

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\_\_\_\_\_  
DONNA CORBELLO,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THOMAS GAETANO DEVITO et al.,

Defendants.  
\_\_\_\_\_

2:08-cv-00867-RCJ-PAL

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Donna Corbello is the widow and heir of Rex Woodard, who assisted Defendant Thomas Gaetano “Tommy” DeVito in writing his unpublished autobiography *Tommy DeVito — Then and Now* (“the Work”). Plaintiff sued DeVito and others when they used the Work to develop the screenplay for *Jersey Boys* (“the Play”), a hit musical based on the band The Four Seasons that has played in the United States, Canada, England, and Australia. Corbello sued several Defendants for copyright infringement, and she sued DeVito for an accounting. The Court granted summary judgment to Defendants. The Court of Appeals reversed in part and remanded for trial. At the close of Plaintiff’s evidence, Defendants orally moved for judgment as a matter of law, and the Court granted the motion in part and denied it in part, ruling that Defendants Frankie Valli and Robert Gaudio were entitled to judgment as a matter of law against the claims of copyright infringement, and that all Defendants were entitled to judgment as a

1 matter of law against enhanced damages for willful copyright infringement. The jury returned a  
2 verdict for Plaintiff. Three post-trial motions are pending before the Court.

### 3 **I. FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

#### 4 **A. Factual Background**

##### 5 **1. The Work**

6 Rex Woodard was an attorney, author, and avid Four Seasons fan. He finally met  
7 Defendant and founding Four Seasons member Tommy DeVito for an interview on December 9,  
8 1981, as a result of the publicity generated from an article Woodard had written about the band  
9 in *Goldmine* magazine earlier that year (the “1981 Article”) that focused on the years between  
10 the band’s breakup in 1970 and reconstitution in 1975. (*See* Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 26–29, ECF  
11 No. 457). On December 23, 1981, Woodard interviewed Tommy’s brother Nick DeVito, and on  
12 January 8, 1982, he interviewed Nick Massi, another founding member of The Four Seasons. (*Id.*  
13 ¶ 29). The result of these three interviews was a second article published in *Goldmine* in June of  
14 1982 (the “1982 Article”), which focused on the band’s earliest incarnation, The Four Lovers.  
15 (*Id.*).

16 Woodard kept in touch with DeVito and founding Four Seasons member Frankie Valli  
17 throughout the 1980s, and in November of 1988 Woodard flew to Las Vegas, Nevada for a series  
18 of interviews (the “1988 Interviews”) with DeVito that sowed the seeds of the present litigation.  
19 (*See id.* ¶ 31–32). During these interviews, DeVito explained to Woodard that except for Valli  
20 and final Four Seasons founding member Robert “Bob” Gaudio, the members of the band  
21 (DeVito and Massi) had spent several years engaged in criminal enterprises and in prison and  
22 retained “underworld contacts” throughout the band’s era of popularity. (*See id.* ¶ 32). Because  
23 this revelation was in stark contrast to the clean-cut image of the band presented in the popular  
24

1 media, Woodard realized the journalistic value of the story, and DeVito offered Woodard the  
2 opportunity to write his authorized biography with full credit and an equal share in any profits.  
3 (*See id.*).

4 Woodard returned to Beaumont, Texas to begin writing DeVito's authorized biography  
5 (the "Work"), which has never been published. (*See id.*). On December 1, 1988, Woodard sent  
6 DeVito a letter (the "Letter Agreement") memorializing their previous verbal understandings  
7 concerning creation of the Work. (*Id.* ¶ 33). DeVito signed the Letter Agreement beneath the  
8 word "APPROVED" and mailed it back to Woodard. (*See id.*; Letter Agreement, Dec. 1, 1988,  
9 ECF No. 457-11). The Letter Agreement reads in full:

10 December 1, 1988

11 Mr. Tommy DeVito  
12 [street address]  
Las Vegas, Nevada [zip code]

13 Dear Tommy:

14 I am making progress on the taped interviews we did. You suggested that I  
15 prepare a written memorandum of our arrangement for future reference. I will do  
so by this letter.

16 I agreed to write your authorized biography based on the recorded  
17 interviews you gave me, plus any other relevant information which would benefit  
the book. You and I will be shown as co-authors, with you receiving first billing.  
18 I will do all of the actual writing, but you will have absolute and exclusive control  
over the final text of this book.

19 We have further agreed that we will share equally in any profits arising from  
20 this book, whether they be in the form of royalties, advances, adaptations fees, or  
whatever. This agreement will be binding upon our heirs, both as to obligations  
and benefits, in the event one or both of us should die.

21 If this letter accurately sets forth our agreement as you understand it, sign  
22 the enclosed photocopy where indicated and return it to me in the enclosed self-  
23 addressed, stamped envelope. Keep this original letter in your own file.  
24

1 Thank you for asking me to work with you on this project. I look forward  
2 to working with you over the next several months.

3 Sincerely,  
4 [signed Rex Woodard]  
5 Rex Woodard

6 RW/ml  
7 Enclosures

8 APPROVED:  
9 [signed Tommy DeVito]  
10 TOMMY DEVITO

11 (Letter Agreement). Over the next two years, Woodard used the 1988 Interviews and all of his  
12 other knowledge about the band to create the Work, including his past interviews with band  
13 members, newspaper articles, magazine articles, album linings, Freedom of Information Act  
14 requests he filed with law enforcement agencies, and questionnaires he sent to DeVito. (Third  
15 Am. Compl. ¶ 34). Woodard compiled all of this information into the Work, resulting in a first-  
16 person, narrative-style biography told from DeVito's perspective. (*See id.*). Woodard remained  
17 in close contact with DeVito throughout his creation of the Work and sent DeVito each chapter  
18 for approval and editing as it was completed. (*Id.* ¶ 35).

## 19 **2. Woodard's and DeVito's Publication Attempts**

20 As the Work neared completion in late 1990, Woodard and DeVito attempted to find a  
21 publisher and even provided an outline of the Work to actor Joe Pesci to explore adaptation to a  
22 screenplay. (*See id.* ¶ 36). Plaintiff provides a copy of what she claims is a cover sheet to a  
23 January 1991 version of the Work, which reads in full:

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

TOMMY DEVITO  
REX WOODARD  
©, January, 1991

(See January 1991 Work Cover Page, ECF No. 457-15).

Though he never smoked, Woodard had been diagnosed with lung cancer in 1989, and his condition had begun seriously to worsen by late 1990. (*Id.* ¶ 39). By February or March of 1991, he was bedridden, and he died on May 25, 1991, at age forty-one. (*Id.* ¶ 40). Woodard had hoped that income generated from the Work would support his wife and children. (*Id.* ¶ 41).

### **3. Plaintiff's and Ceen's Publication Attempts**

In accordance with Woodard's wishes, Plaintiff and Woodard's sister Cindy Ceen continued to seek publication after Woodard's death independently of DeVito; however, public interest in The Four Seasons had waned, making it difficult to find a publisher. (*Id.* ¶ 42). In September 2005, Ceen decided to contact DeVito for his assistance in publishing the Work. (*See id.*). Ceen first contacted a prominent member of an Internet Four Seasons fan group named Charles Alexander to facilitate contact with DeVito. (*See id.* ¶ 43). On September 22, 2005, Alexander responded to Ceen that he had met with DeVito the previous day, had told DeVito of Ceen's desire to publish the Work, and that DeVito had agreed to help. (*See id.*). Ceen called DeVito the same day at a telephone number provided by Alexander, and DeVito indicated that he wanted to update the Work with post-1990 events and restore some "obscene" language Woodard had omitted. (*Id.*). DeVito also claimed he had lost his copy of the Work and asked Ceen for a replacement, which she mailed to DeVito the next day, along with a letter memorializing their telephone conversation and informing DeVito that Plaintiff was considering self-publishing the Work if a traditional publisher could not be found. (*Id.*). Neither Plaintiff nor Ceen heard from DeVito again. (*Id.* ¶ 44). DeVito's attorney Jay Julien left Ceen a voicemail

1 message on November 2, 2005, and Ceen returned his call the next day, during which  
2 conversation Julien told Ceen that he had spoken with DeVito regarding the Work and concluded  
3 that it was “not saleable.” (*Id.*). Ceen was surprised by this conclusion, because the play *Jersey*  
4 *Boys* was scheduled to open on Broadway a few days later. (*Id.*). Julien did not disclose that the  
5 Work had been used or exploited in any way or that rights in the Work had been licensed or  
6 assigned. (*Id.*).

