

1 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 000116  
2 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 004762  
3 CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 009166  
4 OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY  
& DESRUISSEAUX  
5 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, NV 89129  
6 (702) 384-4012  
FAX: (702) 383-0701  
7 jolson@ocgd.com  
mstoberski@ocgd.com

8 Attorneys for Defendants  
9 KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and  
CENTER FOR INTERCULTURAL ORGANIZING

10  
11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

13  
14 RIGHTHAVEN, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company )  
CASE NO. 2:10-cv-01322-JCM-LRL  
15 Plaintiff, )  
16 vs. )  
17 KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and ) **ERRATA**  
CENTER FOR INTERCULTURAL )  
18 ORGANIZING, a Non-Profit Organization, )  
19 Defendant. )  
20

21 COME NOW, Defendants KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and CENTER FOR  
22 INTERCULTURAL ORGANIZING, by and through their attorneys, OLSON, CANNON,  
23 GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX, and hereby submit this Errata to their ORDER GRANTING  
24 JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANTS erroneously titled "DEFENDANTS"  
25 OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND,  
26 ALTERNATIVELY, REQUEST FOR A CONTINUANCE TO CONDUCT DISCOVERY

27 ...  
28 ...

*Law Offices of*  
**OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX**  
*A Professional Corporation*  
9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129  
(702) 384-4012 Telecopier (702) 383-0701

1  
2 PURSUANT TO FRCP 56(f)", which Order was filed on March 25, 2011 [Dkt. #34]. The  
3 corrected Order is attached hereto for the Court's consideration.

4 DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of April, 2011.

5 OLSON, CANNON,  
6 GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX

7  
8 By: \_\_\_\_\_

9 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 000116  
10 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 004762  
CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 009166  
11 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129  
12 Attorneys for Defendants

13  
14 **ORDER**

15 Presently before the Court is the Order to Show Cause why the Case should not be  
16 Dismissed pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 107. The Court issued the Order to Show Cause why the  
17 Case should not be Dismissed pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 107. (Dkt. #12). Plaintiff, Righthaven,  
18 LLC ("Righthaven") filed a Response to Order to Show Cause, and Alternatively Request for  
19 Continuance to Conduct Discovery Pursuant to FRCP 56(f). (Dkt. #14). Defendants, Kayse  
20 Jama and Center for Intercultural Organizing ("Defendants") filed an Opposition to the Response  
21 to Order to Show Cause, and Alternatively Request for Continuance to Conduct Discovery  
22 Pursuant to FRCP 56(f). (Dkt. #18). Professor Jason Schultz filed Brief of Amicus Curiae.  
23 (Dkt. #21). Righthaven filed its Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Response to Order to Show  
24 Cause. (Dkt. #22). Righthaven filed an Opposition to Professor Jason Schultz filed Brief of  
25 Amicus Curiae. (Dkt. #24). Righthaven filed Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of  
26 Material Fact that Require Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #28).  
27 Defendants filed an Opposition to Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact  
28 that Require Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #29). Professor Schultz

Law Offices of  
OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX  
A Professional Corporation  
9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129  
(702) 384-4012 Telecopier (702) 383-0701

Law Offices of  
OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX  
A Professional Corporation  
9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129  
(702) 384-4012 Telecopier (702) 383-0701

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

filed Brief of Amicus Curiae Professor Jason Schultz in Response to Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact that Require Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #30). Thereafter, the Court reset the hearing for oral argument on the Order to Show Cause for March 18, 2011.

The Court, having considered the papers and pleadings submitted and oral arguments of the parties present, finds there are no issues of material fact precluding the entry of judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f)(3).

Accordingly,


IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that summary judgment be GRANTED in favor of Defendants.

