietary algorithm that locates and selects images by analyzing "the text on the page adjacent to the image content, the image caption, and dozens of other factors to determine the image content." Id., ¶21. See Search King, Inc. v. Google Tech., Inc., 2003 WL 21464568 at \*3-4 (W.D. Okla. 2003) (Google's search algorithms reflect Google's "subjective opinion"). Google admits it "can control which images will appear...as a result of a Google image search on a particular term." Declaration of Jeffrey W. Mausner ("Mausner Decl."). Exh. 118, Response to RFA 265. Google also admits it can prevent a particular image associated with a specific URL, or even the URL itself, from appearing in its search results as a link. Id., Response to RFA 245, 247-254, 302, 304. Google controls what is in its search results and can change or delete those results, even excluding duplicate images. See Memorandum in Opposition to Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Search King, Inc. v. Google Tech., Inc. (Dec. 30, 2002) [Request for Judicial Notice, Exh. B] at 19 ("Google is under no obligation to include every web page on the Internet .... Nor is Google obligated to maintain in its index web pages it once decided to include.").

# 2. Google Displays and Distributes Perfect 10 Images.

Through its Image Search, Google displays and distributes, without consent, over 1,000 of Perfect 10's best copyrighted images. Zada Decl., ¶ 23. Google provides several ways for users to view Perfect 10 images, which are illustrated in a CD entitled "The Google Experience" filed herewith. Zada Decl., Exh. 8.

Mitchell 28 Silberberg & Knupp LLP

The first infringing page. When a user types the name of a Perfect 10 model into the search box on Google's homepage, presses "enter," and then clicks "Images," Google instantaneously displays on the user's computer screen as many as twenty reduced size Perfect 10 images on a page. (Additional images may be displayed on additional pages.) Zada Decl., ¶¶ 27-37, 58, 92, 95, 104-108, 150, Exhs. 8, 9, 26, 78, 80, 87-91, 116. These images are reduced in size from the originals, but generally are significantly larger than a "thumbnail." They are comparable to images available only to subscribers to perfect10.com, and are the same size and clarity as versions currently sold by Perfect 10 for download and display on cell phones. Declaration of Dave Moreau, ¶ 6; Zada Decl., ¶¶ 54-56, 58, Exhs. 23-24. In fact, Google *promotes* the downloading of such images onto cell phones and provides instruction and help to enable users to do so. Id., ¶ 55, Exh. 23.

The second infringing page. When a user clicks on one of these reduced size images, a second Google page appears which displays *another* infringing reduced size Perfect 10 image, accompanied by a link stating "See full-size image" and the message: "Image may be scaled down and *subject to copyright*." Id., ¶¶ 27-30, 38-39, 114, Exhs. 8, 10-11, 96 (emphasis added). Clicking on this link often enlarges the image to full size. Id., ¶¶ 27-30, 38-39, 114, Exhs. 8, 11, 96.

Below the reduced-size image, in a large "window," Google also displays the portion of the Infringing Site from which the image was copied; this window often contains a full size infringing image which appears to the user to be on google.com. The Google user does not need to leave google.com to view that image. Id., ¶¶ 27-47, 61, 114, Exhs. 8-18, 28, 96. See Hard Rock Café Int'l (USA) Inc. v. Morton, 1999 WL 717995, \*25 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) ("Through framing [two sites] are combined together into a single visual presentation...."). The user may navigate through and view different pages of the third party website (which often displays other infringing Perfect 10 images) while the reduced size Perfect 10 image remains at the top of the screen. Zada Decl., ¶¶40, 47, Exhs. 12, 18. Thus, Google keeps the user connected

Mitchell Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP

3

4 5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

Silberberg & 28

Knupp LLP

to its own website, while the user can view, print, copy, or download infringing Perfect 10 images. Zada Decl., ¶¶ 27-51, 61-64, Exhs. 8-21, 28-30.

The infringing "cache" links. As described above, when a Web Search is conducted on the name of a Perfect 10 model, listings of web pages are returned. With most such listings, Google provides a "cache link," which Google says displays a "snapshot" of the third party website when Google "crawled" it on a prior, specific date. These "snapshots" often display full-size Perfect 10 images. Id., ¶¶ 49-51, Exhs. 19-21, 85, 86. Although the term "cache" typically is associated with temporary storage, some full size Perfect 10 images have been displayed by Google in this manner for over a year – and even after the Infringing Site from which Google obtained the image had removed it. Id. ¶¶ 50-51, Exhs. 20, 21.