#### 7 **4. *Jersey Boys* and Plaintiff’s Discovery of the Alleged Infringements**

8 By late 2006, *Jersey Boys* had become a Broadway hit, earning four Tony Awards. (*Id.*  
9 ¶ 45). Plaintiff had not seen the show, but she and Ceen estimated that the show’s success would  
10 revive interest in the band and make publication of the Work viable. (*Id.*). Plaintiff and Ceen  
11 engaged counsel to confirm the registration of Woodard’s and DeVito’s copyright in the Work,  
12 to register the copyright if not yet registered, and to contact Julien to see if DeVito had changed  
13 his mind about joint publication of the Work in light of *Jersey Boys*’s success. (*Id.*). A January  
14 3, 2007 search of the U.S. Copyright Office’s online records indicated no registration of the  
15 Work to Woodard but showed that on January 11, 1991 (four months before Woodard’s death),  
16 DeVito had registered a literary work entitled *Tommy DeVito - Then and Now*, Reg. No. Txu 454  
17 118 (the “DeVito Work”). (*Id.* ¶ 46). Plaintiff’s counsel ordered a copy of the registration and  
18 discovered that DeVito had registered the DeVito Work in his own name only, claiming that the  
19 work was unpublished and that he wrote it in its entirety in 1990. (*Id.* ¶ 47). Plaintiff’s counsel  
20 ordered a copy of the DeVito Work itself and discovered that the DeVito Work was identical to  
21 the Work, and in fact appeared to be a photocopy of the manuscript typed by Woodard’s  
22 secretary Myrtle Locke, with two exceptions. (*Id.* ¶¶ 48–49). First, the original cover page from  
23  
24

the January 1991 version of the Work had been replaced with a cover page in a different font and font size, reading:

TXu 454 118

....

Tommy DeVito - Then and Now  
by  
Tommy DeVito

(*Id.* ¶ 49; *see* DeVito Work Cover Page, ECF No. 457-23). Second, the first page of Chapter 41 (page 264 of the Work) was missing. (*See* Third Am. Compl. ¶ 49). Plaintiff concluded in light of the Letter Agreement and her dealings with DeVito and his counsel after Woodard’s death that DeVito had registered the Work without credit to Woodard or disclosure to Woodard or his heirs. (*Id.* ¶ 50).

Plaintiff also soon discovered that the writers of and several actors in *Jersey Boys* had access to the Work and that DeVito had received royalties or other profits from *Jersey Boys*, and she concluded that the Work had “inspired the form, structure, and content of the musical . . . .” (*See id.* ¶ 51). As support for this conclusion, Plaintiff notes that Defendant Des McAnuff, the director of *Jersey Boys*, was quoted in a July 8, 2006 report in *Backstage* magazine as stating that Defendants Marshall Brickman and Eric Elice had relied in part on “an unpublished autobiography by DeVito” in creating the libretto. (*See id.* ¶ 52). Plaintiff notes that Christian Hoff, the first actor to play DeVito in *Jersey Boys*, stated in what appears to be an online interview that he was provided with a synopsis of the Work for his audition and a full copy for background research. (*See id.*). Plaintiff also cites to a Wikipedia entry for support that the Work served as a basis for the musical. (*See id.*). Plaintiff also notes an exchange on a *Jersey Boys* podcast website indicating that one fan had reported to another that the musical was based on

DeVito's unpublished biography. (*See id.*). Plaintiff also saw public reports of DeVito's financial profits from the musical. (*See id.*).

### 5. Pre-Litigation Negotiations

On June 13, 2007, Plaintiff's counsel wrote Julien by email and overnight courier demanding that DeVito execute an application for supplementary registration with the U.S. Copyright Office to add Woodard as a coauthor and co-claimant of the Work and demanding an accounting of profits in accordance with the Letter Agreement. (*Id.* ¶ 53). Counsel conferred with one another by email and telephone between June and October 2007, and Julien admitted at one point that DeVito had provided a copy of the Work "to Jersey Boys" and expressed interest in the possibility of a joint copyright infringement action against "Jersey Boys," but later decided that Plaintiff's only recourse was a suit against DeVito because he had authorized the use of the Work. (*Id.* ¶ 54). Although DeVito initially considered filing a supplemental registration of the Work to credit Woodard, he later refused, claiming that he in fact was the sole author and that Woodard had been a mere scribe. (*Id.*).

On July 2, 2007, Plaintiff filed her own supplementary application with the U.S. Copyright Office to add Woodard as a coauthor and co-claimant of the Work, but the office rejected the application because DeVito, the original claimant, had not signed it. (*Id.* ¶ 55). Under 17 U.S.C. § 201(a), the office could not permit a non-author, non-claimant of an original registration, i.e., a "basic registration," to supplement the basic application. However, such a person could apply to register her own work, in which case the office would consider the new claim to be adverse to the existing claim if the claims purported to register the same work exclusively to different claimants. (*See* Copyright Office Letter, June 16, 2008, ECF No. 457-27, at 7). However, the Copyright Office Review Board granted Plaintiff's appeal based on a closer



1 examination of regulations and practices, determining that her supplemental registration could be  
2 accepted, and that a certificate of registration would be issued after processing. (*See* Copyright  
3 Office Letter, Mar. 27, 2009, ECF No. 457-28). The amended certificate, Reg. No. Txu1 372-  
4 636, lists Woodard and DeVito as coauthors of the entire text of the Work and co-claimants  
5 thereto. (*See* Certificate of Registration TXu1 372-636, July 3, 2007, ECF No. 457-29).

6 Thereafter, further indication of the connection between *Jersey Boys* and the Work  
7 emerged through public sources such as public interviews of certain Defendants. (*See* Third Am.  
8 Compl. ¶ 56). Plaintiff alleges that the evidence that the musical was an adaptation of the Work  
9 means that *Jersey Boys* is a “derivative work” of the Work under 17 U.S.C. § 101. (*See id.* ¶ 57).  
10 Plaintiff recounts various similarities between *Jersey Boys* and the Work. (*See id.*).

#### 11 **6. The “Cover-Up”**

12 DeVito and Julien then took steps to conceal the fact that DeVito had exploited the Work  
13 to create and profit from *Jersey Boys*. (*See id.* ¶ 58). First, DeVito withdrew his quotes from  
14 Charles Alexander’s forward to the upcoming *Jersey Boys* book, because the use of those  
15 quotations would have linked the book, and hence the musical, to the Work. (*See id.*). Second,  
16 DeVito reported in an interview that he had never shown the Work to anyone except Brickman,  
17 Elice, and McAnuff, the writers and director of *Jersey Boys*. (*Id.*). Third, DeVito “dismantled”  
18 his website (www.tommydevito.com) to remove reference to “his SMASH HIT *Jersey Boys*.”  
19 (*Id.*). Fourth, he stated in an interview that he had dictated the Work to a lawyer and that the  
20 book was not to be published yet. (*Id.*).

#### 21 **7. DeVito’s Licensing of the Work**

22 Certain documents made public during Valli’s divorce proceedings in July 2008 revealed  
23 that DeVito had granted Valli and Gaudio an exclusive, irrevocable, perpetual, worldwide,  
24

1 assignable license (the “1999 Agreement”) freely to use and adapt certain “Materials,” including  
2 his “biographies,” for the purpose of creating a musical based on the “life and music” of The  
3 Four Seasons. (*Id.* ¶ 59). The 1999 Agreement included the right to “ancillary and subsidiary  
4 exploitations thereof including, without limitation, cast albums, motion picture and televised  
5 versions, merchandise, and/or other works . . . in all media now existing or later devised.” (*Id.*).  
6 The 1999 Agreement waived any claim of copyright infringement by DeVito, provided that  
7 DeVito would be entitled to 20% of any royalties Valli and Gaudio obtained through exploitation  
8 of the Materials, and provided that Massi would be entitled to 5% of any such royalties. (*See id.*).  
9 Plaintiff suspects that Valli and Gaudio further licensed the Materials, which included the Work,  
10 to one or more unknown authors in 1999 for adaptation into an early version of *Jersey Boys*  
11 called Walk Like a Man. (*See id.*). When the original producer rejected Walk Like a Man, Valli  
12 and Gaudio fired its authors, permitted their agreement with the original producer to lapse, and  
13 further licensed the Materials to Brickman and Elice, who used them to write *Jersey Boys*. (*See*  
14 *id.*). Plaintiff implies that Valli’s and Gaudio’s joint ventures related to their exploitation of the  
15 Materials constitute a general partnership as a matter of law that Plaintiff refers to as “The Four  
16 Seasons Partnership.” (*See id.* ¶ 4–5).