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of April, 2011.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Submitted by:

OLSON, CANNON,  
GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX

By:   
JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 000116  
MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 004762  
CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 009166  
9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129  
Attorneys for Defendants

**CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 1<sup>st</sup> day of April, 2011, I did serve, via the Court's CM/ECF System, a copy of the above and foregoing ERRATA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
An Employee of OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY  
& DESRUISSEAU

*Law Offices of*  
**OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAU**  
*A Professional Corporation*  
9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129  
(702) 384-4012, Telecopier (702) 383-0701

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

1 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.  
 Nevada Bar No. 000116  
 2 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.  
 Nevada Bar No. 004762  
 3 CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.  
 Nevada Bar. No. 009166  
 4 OLSON, CANNON, GORMLEY  
 & DESRUISSEAU  
 5 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
 6 Las Vegas, NV 89129  
 (702) 384-4012  
 7 FAX: (702) 383-0701  
 8 jolson@ocgd.com  
mstoberski@ocgd.com  
 9 Attorneys for Defendants  
 10 KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and  
 CENTER FOR INTERCULTURAL ORGANIZING

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

12 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

14	RIGHTHAVEN, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,	)	CASE NO. 2:10-cv-01322-JCM-LRL
15		)	
16	Plaintiff,	)	<b>DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO</b>
17	vs.	)	<b>PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO</b>
18	KAYSE JAMA, an individual, and	)	<b>ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND,</b>
19	CENTER FOR INTERCULTURAL ORGANIZING, a Non-Profit Organization,	)	<b>ALTERNATIVELY, REQUEST</b>
20		)	<b>FOR A CONTINUANCE TO</b>
21	Defendant.	)	<b>CONDUCT DISCOVERY</b>
		)	<b>PURSUANT TO FRCP 56(f)</b>

22 Presently before the Court is the Order to Show Cause why the Case should not be  
 23 Dismissed pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 107. The Court issued the Order to Show Cause why the Case  
 24 should not be Dismissed pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 107. (Dkt. #12). Plaintiff, Righthaven, LLC  
 25 ("Righthaven") filed a Response to Order to Show Cause, and Alternatively Request for  
 26 Continuance to Conduct Discovery Pursuant to FRCP 56(f). (Dkt. #14). Defendants, Kayse Jama  
 27 and Center for Intercultural Organizing ("Defendants") filed an Opposition to the Response to  
 28

1 Order to Show Cause, and Alternatively Request for Continuance to Conduct Discovery Pursuant  
2 to FRCP 56(f). (Dkt. #18). Professor Jason Schultz filed Brief of Amicus Curiae. (Dkt. #21).  
3 Righthaven filed its Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Response to Order to Show Cause. (Dkt. #22).  
4 Righthaven filed an Opposition to Professor Jason Schultz filed Brief of Amicus Curiae. (Dkt.  
5 #24). Righthaven filed Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact that Require  
6 Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #28). Defendants filed an Opposition to  
7 Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact that Require Resolution Prior to  
8 Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #29). Professor Schultz filed Brief of Amicus Curiae  
9 Professor Jason Schultz in Response to Plaintiff's Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact  
10 that Require Resolution Prior to Continued Fair Use Hearing. (Dkt. #30). Thereafter, the Court  
11 reset the hearing for oral argument on the Order to Show Cause for March 18, 2011.

12  
13 The Court, having considered the papers and pleadings submitted and oral arguments of  
14 the parties present, finds there are no issues of material fact precluding the entry of judgment  
15 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f)(3).

16 Specifically, as to the first fair use factor – the purpose and character of the use – the Court  
17 finds there is no dispute as to Defendants' non-profit status and the fact that Defendants did not  
18 sell, license, or publish the work commercially. *See* Affidavit of Kayse Jama (Dkt. #7-2) and  
19 Complaint, Exhibit 2 (Dkt. #1-1). The Court further finds that no reasonable jury could conclude  
20 that any general donation or solicitation for donations to Defendants' mission would constitute  
21 using the work for a commercial purpose. Moreover, the Court finds that Defendants have made a  
22 transformative use by targeting a different audience for a different purpose than the original  
23 publisher, the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. *See Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 487 F. 3d 701,  
24 722 (9th Cir. 2007) (finding fair use where defendant used a copyrighted work "in a new context  
25 to serve a different purpose"). The Court also finds that because Righthaven does not exploit or  
26 offer the work to the public in any form, there can be no substitution of the Defendants' use for  
27  
28

1 Righthaven's use of the work under the first fair use factor. *See Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com,*  
2 *Inc.*, 508 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2007). This factor weighs in favor of Defendants.