### Google Links Perfect 10 Images To Infringing Websites From 3. Which Google Receives Revenue.

Google not only copies and displays Perfect 10 images itself, but also links them to Infringing Sites with which Google has partnered and from which Google receives revenue through its "AdSense" advertising program. Google refers to these third-party, AdSense websites as its "Network." Zada Decl., Exh. 6, p. 98; Google 10-K at 21-23. Google places on AdSense websites targeted ads for products or services related to the content of the websites, and shares with its AdSense websites the revenue Google receives from these targeted ads. Zada Decl. ¶¶ 24, 25, Exhs. 6, 7. Google's AdSense contracts state, among other things, that Google "reviews" each AdSense website and "also monitor(s) sites after they begin running Google ads under this program." Id. ¶ 25, Exh. 7. Revenue from Adsense websites makes up a significant portion of Google's total revenue. For the quarter ending June 30, 2005, Google received \$1.384 billion in revenue, out of which \$630 million came from Google's partner sites, through AdSense programs. Zada Decl. ¶ 24, Exh. 6, page 98.

When Google users click on reduced-size Perfect 10 images displayed by Google, Google often transports them directly to Infringing Sites that are Google's AdSense partners, and which display full size infringing Perfect 10 images *next to* ads provided by Google from Google's advertisers (frequently identified as "Ads by Gooooogle.") When users click on these advertisements, Google and the Infringing Site share in the resulting revenue.<sup>2</sup> Zada Decl. ¶¶ 61-62, 25, Exh. 28, 83 L-Z, 7. Despite notice from Perfect 10, in some cases 96% of Google web search results on the names of Perfect 10 models lead to AdSense websites displaying infringing Perfect 10 images. Id. ¶¶ 65-73, Exhs. 32-35.

# 4. Google Provides Perfect 10 Passwords.

Paid subscribers to Perfect 10's website, <u>perfect10.com</u>, need a unique username and password to access and view Perfect 10's copyrighted images. In its Web Search results, Google publishes on <u>google.com</u> hundreds of confidential <u>perfect10.com</u> usernames and passwords in response to the query: "perfect10.com passwords." Despite notice, Google has continued to publish these passwords, thereby enabling unauthorized access to <u>perfect10.com</u> (and its copyrighted images) in this manner. Zada Decl. ¶¶ 119-126, Exhs. 101-106. <u>See</u> 17 U.S.C. § 1201 (circumvention of copyright protection systems).

# C. Google's Refusal to Respond to Notices of Infringement.

Since May 2004, Perfect 10 has sent Google thirty-four detailed notices of infringement. Zada Decl., ¶¶ 76-88, Exhs. 37-74. These notices identified specific infringing images displayed by Google; specific infringing web pages linked to by Google; and the source of the Perfect 10 images infringed. Id. ¶¶ 86, 97. Although Google's display and distribution of infringing images does not bring it within the limitation on remedies of 17 U.S.C. § 512(d) of the Digital Millennium Copyright

Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP

Google advertisements also are displayed next to full size Perfect 10 images that are "cached" on google.com, as well as on websites that provide perfect10.com passwords. Zada Decl., ¶¶ 64, 125, Exhs. 30, 105.

Act ("DMCA") (which applies to "referring or linking users" to another "online location"), these notices complied with the DMCA's "take down" requirements. 17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(3)(A).<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Zada Decl., ¶¶ 76-88, Exhs. 37-74. Nevertheless, Google continues to display at least 1,043 Perfect 10 copyrighted images from the exact same Infringing Sites and web pages identified in notices, in some cases sent to Google 400 days earlier. Zada Decl. ¶¶ 96-102, 150-151, Exhs. 81-85, 116-117.

On August 12, 2005, Google added hundreds of additional Perfect 10 copyrighted images to its image search results despite all of Perfect 10's notices. Zada Decl. ¶¶ 150-151, Exhs. 116-117.