## 17 **8. *Jersey Boys***

18 The *Jersey Boys* foundational production agreement (the “Jersey Boys Agreement”) is  
19 dated May 1, 2004. (*See id.* ¶ 61; Jersey Boys Agreement 1, ECF No. 457-34, at 2). The Jersey  
20 Boys Agreement lists five parties: Valli and Gaudio as “Owner,” Brickman and Elice as  
21 “Bookwriter,” and Dodger Stage Holding Theatricals, Inc. (now known as DSHT, Inc.) as  
22 “Producer.” (*See* Jersey Boys Agreement 1). The copies of the signature page of the Jersey Boys  
23 Agreement attached to the Third Amended Complaint (“TAC”) include signatures by all of these  
24

1 parties except Brickman, and DSHT's signature is typewritten, without the handwritten signature  
2 of any natural person as an agent of DSHT. (*See id.* at 24, ECF No. 457-34, at 25–26). The  
3 signatures are not dated. (*See id.*). The Jersey Boys Agreement is comprehensive and appears to  
4 govern the worldwide exploitation of *Jersey Boys*. (*See generally id.*). The details of the twenty-  
5 three-page agreement need not be recounted here, but will be noted where relevant to the  
6 determination of claims. The Jersey Boys Agreement includes a schedule and two exhibits as  
7 attachments, all of which the base agreement identifies. Schedule A is a table of musical  
8 compositions to be used in the musical along with details of authorship and copyright ownership.  
9 Exhibit A is the 1999 Agreement. Exhibit B is a list of “payment instructions” consisting of  
10 addresses for mailing payments to the signatories and other beneficiaries.

11 Plaintiff believes that DSHT further assigned or licensed its rights under the Jersey Boys  
12 Agreement to Defendant Dodger Theatricals, Ltd., which is the primary producer of *Jersey Boys*  
13 on Broadway, tours throughout the United States, and in London, U.K. (*See Third Am. Compl.*  
14 ¶ 62). Plaintiff believes that DSHT and/or Dodger Theatricals further licensed their rights to  
15 others and eventually assigned them to Defendant Jersey Boys Broadway Limited Partnership,  
16 which in turn licensed them to several parties, including Defendants JB Viva Vegas and Jersey  
17 Boys Records Limited Partnership. (*See id.*). Plaintiff alleges that *Jersey Boys* has earned profits  
18 of approximately \$150 million per year, with a life expectancy of at least ten years, and believes  
19 she is entitled to at least \$6.5 million. (*See id.* ¶ 70).

## 20 **B. Procedural History**

### 21 **1. The Present Lawsuit**

22 In December 2007, Plaintiff sued DeVito in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern  
23 District of Texas on three causes of action: (1) declaratory judgment; (2) equitable accounting;  
24

1 and (3) breach of contract. That court transferred the case to this District in 2008 pursuant to 28  
2 U.S.C. § 1404(a), without deciding whether it had personal jurisdiction over DeVito, and it  
3 denied Plaintiff's motion to reconsider. The TAC, filed in March 2011, lists fourteen Defendants  
4 and twenty causes of action: (1) declaratory judgment (DeVito); (2) equitable accounting  
5 (DeVito); (3) breach of contract (DeVito); (4) unjust enrichment (DeVito); (5) breach of the  
6 covenant of good faith and fair dealing (DeVito); (6) constructive fraud (DeVito); (7) fraud  
7 (DeVito); (8) conversion (DeVito); (9) copyright infringement under § 16(2) of the Copyright,  
8 Designs, and Patents Act of 1988 (U.K.) (DeVito); (10) copyright infringement under § 27(1) of  
9 the Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1985 (Can.) (DeVito); (11) copyright infringement under §§ 115(1),  
10 36, and 39 of the Copyright Act of 1968 (Cth) (Austl.) (DeVito); (12)–(13) declaratory judgment  
11 (Valli, Gaudio, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals, and Jersey Boys Broadway); (14) equitable  
12 accounting (Valli, Gaudio, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals, and Jersey Boys Broadway, in the  
13 alternative) (15) copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 501(a) (Valli, Gaudio, Brickman,  
14 Elice, McAnuff, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals, Jersey Boys Broadway, JB Viva Vegas, and Jersey  
15 Boys Records); (16) vicarious copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 502 (Valli, Gaudio,  
16 Brickman, Elice, McAnuff, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals, Jersey Boys Broadway, Jersey Boys  
17 Records, Skunk, and Getting Home); (17) contributory copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C.  
18 § 502 (Valli, Gaudio, Brickman, Elice, McAnuff, Michael S. David, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals,  
19 Jersey Boys Broadway, and Jersey Boys Records); (18) copyright infringement under § 16(2) of  
20 the Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act of 1988 (U.K.) (Valli, Gaudio, Brickman, Elice,  
21 McAnuff, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals, and Jersey Boys Broadway); (19) copyright infringement  
22 under § 27(1) of the Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1985 (Can.) (Valli, Gaudio, Brickman, Elice,  
23 McAnuff, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals, and Jersey Boys Broadway); and (20) copyright  
24

1 infringement under §§ 115(1), 36, and 39 of the Copyright Act of 1968 (Cth) (Austl.) (Valli,  
2 Gaudio, Brickman, Elice, McAnuff, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals, and Jersey Boys Broadway).

3 **2. The First Summary Judgment Order (ECF No. 300)**

4 On March 31, 2010, the Court issued an order resolving ten pretrial motions as against  
5 the Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”). The Court denied DeVito’s motion to dismiss, or in  
6 the alternative for summary judgment, finding that certain state law defenses were preempted by  
7 the Copyright Act and that in any case there was no evidence of an attorney–client relationship  
8 but only of a business relationship between DeVito and Woodard. The Court also found that  
9 there remained genuine issues of material fact as to the eligibility of the Work or certain parts of  
10 it for copyright protection and as to what parts of the Work were used to create *Jersey Boys*. The  
11 Court granted Corbello’s cross motion for summary judgment as to DeVito’s state law defenses  
12 but denied it as to infringement for the same reasons the Court denied DeVito’s motion.

13 The Court denied Valli’s, Gaudio’s, Brickman’s, Elice’s, McAnuff’s, DSHT’s, Dodger  
14 Theatricals’, and JB Viva Vegas, LP’s (collectively, “New Defendants”) motion to dismiss  
15 counts 15–17 for copyright infringement. New Defendants argued that DeVito had waived and  
16 released any right to sue them and that they had an implied nonexclusive license from DeVito.  
17 Finding no New York law to the contrary, the Court ruled in accordance with Ninth Circuit  
18 precedent that a failed attempt to grant an exclusive license could result in a nonexclusive license  
19 and that that was what happened in this case according to undisputed facts. The Court denied the  
20 motion to dismiss, however, because it had been sufficiently alleged that New Defendants had  
21 sublicensed the work beyond the scope of their own license.

22 The Court denied Brickman’s, Elice’s, McAnuff’s, DSHT’s, Dodger Theatricals’, and JB  
23 Viva Vegas, LP’s other motion to dismiss counts 15–17 for copyright infringement. Movants  
24

1 argued that the alleged similarities were unprotectable under copyright law, that many alleged  
2 similarities were not similarities, and that there was no “bodily appropriation” or “wholesale  
3 appropriation” of the Work by the *Jersey Boys* script. The Court found the claims to have been  
4 sufficiently alleged.

5 The Court denied Valli’s, Gaudio’s, DSHT’s, and Dodger Theatricals’ motion to dismiss  
6 counts 13–14 for declaratory judgment and an equitable accounting, finding that Corbello had  
7 sufficiently alleged in the alternative that DeVito had assigned his copyright in the Work via the  
8 1999 Agreement such that movants could authorize others to use it but would owe Corbello, a  
9 joint owner, an accounting for any profits thereby obtained.