3 As to the second fair use factor – the nature of the work – the Court finds no genuine issue  
4 of material fact, because the nature of the work can be determined by examination of the article.  
5 Complaint Exhibit 1 (Dkt. #1-1). The news story at issue is largely factual and thus deserving of  
6 minimal copyright protection. This factor weighs heavily in favor of Defendants. *See Los Angeles*  
7 *News Serv. v. KCAL-TV Channel 9*, 108 F.3d 1119, 1122 (9th Cir. 1997).

8 As to the third factor – the amount and substantiality of the use – the Court finds that while  
9 Defendants posted the entirety of the work, this was reasonable in light of the purpose and  
10 character of the use under the first factor – to inform its members of important social and political  
11 information about immigrant issues. *See Amazon*, 508 F.3d at 1165; *Kelly v. Ariba Soft Corp.*, 336  
12 F.3d 811, 820-21 (9th Cir. 2003). *See also A.V. v. iParadigms, LLC*, 562 F.3d 630, 642 (4th Cir.  
13 2009); *Bond v. Blum*, 317 F.3d 385, 393 (4th Cir. 2003). *Nuñez v. Caribbean Int'l News Corp.*,  
14 235 F.3d 18, 24 (1st Cir. 2000); *Field v. Google Inc.*, 412 F. Supp. 2d 1106 (D. Nev. 2006).  
15 Because the amount copied was reasonable in relation to the purpose of the copying, this factor  
16 favors neither party. *See Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 US 569, 586 (1994).

17 Righthaven's reliance on *Worldwide Church of God v. Philadelphia Church of God, Inc.*,  
18 227 F.3d 1110 (9th Cir. 2000) is misplaced. As an initial matter, that case does not stand for the  
19 broad proposition that use of an entire work precludes a fair-use finding. *Id.* at 1118 (recognizing  
20 that “ ‘wholesale copying does not preclude fair use per se’ ”) (quoting *Hustler Magazine, Inc. v.*  
21 *Moral Majority, Inc.*, 796 F.2d 1148, 1155 (9th Cir. 1986)).

22 In *Worldwide Church of God*, a church owned the copyright in a 380-page book written by  
23 its founder entitled “Mystery of the Ages.” 227 F. 3d at 1112. The church stopped distributing the  
24 book when certain of its doctrines changed. *Id.* at 1113. A splinter group countermanded that  
25 directive by printing and distributing 30,000 copies of “Mystery of the Ages.” *Id.* When the new  
26 group ignored the church's cease-and-desist letter, the church filed a copyright infringement  
27  
28

1 action. *Id.* The splinter group made no attempt to claim that its use was transformative or served  
2 some different purpose than the original work. Instead, the group merely relied on its non-profit  
3 status as a defense. That was unavailing. By distributing “Mystery of the Ages” in bulk, the  
4 splinter group was able to draw thousands to its congregation, and those members tithed 10% of  
5 their income to the new church. *Id.* at 1118.

6 *Worldwide Church of God* is distinguishable. First, Defendants’ use of the short news  
7 article at issue serves a different purpose than the original work by providing information to its  
8 members concerning the specialized topic of immigrant and refugee rights. *See Amazon*, 508 F.3d  
9 at 1165 (“making an exact copy of a work may be transformative so long as the copy serves a  
10 different function than the original work”). Second, as discussed above, Defendants’ use was not  
11 competitive with either Righthaven’s use or even the use of the original copyright owner, the  
12 Review-Journal. By contrast, the parties in *Worldwide Church of God* were directly competing for  
13 same tithing members.  
14