Google's conduct is exemplified by its infringement of images of Perfect 10 model Monika Zsibrita. Perfect 10 first notified Google on May 31, 2004, that it was infringing specific images of Ms. Zsibrita. <u>Id.</u>, ¶¶ 90-91, Exhs. 40, 77. Since then, the number of infringing images of Ms. Zsibrita displayed by Google has *increased*, from 15 in June 2004, to 50 in July 2005, to most recently, 130 on August 12, 2005. Google continues to display over 1,000 of the same images identified in Perfect 10's notices and has even added back images that were identified in those notices. <u>Id.</u>, ¶¶ 92-102, 150-151, Exhs. 78-85, 116-117.

### II. PERFECT 10 HAS A HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.

"A preliminary injunction should be granted if a plaintiff can show either: (1) a combination of probable success on the merits and the possibility of irreparable harm; or (2) that serious questions are raised and the balance of hardships tilt in the

Mitchell 28 Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP

Google does not qualify for "safe harbor" as an information location tool under the DMCA for a number of additional reasons – one (but not the only) of which is its failure to "expeditiously" remove infringing images after notice. 17 U.S.C. § 512(d)(3). Google's "caching" of Perfect 10's images also does not bring it within the "system caching" safe harbor, as the DMCA requires storage to be "temporary," the material be made available online by the originating website, and the copy not be changed in any way. 17 U.S.C. § 512(b)(2). Even if Google could qualify for either safe harbor, Perfect 10 still would be entitled to injunctive relief under the DMCA, 17 U.S.C. § 512(j), as Google itself recognizes. Google 10K at 13, 54 ("the [DMCA] has provisions that limit, but do not eliminate, our liability for listing or linking to third-party web-sites that include materials that infringe copyrights...").

\_

Mitchell 28 Silberberg & Knupp LLP plaintiff's favor." <u>Elvis Presley Enters.</u>, <u>Inc. v. Passport Video</u>, 349 F.3d 622, 627 (9th Cir. 2003). Both standards are satisfied here.

# A. Google Is Liable For Direct Copyright Infringement.

Copyright infringement is established if Perfect 10 shows that (1) it owns copyrights in the photographs; and (2) Google violated one of Perfect 10's exclusive rights. See Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., Inc., 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991). Intent to infringe and knowledge of infringement are irrelevant. Pinkham v. Sara Lee Corp., 983 F.2d 824, 829 (8th Cir. 1992).

# 1. Perfect 10 Owns The Copyrights in Its Photographs.

Photographs are copyrightable subject matter. See, e.g., Ets-Hukin v. Skyy Spirits, Inc., 225 F.3d 1068, 1073-75 (9th Cir. 2000) (reviewing history of photography as copyrightable artistic expression). Perfect 10's registration certificates, Zada Decl., ¶ 15, Exh. 1, constitute *prima facie* evidence that (a) Perfect 10 owns the copyrights in its images, Hamil America, Inc. v. GFI, 193 F.3d 92, 98 (2d Cir. 1999); (b) the individual images are copyrightable, Perfect 10, Inc. v. Cybernet Ventures, Inc., 213 F. Supp. 2d 1146, 1166 (C.D. Cal. 2002); and (c) the copyrights are valid. 17 U.S.C. § 410(c).

# 2. Google is Reproducing Perfect 10 Reduced Size Images.

Google infringes Perfect 10's *reproduction* right by using its proprietary "web crawler" to copy infringing images from Infringing Sites by downloading selected images. Zada Decl. ¶¶ 17, 49, 144, Exhs. 19, 111. Google also admits it stores "reduced size extracts of images" on its servers. Mausner Decl., Exh. 118, Response to RFA 24, 263. See Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Webbworld, Inc., 991 F. Supp. 2d 543, 550 (N.D. Tex. 1997) (describing process), aff'd, 168 F.3d 486 (5th Cir. 1999); Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp., 336 F.3d 811, 815-16 (9th Cir. 2003) (defendant "obtained its database of pictures by copying images from other websites" and conceded *prima facie* case of violation of reproduction right). Copying a computer file containing a copyrighted work is infringement. 17 U.S.C. § 106(1); see MAI

Sys. Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc., 991 F.2d 511, 518 (9th Cir. 1993); see also 2 1 2 M.& D. Nimmer, Nimmer On Copyright, § 8.08 [A][1] (2005 ed.) ("input of a work into a computer results in the making of a copy, and hence...such unauthorized input infringes the copyright owner's reproduction right"). 4