10 **3. The Second Summary Judgment Order (ECF No. 661)**

11 On October 27, 2011, the Court granted in part and denied in part two summary judgment  
12 motions. Corbello and Defendants Valli, Gaudio, DSHT, Dodger Theatricals, and Jersey Boys  
13 Broadway filed cross motions for summary judgment as to counts 12–14 for declaratory  
14 judgment and an equitable accounting. As to count 12 for a declaration that DeVito as a joint  
15 owner of the Work lacked the legal ability to grant Valli and Gaudio an exclusive license and  
16 that the 1999 Agreement was therefore either void, a nonexclusive license, or a transfer of  
17 DeVito’s rights in the Work, the Court denied summary judgment, ruling that the 1999  
18 Agreement was not a transfer of ownership but a license that was exclusive as against DeVito but  
19 nonexclusive as against Corbello. As to count 13 for an alternative declaration that the 1999  
20 Agreement permitted Valli and Gaudio to further transfer or license the Work, that they did  
21 transfer or license the Work to DSHT and/or Dodger Theatricals via the Jersey Boys Agreement,  
22 and that Dodger Theatricals thereafter transferred or licensed the Work to Jersey Boys  
23 Broadway, the Court granted summary judgment to Plaintiff in part, ruling that the 1999  
24

1 Agreement permitted further assignment and that Valli and Gaudio had further assigned the  
2 rights in the Work to DSHT via the Jersey Boys Agreement, but that it was not clear whether  
3 there had been any further assignment. The Court granted summary judgment to Defendants as  
4 to count 14 for an accounting because there had been no transfer of the Work, and the relevant  
5 agreements included no duty to account.

6 **4. The Third Summary Judgment Order (ECF No. 780)**

7 On January 31, 2012, the Court adjudicated seven of the seventeen claims then remaining  
8 and entered judgment in favor of all Defendants except DeVito and David. Jersey Boys Records  
9 had moved for summary judgment based on personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim.  
10 The Court found that it had personal jurisdiction over Jersey Boys Records but granted the  
11 motion on the merits, ruling that Plaintiff had adduced no evidence that Jersey Boys Records had  
12 control over any other Defendant, that there was no allegation that Jersey Boys Records was  
13 aware of any infringement (so it could not be liable for contributory infringement), and that the  
14 album at issue did not pass the extrinsic test as to substantial similarity to the Work. The Court  
15 denied two motions for summary judgment based on the statute of limitations. The Court denied  
16 David's motion for summary judgment based on personal jurisdiction. The Court denied a  
17 motion for summary judgment on the merits of the infringement issue as moot because the Court  
18 contemporaneously granted another motion based on the Defendants' having licenses to use the  
19 Work. The Court granted a motion for summary judgment as against the claims of infringement  
20 under foreign law, following the Second Circuit's persuasive ruling that the Berne Convention  
21 did not provide choice-of-law rules for copyright claims, finding that U.S. law governed issues  
22 of copyright ownership and licensing in this case even if foreign law governed substantive  
23 infringement claims and that the licenses under U.S. law protected Defendants from the foreign  
24

1 infringement claims. The Court granted Corbello's motion for summary judgment as to  
2 declarations that the Work was a joint work, that Woodard was a co-owner of the Work, and that  
3 DeVito held a 50% interest in the Work in constructive trust for Corbello, as successor-in-  
4 interest to Woodard.

## 5 **5. Further District Court Proceedings**

6 At that point, claims 2–11 against DeVito remained for trial. On July 9, 2012, the Court  
7 denied fees to Defendants, added David to the Judgment, and certified the Third Summary  
8 Judgment Order and the present order for immediate appeal under Rule 54(b).

## 9 **6. The Appeal and Remand**

10 Corbello appealed the certified orders, and on February 10, 2015, the Court of Appeals  
11 reversed in part, ruling that the 1999 Agreement had been a transfer of ownership such that Valli  
12 and Gaudio became joint owners with Corbello in 1999, *Corbello v. DeVito*, 777 F.3d 1058,  
13 1064 (9th Cir. 2015), and that although Valli and Gaudio could not be liable for infringement  
14 while they were joint owners, there remained a genuine issue of material fact whether the 1999  
15 Agreement's reversionary clause had later been triggered such that Valli and Gaudio might be  
16 liable for infringement for their use of the Work thereafter, *id.* at 1066–67. The Court of Appeals  
17 also ruled there remained a genuine issue of material fact as to whether DeVito had granted Valli  
18 and Gaudio an implied nonexclusive license upon reversion. *Id.* at 1067–68.

## 19 **7. The Fourth Summary Judgment Order (No. 872)**

20 Before trial, the parties requested that the Court determine certain issues as a matter of  
21 law, i.e., whether certain parts of the Work were protected at all, whether the Work was entitled  
22 to “thick” versus “thin” copyright protection, and whether Defendants were entitled to summary  
23 judgment on the infringement issue under the extrinsic test. The Court ruled that under the law  
24



1 of the case, the jury would have to be instructed that the 1999 Agreement was a transfer of  
2 ownership whereby Valli and Gaudio became joint owners with Corbello, and that Valli and  
3 Gaudio could not be liable for infringement while they were joint owners. The jury would also  
4 have to determine whether the 1999 Agreement's reversionary clause was ever triggered such  
5 that Valli and Gaudio might be liable for infringement thereafter. If the exclusive license had  
6 reverted, the jury would also have to determine whether DeVito had granted Valli and Gaudio an  
7 implied nonexclusive license such that they could not have been liable for infringement even  
8 after their ownership interest reverted to DeVito. Finally, the jury would have to determine  
9 infringement under direct copying or substantial similarity theories. To find liability under the  
10 latter theory, the jury would first have to perform the extrinsic test. The Court granted summary  
11 judgment in part as to the extrinsic test, finding that regular "thick" copyright protection did not  
12 apply as a matter of law, so the jury would have to be instructed that if the Work passed the  
13 extrinsic test, the jury would then have to apply "thin" protection under the intrinsic test. *See*  
14 *Funky Films, Inc. v. Time Warner Entm't Co., L.P.*, 462 F.3d 1072, 1076–77 (9th Cir. 2006);  
15 *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 35 F.3d 1435, 1443 (9th Cir. 1994). The Court also  
16 noted at a status conference that it intended to bifurcate the trial into infringement and damages  
17 phases and intended to hold accounting proceedings without a jury if any Defendant were found  
18 to be liable for infringement or an accounting.

#### 19 **8. The Fifth Summary Judgment Order (No. 972)**

20 The parties filed four additional motions for summary judgment. Plaintiff asked the  
21 Court to grant her summary judgment against the affirmative defense of an implied nonexclusive  
22 license and whether the 1999 Agreement had reverted. Defendants asked the Court to grant them  
23  
24

1 summary judgment based on fair use and against the UK, Canadian, and Australian infringement  
2 claims. The Court denied all four motions.

### 3 **9. The Trial**

4 After 15 days of trial, the Court mostly denied Defendants' motion for a judgment as a  
5 matter of law but granted the motion in favor of Valli and Gaudio as to infringement and in favor  
6 of all Defendants as to willful infringement. The jury found: (1) Tommy DeVito did not grant  
7 Defendants an implied nonexclusive license to use the Work to create the Play; (2) the Play  
8 infringed the Work; (3) the use of the Work in the Play did not constitute fair use; (4) 10% of the  
9 success of the Play was attributable to infringement of the Work; and (5) the remaining  
10 Defendants were liable for direct infringement (as opposed to vicarious or contributory  
11 infringement).

## 12 **II. DISCUSSION**

13 Three substantive motions are pending before the Court. First, DeVito has asked the  
14 Court to vacate part of a previous order requiring his royalty payments from Defendants to be  
15 placed into escrow, because he has settled with Plaintiff. Second, Defendants have renewed their  
16 motion for judgment as a matter of law. Third, Defendants have moved for a new trial.

### 17 **A. DeVito's Motion**

18 The Court grants DeVito's motion and will separately enter the proposed order attached  
19 thereto. No party has objected (although Defendants have "replied" to the motion in order to  
20 make additional arguments against the outcome of the trial).

### 21 **B. Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law**

22 Defendants note that during trial, the Court stated it believed Defendants were entitled to  
23 a directed verdict on the fair use issue but did not want to risk a retrial in the case of reversal, and  
24

1 it therefore denied the Rule 50(a) motion but intended to grant a Rule 50(b) motion. Plaintiff  
2 notes that the Court later opined that it believed the fair use issue was properly a jury question.  
3 The Court has closely examined the evidence under the relevant standards and concludes  
4 Defendants are entitled to a judgment as a matter of law on the fair use issue.

5 Fair use is a mixed question of law and fact determined by four nonexclusive statutory  
6 factors: “(1) the purpose and character of the use; (2) the nature of the copyrighted work; (3) the  
7 substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; (4) the effect on  
8 the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.” *Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v.*  
9 *Nation Enters.*, 471 U.S. 539, 560–61 (1985) (citing 17 U.S.C. § 107).