15 As to the fourth factor – the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the  
16 original work – the Court finds that Defendants use was socially beneficial in that it informed its  
17 members of important social and political information. *Amazon*, 487 F.3d at 724-25; *Field*, 412 F.  
18 Supp. 2d at 1119 (finding fair use where Google’s cache of works served “different and socially  
19 important purposes” than the original works). Furthermore, Righthaven has failed to produce any  
20 evidence that there is a potential market for the work in this case, as it does not make any  
21 commercial use of the work. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d) Declaration of Shawn Mangano (Dkt. #15)*  
22 *and Righthaven’s Identification of Genuine Issues of Material Fact that Require Resolution Prior*  
23 *to Continued Fair Use Hearing (Dkt. #28)*. *See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1)* (“A party asserting  
24 that a fact . . . is genuinely disputed must support the assertion by . . . citing to particular parts of  
25 materials in the record.”); *Matushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574,  
26 587 (1986) (“the nonmoving party must come forward with ‘specific facts showing that there is a  
27 *genuine issue for trial.*’”) (quoting former Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)) (emphasis in *Matushita*);  
28



1 *Precision Airmotive Corp. v. Rivera*, 288 F.Supp.2d 1151, 1154 (W.D. Wash. 2003) (“A  
2 continuance is not justified when all the information and knowledge is already in Plaintiff’s  
3 possession.”).

4 Moreover, in light of *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC*, 547 U.S. 388 (2006), where the  
5 Supreme Court held that there should be no presumption of harm where the holder of a patent does  
6 not commercially exploit the patented invention, this Court finds that the same reasoning should  
7 apply under the fourth fair use factor where a copyright holder does not commercially exploit a  
8 copyrighted work. See *Salinger v. Colting*, 607 F.3d 68 (2nd Cir. 2010) (applying *eBay*’s  
9 reasoning to copyright law); *Blanch v. Koons*, 467 F. 3d 244, 258 (2d Cir. 2006) (fourth factor  
10 “greatly favors” a fair use finding where the copyright holder was not commercially exploiting  
11 photograph); *Field*, 412 F. Supp. 2d at 1121 (fourth factor favored defendant where there was “no  
12 evidence of any market for [the copyright holder’s] works.”); NIMMER ON COPYRIGHT §  
13 13.05[A][4] (2010) (“On occasion, the lack of market harm is apparent.”). This factor also weighs  
14 in favor of defendants.  
15

16 Finally, the four factors must be considered “in light of the purposes of copyright,” which  
17 are “[t]o promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts and to serve the welfare of the public.”  
18 *Perfect 10 v. Amazon.com*, 508 F.3d at 1163 (internal citations omitted). In light of the above  
19 findings, the Court concludes that Defendants’ use advances the Copyright Act’s purpose.

20 Accordingly,

21 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that summary judgment be  
22 GRANTED in favor of Defendants.

23 DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of March, 2011.

24  
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

26 Submitted by:  
27  
28

1 OLSON, CANNON,  
2 GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX

3 By:  <sup>9166</sup>  
for

4 JAMES R. OLSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 000116  
5 MICHAEL E. STOBERSKI, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 004762  
6 CHRISTOPHER J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 009166  
7 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129  
8 Attorneys for Defendants

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

1  
2 I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2011, I served the foregoing,  
3 DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW  
4 CAUSE AND, ALTERNATIVELY, REQUEST FOR A CONTINUANCE TO CONDUCT  
5 DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO FRCP 56(f), on:

6 Shawn A. Mangano, Esq.  
7 RIGHTHAVEN LLC  
8 9960 West Cheyenne Avenue, Suite 210  
9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129-7701  
shawn@manganolaw.com

10 Anne Pieroni, Esq.  
11 RIGHTHAVEN LLC  
12 9960 West Cheyenne Avenue, Suite 210  
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129-7701  
ccoons@righthaven.com  
jchu@righthaven.com

14 through the CM/ECF system of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada (or, if  
15 necessary, by U.S. Mail, first class, postage prepaid), upon the following:  
16

17 

18 AN EMPLOYEE OF OLSON, CANNON,  
19 GORMLEY & DESRUISSEAUX  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28