

ORIGINAL  
FILED

FEB 06 2002

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE

1 JULIE E. COHEN - #158490  
2 PROFESSOR OF LAW  
3 GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER  
4 600 NEW JERSEY AVE., NW  
5 WASHINGTON, DC 20001  
6 Telephone: (202) 662-9871  
7 Facsimile: (202) 662-9411

8 Attorney for Amici Curiae

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 ELCOM, LTD., a/k/a ELCOMSOFT CO.,  
16 LTD. and DMITRY SKLYAROV,

17 Defendants.

Case No. CR 01-20138 RMW

**(CORRECTED) MEMORANDUM OF  
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES OF AMICI  
CURIAE**

Date: April 1, 2002  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Judge: Hon. Ronald M. Whyte

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF AMICI.....1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....1

ARGUMENT.....2

    I.    The Intellectual Property Clause Authorizes Protection for “Writings,”  
          Not Prohibition of Technologies Regardless of Originality, Duration,  
          or Infringement. ....2

    II.   The Necessary and Proper Clause Does Not Empower Congress to  
          Abrogate Limits on the Intellectual Property Power. ....3

        A.    A Law That Contravenes Affirmative Limits on Another  
                Enumerated Power Is Not “Proper” .....3

        B.    The Intellectual Property Power Is Limited By Design .....6

        C.    The Anti-Device Provisions Abrogate the Limits on the  
                Intellectual Property Power.....10

    III.  The Commerce Clause Does Not Empower Congress to Abrogate  
          Limits on the Intellectual Property Power. ....13

    IV.  The Anti-Device Provisions Violate First Amendment Limits on the  
          Scope of Copyright Protection.....14

        A.    The First Amendment Constrains Congress’ Power to Protect  
                Copyrighted Works .....14

        B.    The Anti-Device Provisions Are Not Appropriately Tailored to  
                Minimize Restrictions on First Amendment Activity .....16

        C.    The Anti-Device Provisions Are Invalid As Applied to the  
                Advanced eBook Reader.....18

    V.    Conclusion. ....20

1 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

2 **Cases**

3 *A&M Records, Inc. v. General Audio Video Cassettes, Inc.*,  
4 948 F. Supp. 1449 (C.D. Cal. 1996).....17

5 *Attia v. Society of New York Hosp.*,  
6 201 F.3d 50 (2d Cir. 1999), *cert. denied*, 121 S. Ct. 109 (2000).....15

7 *Baker v. Selden*,  
8 101 U.S. 99 (1879)..... 2, 9

9 *Bateman v. Mnemonics, Inc.*,  
10 79 F.3d 1532 (11th Cir. 1996).....11

11 *Bobbs-Merrill Co. v. Straus*,  
12 210 U.S. 339 (1908)..... 9

13 *Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.*,  
14 489 U.S. 141 (1989)..... 8, 12

15 *Boos v. Barry*,  
16 485 U.S. 312 (1988).....5

17 *Brown v. Investors Mortgage Co.*,  
18 121 F.3d 472 (9th Cir. 1997).....13

19 *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*,  
20 510 U.S. 569 (1994)..... 9, 15, 16

21 *Cardtoons L.C. v. Major League Baseball Players Ass'n*,  
22 95 F.3d 959 (10th Cir. 1996).....16

23 *City of Boerne v. Flores*,  
24 521 U.S. 507 (1997).....4, 13

25 *Clayton v. Stone*,  
26 5 F. Cas. 999 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. 1829)..... 9

27 *Cohen v. California*,  
28 403 U.S. 15 (1971).....16

*De Geofroy v. Riggs*,  
133 U.S. 258 (1890).....5

*Donaldson v. Beckett*,  
1 Eng. Rep. 837 (H.L. 1774)..... 7, 8

*Dr. Seuss Enterprises, L.P. v. Penguin Books USA, Inc.*,  
109 F.3d 1394 (9th Cir.), *cert. dismissed*, 521 U.S. 1146 (1997)..... 15

*Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.*,  
499 U.S. 340 (1991)..... 2, 6, 9