10 **1. Effect on the Potential Market for or Value of the Copyrighted Work**

11 The fourth *Harper & Row* factor is the most important, *id.* at 566 (citing 3 M. Nimmer,  
12 Copyright § 13.05[A], at 13–76 (1984)), so the Court will begin there. The evidence at trial  
13 indicated that before the Play debuted, the Work had no market value. Woodard, DeVito,  
14 Plaintiff, and Plaintiff’s sister had been unable to find any company interested in publishing the  
15 Work despite their various attempts to do so between 1990 and 2005, because interest in the Four  
16 Seasons was not great enough to make sales of the Work profitable. Under these circumstances,  
17 the fourth and most important *Harper & Row* factor “greatly favors” a defendant. *Blanch v.*  
18 *Koons*, 467 F.3d 244, 258 (2nd Cir. 2006) (affirming summary judgment under similar  
19 circumstances even where the infringing use was commercial and successfully so, the  
20 copyrighted work was an artistic photograph created for a magazine advertisement, and the third  
21 factor did not favor either party). Plaintiff only discovered that DeVito had registered the Work  
22 when she attempted to register it herself in 2007, having been motivated by the success of the  
23 Play, which had opened in 2006. To the extent the Work may be profitable today, it is almost  
24

1 certainly only because of the Play, which—and this is important under the third *Harper & Row*  
2 factor—consists of over 50% musical works (by running time) in which Plaintiff has no  
3 copyright, and the remainder of which (the non-musical script of the Play) is comprised of less  
4 than 1% of creative expression found in the Work and uses less than 1% of the Work. If  
5 anything, the Play has increased the value of the Work. The fourth, most important factor  
6 strongly favors a finding of fair use.

## 7           **2.       Purpose and Character of the Use**

8           Commercial use, as here, generally weighs against a finding of fair use. *Harper & Row*  
9 *Publishers, Inc.*, 471 U.S. at 562. The first factor weighs against fair use in the present case as it  
10 does in most cases, because the producers of the Play have profited from exploitation of the  
11 copyrighted material without paying the customary price. *See id.*

## 12           **3.       Nature of the Copyrighted Work**

13           This factor depends on the extent of the Work’s creativity and whether it is published.  
14 The biographical nature of the Work (which is claimed therein to constitute a factual relation of  
15 events as contrasted with other allegedly untrue accounts of events) weighs in favor of a finding  
16 of fair use. *See id.* at 563 (“The law generally recognizes a greater need to disseminate factual  
17 works than works of fiction or fantasy.”). The unpublished nature of a work normally weighs  
18 against a finding of fair use. *Id.* at 564 (“[T]he scope of fair use is narrower with respect to  
19 unpublished works [because of] the author’s right to control the first public appearance of his  
20 expression.”). As Defendants note, however, in this case the publication of (small parts of) the  
21 Work did not diminish its value by preempting Plaintiff’s right to control the first public  
22 appearance of the Work. The reason the Work was not yet published was because it was simply  
23 not publishable despite years of effort. As the Supreme Court has noted, the Senate reasoned  
24

1 that “[t]he applicability of the fair use doctrine to unpublished works is narrowly limited since,  
2 although the work is unavailable, this is the result of a *deliberate choice* on the part of the  
3 copyright owner.” S. Rep. No. 94–473, p. 64 (1975) (emphasis added). A work that is only  
4 unpublished because it is unpublishable despite great efforts, however, is an atypical situation.  
5 Such a work is not unavailable to the public because of a deliberate choice by the copyright  
6 owner, but because it is not commercially viable. In this case, the unpublished nature of the  
7 Work does not overshadow its biographical nature. The Court finds that this factor weighs in  
8 favor fair use.

#### 9 **4. Substantiality Used in Relation to the Copyrighted Work as a Whole**

10 After discounting those similarities based on unprotected elements of the Work or where  
11 the corresponding element of the Play was original to the Play, the jury was permitted to  
12 consider 12 similarities between the Work and the Play. (*See* Jury Instr. No. 27, ECF No. 1076).  
13 As recounted in detail, *infra*, the amount of protectable, creative material potentially copied in  
14 relation to the Work as a whole is very small, less than 1%, even if the jury were to have applied  
15 “thick” as opposed to “thin” copyright protection.

##### 16 **a. Tommy DeVito’s Introduction**

17 Tommy DeVito’s introduction in the Play concerning his background copies no creative  
18 words form the Work and accounts for approximately one minute of the Play from 5:09 to 6:50  
19 (excluding a musical interlude from 5:30 to 6:07).<sup>1</sup> Chapter 1 of the Work is a five-page tale of a  
20 fourteen-year-old Tommy DeVito and four of his friends stealing a car for a joyride and their  
21 subsequent arrest. Before the story about the car begins, the first three sentences (consisting of  
22

---

23 <sup>1</sup> The Court has painstakingly reviewed Exhibit 602 (a DVD of a Broadway performance of the  
24 Play) from the trial and compared it to Exhibit 13 (the Work).

33 words) sets the scene of Tommy DeVito and his friends “hanging out on a Jersey Street Corner . . . puff[ing] on cigarettes and dar[ing] anyone to mess with [them] . . . cool beyond belief.” That is the copyrightable comparison—DeVito’s “voice, cool demeanor, and braggadocio”—allegedly copied from the Work as the DeVito character addresses the audience at the outset of the Play, after the opening musical performance. The Play does not recreate the scene of DeVito and his teenage friends on the street corner, however, and copies no words from the Work.

**b. The Dialogue Surrounding the Song Title and Subject Matter of the Song “Walk Like a Man”**

In the Play, DeVito argues with Gaudio over the title to the song, saying he doesn’t “get it.” “Walk like a man? As opposed to what? A woman?!” DeVito gives Gaudio a comical concerned look as if to imply the song has homosexual overtones. Gaudio explains that the message is not for young boys to act like men instead of girls but to act like men instead of boys. Band manager Bob Crewe then explains the song is “an anthem for any guy who’s ever been twisted around a girl’s little finger.” The scene then shifts to the band performing the song. Although the Work indicates that the band was only “kid[ding]” Gaudio, as opposed to it having been a legitimate argument with DeVito, and that Gaudio, not Crewe, made the comment about being twisted around a girl’s little finger, the dialogue is very similar. Assuming the jury believed the dialogue was not a historical recounting but a creation of DeVito and Woodard—a finding that is unlikely and perhaps not even permissible given the Work’s claim of historical accuracy—the closely copied dialogue consists of about 65 words.

**c. The Beatles Line**

The Work contains the protectable lines, “[T]he Beatles come to represent a whole social movement. We never aspire to be more than entertainers.”

1 In the Play, Gaudio says, “Around this time, there’s a little dust-up called the British  
 2 Invasion. Britannia’s ruling the airwaves. So we start our own American Revolution. The battle  
 3 begins on a Sunday night at eight o’clock, and the whole world is watching.” The scene shifts to  
 4 historical footage of Ed Sullivan introducing the band, and then to the band performing the song  
 5 “Dawn” onstage. That is, the actors in the Play perform the song onstage with a studio camera  
 6 crew, as if on the Ed Sullivan Show. The live footage, from the perspective of the camera crew,  
 7 is displayed on a screen behind the band in black-and-white, mimicking what was presented to  
 8 the TV audience of the time, along with what are presumably clips from the actual 1964 studio  
 9 audience watching the actual 1964 performance. The band finishes the song, and Gaudio says:

10 We weren’t a social movement like the Beatles. Our fans didn’t sit and put  
 11 flowers in their hair and try to levitate the Pentagon. Maybe they should have. Our  
 12 people were the guys who were shipped overseas, and their sweethearts. They were  
 13 factory workers, the truck drivers, the kids pumping gas, flipping burgers. The  
 14 pretty girl with circles under her eyes behind the counter at the diner. They’re the  
 15 ones who really got us, who pushed us over the top.

16 The line about the Beatles being a “social movement” by contrast to the Four Seasons is arguably  
 17 protectable as original expression in the Work beyond bare historical fact.

18 **d. The Creative Expression Within the Description of the Rock & Roll Hall of  
 19 Fame Induction Ceremony**

20 In the Play, Crewe briefly introduces the band, noting that it had been over 20 years since  
 21 they last played together onstage. The band rises up from below the stage, performing “Rag  
 22 Doll.” They pause, and DeVito says, “Is this like bein’ in a fuckin’ time machine, or what?”  
 23 Valli asks DeVito how Las Vegas is. DeVito gives his condolences to Valli about his daughter’s  
 24 untimely death. Gaudio says Valli has a new family now, “three boys.” DeVito invites Valli and  
 Gaudio to his room after the event. Valli accepts. Massi asks if they ever thought they’d be  
 standing on the same stage, and DeVito responds that he never thought he’d be standing,

1 “period.” DeVito explains that the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame is the best honor an artist can  
2 receive. Other awards, such as the Oscars or the Emmys, can be bought, but the Hall of Fame is  
3 an affirmation by the fans. The band then finishes performing “Rag Doll.”