#### 3. Displaying Perfect 10's Copyrighted Images.

Google also is violating Perfect 10's exclusive right to display its images by displaying, in both reduced and full size, infringing copies of over 1,000 of Perfect 10's best images. Zada Decl., ¶¶ 23, 27-51, 61, 91-108, 114, 150, Exhs. 8-21, 28, 78-91, 96, 116. 17 U.S.C. § 106(5); see 17 U.S.C. § 101 ("'Display' covers any showing of a 'copy' of the work") (emphasis added); H.R. Rep. No. 1476, 94th Cong., 2d Sess., reprinted in 1976 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5659, 5677 (1976) ("display" would include the projection of an image on a screen or other surface by any method"); see also Webbworld, 991 F. Supp. at 549 (display right infringed by displaying thumbnail copies of Playboy's images it obtained by an automated function from "select adult-oriented Internet 'newsgroups'."); Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Webbworld, 968 F. Supp. 1171, 1175 (N.D. Tex. 1997); Video Pipeline, Inc. v. Buena Vista Home Entertainment, Inc., 192 F. Supp. 2d 321, 332 (D. N.J. 2002) (showing movie trailers to individual web users is public display), aff'd, 342 F.3d 191 (3d Cir. 2003); Michaels v. Internet Entertainment Group, Inc., 5 F. Supp. 2d 823, 831 (C.D. Cal. 1998) (showing copies of still images from videotape over the Internet is public display); Kelly, 336 F.3d at 815-16 (defendant conceded, and district court found, a *prima facie* case of infringement by a search engine by providing "thumbnail" copyrighted images; defendant relied on fair use defense, which is inapposite here).4

25

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

<sup>26</sup> 27

Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP

By making these images available to millions of users to download, Google also violates Perfect 10's *distribution* right. 17 U.S.C. § 106(3); see A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004, 1014 (9th Cir. 2001) (making music files available to individuals over the Internet infringes distribution right); Hotaling v. Church of Latter-Day Saints, 118 F.3d 199, 203 (4th Cir. 1997) (making unauthorized work

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

Silberberg & 28 Knupp LLP

0841742.

### В. The Fair Use Defense Is Not Available to Google.

Fair use is an affirmative defense on which the defendant bears the burden of proof. See, e.g., Dr. Seuss Enters., L.P. v. Penguin Books USA, Inc., 109 F.3d 1394, 1403 (9th Cir. 1997) (affirming preliminary injunction). Examination of the four fair use factors, 17 U.S.C. § 107(1)-(4), reveals that this putative defense is unavailable, both with respect to the full size images and the reduced size images infringed by Google. Although a plaintiff need not prevail on all of the fair use factors, see Los Angeles News Service v. Reuters Television Int'l, Ltd., 149 F.3d 987, 994-95 (9th Cir. 1998), all four favor Perfect 10 here.

### Google's Use of Full Size Images Is Not Fair Use. 1.

Purpose and Character of the Use: Google does for free what Perfect 10 does for its paying customers – display and distribute Perfect 10's full size images. Google uses Perfect 10's copyrighted works as a "draw" to attract customers to Google's commercial website, as well as to send customers to Infringing Sites from which Google earns additional advertising revenue. Zada Decl. ¶¶ 61-64, Exhs. 28-30. See A&M Records, 239 F.3d at 1023 ("availability of infringing material acts as a draw for customers"); Fonovisa, Inc. v. Cherry Auction, Inc., 76 F.3d 259, 264-65 (9th Cir. 1996) (availability of infringing recordings is a "draw" for swap meet customers);<sup>5</sup> see also Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters., 471 U.S. 539, 562 (1985) (central inquiry "is not whether the sole motive of the use is monetary gain but whether the user stands to profit from exploitation of the copyrighted material without paying the customary price.").

available to public violates distribution right); Webbworld, 991 F. Supp. at 551-52 (allowing users to download images via web browser is public distribution).

It is Google's use of the copyrighted works that is the relevant commercial use.

See, e.g., Infinity Broadcast Corp. v. Kirkwood, 150 F.3d 104, 108 (9th Cir. 1998).

In any event, Google users derive a commercial benefit by obtaining for free that which they would otherwise have to buy. A&M Records, 239 F.3d at 1015.