4 In the Work, DeVito recalls how he took a phone call from Valli the morning of the  
5 ceremony (January 17, 1990, in New York City) and held a small gathering in his room. Family  
6 and friends attended, including Massi, but not Valli, whom DeVito didn’t see until the press  
7 conference. Before the press conference, DeVito was reunited in the same room with Valli,  
8 Massi, and Gaudio for the first time since 1965. “I felt like I was stepping from a time machine.”  
9 He recalled a “rush of good feelings and warm memories.” Crewe introduced the band at the  
10 ceremony. DeVito recalls playing a free-for-all “jam session” on stage but does not recount the  
11 band having played “Rag Doll” or any other song together as a band at the ceremony.

12 The events recounted in both the Work and the Play, apart from the basic fact of the  
13 induction ceremony, include the gathering in DeVito’s room and the “time machine” line. The  
14 gathering in DeVito’s room, however, is a historical event that was not created by the authors of  
15 the Work, and the Court has already ruled that the “time machine” line is an ordinary phrase that  
16 is not protectable.

17 **e. The Creative Expression Within the Description of the “Roman Orgy” Scene**

18 In the Play, Gaudio sings the song “December, 1963 (Oh, What a Night)” while DeVito  
19 and Massi make out with one or more women (Valli is not present in the scene). Gaudio breaks  
20 to explain that the record company had set up a party in Chicago with some women around  
21 Christmastime during the band’s first nationwide tour. Gaudio explains that he was a virgin at  
22 the time, but he eventually takes a girl “downstairs” after DeVito tells him to “grab some  
23 Christmas cheer.” DeVito and Nick Massi look “downstairs” and report Gaudio’s progress play-



1 by-play to the audience with comically obscene space travel metaphors. Gaudio returns  
2 “upstairs” and finishes the song.

3 In the Work, the record company sets up the party in Detroit. DeVito compares the scene  
4 to a “Roman orgy.” DeVito tells Gaudio to “Grab a girl and have a good time,” and Gaudio  
5 leaves with a girl. DeVito does not claim in the book that Gaudio was a virgin, but that he was a  
6 “naïve kid.” The only dialogue potentially copied from the Work into the Play is the “[g]rab a  
7 girl” line, which is not reproduced exactly. Even assuming it were not a historical fact that  
8 DeVito said that line, the Play added creative elements to it. The word “grab” and the image of  
9 Gaudio bowed over with his hands on his knees are protectable if not meant to be historically  
10 accurate, about 20 words worth. The event itself is an unprotectable historical event.

11 **f. The Creative Expression Regarding the Introduction of the Song “Sherry”**

12 The Play, like the Work, recounts how Bob Gaudio arrived late to a rehearsal excited  
13 about a new song he just wrote. In the Play, contrary to Gaudio’s and Valli’s enthusiasm for the  
14 song, DeVito thinks the song is no good, “bullshit,” and that it was a “fuckin’ insult” Gaudio  
15 wrote it “fifteen minutes ago.” The band calls Crewe, who loves it. The scene shifts to disc  
16 jockey “Barry Belson” praising the record and announcing the band’s upcoming appearance on  
17 American Bandstand. The scene then shifts to the band performing “Sherry” on stage.

18 In the Work, Gaudio arrives late to the rehearsal and announces he thinks he wrote a hit.  
19 He plays “Sherry” on the piano. DeVito recalls he liked the song but “didn’t think [they] could  
20 get away with it,” because the song was about a girl much younger than the band members.  
21 Crewe, however, was at the rehearsal and heard “Sherry” the same time the band members did.  
22 He added it to the recording session because he thought it had potential. The band released the  
23 song on their album but didn’t yet perform it on stage. Disc jockey “Murry the K” played the  
24

1 song in New York City for a call-in poll, but the song came in third. The band was dejected, but  
2 soon found out the record had sold 180,000 copies. They then play “Sherry” onstage, and the  
3 audience “goes nuts.”

4 The dialogue in the Play is not copied from the Work. Only the unprotectable historical  
5 facts of Gaudio having written the song at the last minute and the song being a hit are potentially  
6 copied from the Work. The dialogue is completely different, as is DeVito’s initial reaction to the  
7 song.

8 **g. The Creative Expression Regarding the Introduction of the Song “Big Girls  
9 Don’t Cry”**

10 In the Play, Gaudio recounts to the audience that he was wondering where his next hit  
11 would come from as he was watching a John Payne movie. Payne’s character slapped Rhonda  
12 Flemming’s character and asked her what she thought about it, to which she replied, “Big girls  
13 don’t cry.” In the Play, Gaudio finishes the story with the words, “and she says....” The line  
14 “Big girls don’t cry” is then sung by Valli as the band begins the song onstage.

15 In the Work, DeVito relates that it was Crewe who was inspired by the Rhonda  
16 Flemming line and that Crewe co-wrote the song with Gaudio. The only similarity is the  
17 unprotectable historical fact that the song was inspired by the Rhonda Flemming line.

18 **h. The Creative Expression Regarding the Introduction of the Song “Walk Like  
19 a Man”**

20 This issue is redundant with “The Dialogue Surrounding Song Title and Subject Matter  
21 of the Song ‘Walk Like a Man.’” *See supra*.

22 **i. The Creative Expression Regarding the Introduction of the Song “Dawn”**

23 The introduction of the song “Dawn” in the Play is described, *supra*, in connection with  
24 “The Beatles Line.” The Work recounts that Sandy Lindzer approached Gaudio with a partially

1 written “Dawn,” and that Gaudio recognized its potential and finished it. The Work notes that  
2 the Beatles had “hit the public consciousness like a load of bricks” when “Dawn” was ready for  
3 release. The Work recounts the billboard competition between the Beatles and the Four Seasons  
4 for several pages, but the Play does not address this. In summary, the Court cannot identify any  
5 protectable expression in the Work concerning the release of “Dawn” that appears in the Play,  
6 apart from the “social movement” line noted *supra*.

7 **j. The Creative Expression Regarding DeVito’s Introduction of Valli to Mary**  
8 **and the Characterization of Mary**

9 In the Work, Valli’s introduction to Mary and his interest in her is recounted for about  
10 half a page on pages 58–59, and his further interest in her, as well as his mother’s disapproval  
11 stated to DeVito, is recounted for a little more than half a page on page 62. Valli’s first  
12 encounter with Mary in the Play is three minutes long from 17:05 to 20:05. In the Work, Valli  
13 inquires about Mary to DeVito as they drive home from a show where Valli had noticed her, and  
14 DeVito warns him away but ultimately agrees to help him with her. In the Play, Valli notices  
15 Mary at the show, and DeVito warns him away, but Valli ultimately leaves with Mary on a date  
16 that comprises most of the three-minute scene. No dialogue appears to have been copied, only  
17 the unprotectable historical facts that Valli first noticed Mary at a show and that DeVito warned  
18 Valli away when Valli inquired about her.

19 In the Work, Valli’s mother later calls DeVito and asks him to “get Frankie away from  
20 this whore.” In the Play, DeVito recounts immediately after the date scene that Valli has now  
21 married Mary and that he wanted to buy her some jewelry, which leads into the fake murder  
22 scene, without any indication that Valli’s mother asked DeVito to try to break up Valli and Mary.

23 On pages 67–71 of the Work, DeVito recounts how Mary took advantage of Valli’s  
24 devotion to her and sometimes criticized and ridiculed Valli to his face, even in front of his

1 friends, causing him to become more reserved and transforming him “into a different type of  
2 person.” In DeVito’s opinion, the change made Valli less likeable but also perhaps fueled his  
3 drive for perfection and success. Ultimately, DeVito was unable to “forgive Mary for her role in  
4 quenching the sparkle in his eye.” He wrote that Mary, like some other women involved with  
5 rock band members, had “profoundly test[ed] the group.” The Play depicts an argument between  
6 Valli and Mary where Mary complains that he is rarely home with the family, and Valli  
7 complains about her substance abuse. But apart from Mary once insulting Valli as “a dumb wop  
8 from Jersey who never even graduated high school,” the only similarity is the fact of some sort  
9 of conflict. The Play does not depict Mary criticizing Valli into timidity or berating him in front  
10 of others. Gaudio, who is narrating the Play at that point, does not indicate that Mary had  
11 changed Valli’s personality through any kind of prolonged emotional abuse. To the contrary, he  
12 notes that Valli had told the band members that his divorce from Mary had been “for the best,”  
13 but that they knew “that wasn’t the whole story.” The scene then shifts to Valli singing “My  
14 Eyes Adored You,” with Mary watching from the side of the stage and eventually joining Valli  
15 in the song, followed by the other members of the band. It is a song about unrequited childhood  
16 love that does not perfectly fit the story, but which clearly enough expresses the Play’s authors’  
17 message that Valli was unhappy about the divorce, had genuinely loved Mary, and perhaps still  
18 did. The Play’s narrative is contrary to the Work’s narrative about Valli having been beaten  
19 down emotionally by Mary.

20 In summary, the Play copied no creative expression from the Work in relation to Valli’s  
21 introduction to or relationship with Mary. The Play used its own creative expression in telling  
22 the story of Valli’s interest in Mary, DeVito having warned him away, and any conflict between  
23 Valli and Mary. The historical facts of these events are not protectable by copyright.

**k. The Creative Expression Regarding DeVito's Intercession After Valli's Arrest at The Request of Valli's Mother**

The Play recounts DeVito's intercession after Valli's arrest (excluding a musical interlude), for a total of about one minute. The Work recounts the incident for about one page. No creative expression from the Work relating to this event is copied into the Play. In the Play, Valli's mother tells DeVito that Valli looks up to him, and DeVito promises to look out for Valli. Valli's interrogation by the police and release by the judge at DeVito's urging follows, and although Valli's mother appears as an observer in the courtroom scene, there is no indication she specifically asked DeVito to intercede after Valli's arrest, as recounted in the Work. Rather, she had only given DeVito a general admonition to look out for Valli. Valli's mother's only dialogue in the scene is original to the Play. She has no dialogue in the Work as to this incident.

In summary, there is nothing creative in the Work as to this scene that was copied into the Play, but only the unprotectable historical fact of DeVito's intervention. The Play does not even recount the details of the intervention accurately, but creates a slightly different scene in order to abbreviate the incident and merge it with a recounting of DeVito's return to prison. That is, the Work recounts DeVito's indirect intervention via a probation officer he knew, whereas the Play depicts DeVito directly intervening with the judge during a hearing, after which the judge gives DeVito his own sentence. Only the broad, unprotectable historical fact of intervention by DeVito on behalf of Valli is potentially copied from the Work.

**l. The Creative Expression Regarding the Fake Murder in Valli's Car**

The fake murder scene runs from 20:40 to 25:20 in the Play, approximately 1:20 for the fake murder itself in the car, 1:00 for DeVito's discussion with Valli explaining it was a scam, and 2:20 for the scene with Gyp DeCarlo, who had fixed the problem for Valli. In the Play, there are two men in the front of Valli's car, with Valli in the back. The two men are ostensibly

1 driving Valli to a jewelry store to buy gifts for Mary. The argument between the driver and the  
2 front passenger erupts based on a disagreement over driving directions. Ultimately, the  
3 passenger “shoots” the driver after they call one another “asshole,” then tells Valli to get out of  
4 the car and that he will take care of it and call him the next day. Valli leaves, and the two men  
5 laugh. The scene shifts to Valli telling DeVito that the passenger wants \$25,000 to get rid of the  
6 “body” and the car. DeVito tells Valli it was a scam and that he will take care of it without  
7 bothering Gyp DeCarlo, a local organized crime boss. DeVito then explains to the audience that  
8 he indeed called Gyp DeCarlo to fix the situation. The scene shifts to DeCarlo, DeVito, and  
9 Valli. After giving DeVito some tasks, DeCarlo asks Valli to sing “My Mother’s Eyes.” Valli  
10 says he doesn’t sing that song anymore but agrees after DeCarlo patiently explains that Valli  
11 owes him a favor because DeCarlo took care of the fake murder situation and got his car back.  
12 The scene implies that Valli didn’t initially realize DeCarlo was the one who had fixed the  
13 situation (because DeVito had previously told Valli that he would handle it himself without  
14 bothering DeCarlo).

15 In the Work, the scene comprises the entirety of Chapter 23, five pages. There are two  
16 men in the front of Valli’s car, but they pick up a third man who joins Valli in the back. The  
17 driver is ostensibly returning Valli’s car after having borrowed it. The plan is to pick up Valli,  
18 drive to the driver’s house, and have Valli drive his car back home. The argument between the  
19 driver and the front passenger erupts based on a disagreement over some unspecified illegal  
20 “business.” The driver pulls over and calls the passenger a “mother-fucker,” and the passenger  
21 calls the driver an “asshole.” The driver then shoots the passenger, rejoins traffic, and tells Valli  
22 he’ll dump the car in the river and that he should report it stolen. Valli tells DeVito what  
23 happened, and DeVito tells Valli to wait for the driver’s call and to tell DeVito exactly what he  
24

1 says. The driver calls three days later and tells Valli that the man in the back seat is going to go  
2 to the police unless they pay him an unspecified amount. Valli tells DeVito, and DeVito goes  
3 directly to DeCarlo, who tells DeVito to tell Valli not to worry about it and to meet him on the  
4 golf course the next day. On the golf course, DeCarlo has Valli retell the whole story, then tells  
5 Valli everything will be fine. Valli's car shows up at his house unharmed two days later.

6       There is very little creative expression here that may have been copied from the Work  
7 into the Play. The incident recounted is historical, which is not protectable. Many details are  
8 recounted differently, in any case, i.e., created by the authors of the Play (the number of people  
9 in the car, the reason for the trip, who shoots whom, the explanation of the need for money,  
10 whether DeVito told Valli he would not involve DeCarlo, the dialogue with DeCarlo, and  
11 whether Valli spoke to DeCarlo before or after the problem was fixed). The only protectable  
12 element that may have been copied is the "asshole" line. Assuming that line was fabricated in  
13 the Work (as opposed to having been recounted as a historical fact) and copied into the Play, it  
14 consists only of the ten words, "Well, asshole, what do you plan to do about it?" And only the  
15 gist of the line is copied—it is not copied word-for-word. The line in the Play is, "Oh yeah,  
16 asshole, what are you gonna do about it?"

17       **m. Summary of the Substantiality Factor**

18       In summary, at most, the jury could have found about 145 creative words to have been  
19 copied from the Work into the Play, whether as dialogue or creative descriptions of events.  
20 Those 145 words constitute about 0.2% of the approximately 68,500 words in the Work  
21 (approximately 250 words per page times 274 pages). This factor strongly weighs in favor of a  
22 finding of fair use, at least where the "heart" of the Work was not infringed. *See Elvis Presley*  
23 *Enters., Inc. v. Passport Video*, 349 F.3d 622, 630 (9th Cir. 2003). Because the Work is  
24

1 biographical in nature, its “heart” consists of unprotected facts (in this case, those facts DeVito  
2 claimed in the Work had previously been hidden or distorted). It is that collection of  
3 uncopyrightable facts that was “the most likely to be newsworthy and important in licensing  
4 serialization.” *Id.* Woodard’s writing style, which is the only aspect of the Work producing  
5 protectable elements, although necessary to production of the Work, was not the heart of the  
6 Work. An author’s writing style could perhaps constitute the “heart” of a biographical work in  
7 an extreme case, for example where the facts of the subject’s life were already known to the  
8 reader or mostly uninteresting but where a highly skilled writer celebrated for his wit and  
9 commentary had written the biography. But that is not the case here. Here, the interest of a  
10 reader of the Work would be in the facts revealed by DeVito, not in Woodard’s writing skills.  
11 That is not to say that Woodard was not a good (or even excellent) writer, but there is no  
12 evidence that there was any market for his writing in-and-of-itself. He was not a known author.  
13 The “heart” of the Work—that aspect of the Work likely to attract buyers—was the unprotected  
14 historical information conveyed by DeVito.

## 15           **5.       Transformation**

16           Finally, “[T]he more transformative the new work, the less will be the significance of  
17 other factors, like commercialism, that may weigh against a finding of fair use.” *Monge v. Maya*  
18 *Magazines, Inc.*, 688 F.3d 1164, 1174–75 (9th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Campbell v. Acuff–Rose*  
19 *Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 579 (1994)). That is, a work is “transformative” to the extent it adds a  
20 different purpose and/or character to the expression in an original work, e.g., a parody. *Id.* at  
21 1173–75. Such a “transformation” of purpose or character is important to fair use because a  
22 parody, for example, is not likely to affect the market for the parodied work, the effect on the  
23  
24



1 market for a work being the most important consideration under a fair use analysis. *Id.* at 1182  
2 (citing *Campbell*, 510 U.S. at 591).

3 The “transformation” in the present case is both a change of purpose and a change of  
4 character. The Play takes on a different purpose from the Work when the script (most of which  
5 was not taken from the Work) is incorporated into musical performances using material in which  
6 Plaintiff has no copyright. The purpose of the Work is primarily to inform. Tommy DeVito set  
7 out to vindicate his perspective and reveal hidden truths. Woodard’s writing skills made the  
8 Work readable, even if the material was ultimately not commercially publishable. The purpose  
9 of the Play, however, is primarily to entertain. Even if the purpose of the Play were primarily to  
10 inform, the Play takes on a different character from the Work by the incorporation of Tommy  
11 DeVito’s singular perspective into a more complete and balanced description of events based on  
12 competing perspectives of all four band members. The Play is structured around this concept,  
13 with the characters of DeVito, Gaudio, Massi, and Valli sequentially narrating the Play from  
14 their own perspectives during the respectively titled Spring, Summer, Fall, and Winter portions  
15 of the play, i.e., the figurative “four seasons” of the history of the band. And in doing so, the  
16 Play adds creative expression beyond mere republication. *See L.A. News Serv. v. CBS Broad.,*  
17 *Inc.*, 305 F.3d 924, 939 (9th Cir. 2002). The transformative nature of the use in this case is  
18 significant. To the extent the character and purpose of the Play differ from the character and  
19 purpose of the Work, the importance of any factors counseling against a finding of fair use are  
20 diminished. *See Monge*, 688 F.3d at 1174–75.

21 In summary, the first factor weighs against fair use as in any typical case of commercial  
22 use, the second factor weighs in favor of fair use, the third factor weighs heavily in favor of fair  
23 use, the fourth (most important) factor weighs heavily in favor of fair use, and the transformative  
24

1 nature of the use diminishes the significance of the sole factor weighing against fair use. To  
2 permit a finding of no fair use based purely on the fact of commercial use where the importance  
3 of that factor is significantly diminished by the transformative nature of the use and the other  
4 factors weigh in favor of fair use (two of them heavily so, including the most important factor),  
5 would be to impermissibly treat the first factor as conclusive. *See Campbell v. Acuff-Rose*, 510  
6 U.S. 569, 585 (1994). A finding of no fair use, where such a tiny part of the creative elements of  
7 a biographical work with little to no market value were copied, and where the use was  
8 significantly transformative, would hinder rather than further the purposes of copyright. *See id.* at  
9 579. The Court finds that Defendants are entitled to a judgment of fair use as a matter of law.<sup>2</sup>

10 The Court denies the renewed motion for judgment as a matter of law on the other  
11 grounds presented. There was evidence adduced at trial of direct copying and more than de  
12 minimis use. The evidence of access to the Work in January 2004; the February 2004 meeting at  
13 which Brickman, Elice, and McAnuff examined the Work; and the Krevolin Report's  
14 comparisons of the Work to the evolving scripts provided sufficient evidence to find direct  
15 copying. Next, the jury could have properly found that the average audience familiar with the  
16 Work would recognize the protected, copied portions in the Play; audience recognition is the test  
17 for de minimis copying, regardless of how minimal the copying is in relation to the infringing  
18  
19

---

20 <sup>2</sup> Having heard the trial evidence and many times examined similar evidence submitted with pre-  
21 and post-trial motions over the last decade, the Court is of the overall impression that the only  
22 bad actor in this case was DeVito. He was deceitful with Plaintiff regarding his registration and  
23 licensing of the joint Work, and he was deceitful with New Defendants as to his alleged sole  
24 ownership of the Work. Plaintiff, however, has chosen to settle her claims against DeVito,  
basically allowing him to keep royalties and waiving any accounting against him. New  
Defendants were ignorant of DeVito's obligations to Plaintiff and were unaware of any potential  
copyright infringement via their use of the Work based on DeVito's representations in the 1999  
Agreement and otherwise. New Defendants are as much victims of DeVito's actions as Plaintiff.

1 work or the copyrighted work as a whole. *See VMG Salsoul, LLC v. Ciccone*, 824 F.3d 871, 878  
2 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Newton v. Diamond*, 388 F.3d 1189, 1193 (9th Cir. 2004)).

3 **C. Motion for a New Trial**

4 After a jury trial, a district court may grant a new trial “for any reason for which a new  
5 trial has heretofore been granted in an action at law in federal court . . . .” Fed. R. Civ. P.  
6 59(a)(1)–(a)(1)(A). Although a court of appeals may only overturn a jury verdict on appeal for  
7 excessiveness if it is “grossly excessive or monstrous,” a trial court may grant a new trial if the  
8 verdict is against the clear weight of the evidence. *Siebrand v. Gossnell*, 234 F.2d 81, 94–95 (9th  
9 Cir. 1956); *Bradley Mining Co. v. Boice*, 194 F.2d 80, 83 (9th Cir. 1951); *S. Pac. Co. v. Guthrie*,  
10 186 F.2d 926, 932 & n.10 (9th Cir. 1951)). The Court is compelled to find this to be the case  
11 here. Specifically, the finding that 10% of the success of the Play was attributable to protected  
12 elements copied from the Work cannot be supported by the evidence adduced at trial.

13 As recounted in detail, *supra*, after subtracting those potential similarities based on  
14 unprotected elements of the Work or where the corresponding creative element was not copied  
15 from the Work but original to the Play, the Court permitted the jury to consider only 12  
16 similarities between the Work and the Play. Those 12 similarities constituted approximately  
17 0.4% of the Play’s script, which itself accounted for less than half of the Play’s running time, the  
18 remainder being comprised of music for which Plaintiff does not own the copyright. Therefore,  
19 assuming that the music that comprised roughly half of the running time of the Play accounts for  
20 roughly half of its success, a finding of 10% implies that the few words copied from the Work  
21 (which account for approximately 0.2% of the running time of the Play) account for roughly 20%  
22 of the success of the Play attributable to the dialogue. That assessment is unsupportable. Of  
23 course, determining the percentage of the Play attributable to infringement of the Work is not a  
24

1 strict, mathematical calculation. But the verdict must be supported by sufficient evidence, and  
2 the Court cannot find under the present circumstances that a figure of 10% could be reached  
3 based on the evidence adduced at trial.

4 The Court's analysis under the substantiality factor of the fair use test, *supra*, leads the  
5 Court to find that the verdict of 10% is against the clear weight of the evidence. Roughly 0.2%  
6 of the Work was both protectable by copyright and copied into the Play, and the copied portions  
7 accounted for no more than 1% of the running time of the Play. Importantly, there is no  
8 evidence that the copied creative elements were disproportionately important to the Play's  
9 success. Additionally, the jury appears to have disregarded the evidence of the limited effect on  
10 the success of the Play due to its use of parts of the Work. There was substantial evidence  
11 admitted at trial to the effect that many additional elements contributed to the worldwide success  
12 and profits of the Play: the additional inventive material in the script, the stagecraft used in live  
13 production, the use of copyrighted music in the Play for which Plaintiff has no copyright,  
14 direction and production efforts (including the employment of world-renowned writers, directors,  
15 and producers), and advertising and promotion efforts, among other elements. The jury cannot  
16 have reached the conclusion it did without disregarding these elements that contributed to the  
17 success of the Play, even assuming the 10% figure were an accurate calculation of the amount of  
18 the infringed material as compared to the Play as a whole, a conclusion that itself is not  
19 supported by the evidence.

20 The jury also failed to focus on the relevant facts as to the remanded question of an  
21 implied nonexclusive license, although the Court accepts some responsibility for the error. In the  
22 Court's summary judgment analysis of an implied nonexclusive license, the Court had found an  
23 implied nonexclusive license based upon the sole factor of DeVito's delivery of the Work to the  
24

1 authors of the Play. The Court of Appeals reversed on that issue, clarifying that delivery may be  
2 considered but cannot be a sole basis for a finding of an implied nonexclusive license. The Court  
3 finds that the verdict of no implied nonexclusive license is against the clear weight of the  
4 evidence given DeVito's attendance at the Play and continued receipt of royalties therefrom.

5 The Court of Appeals' remand on the implied nonexclusive license issue cannot be  
6 construed as requiring jury consideration solely on the factor of delivery. There can be no  
7 implied license where an express license is given. In this case, an express license was given by  
8 DeVito in the 1999 Agreement, which gave full license to use of the Work in creating and  
9 producing a play, but that express license terminated by its own terms on December 10, 2004,  
10 before the Play debuted. No implied license may be found during the period from the execution  
11 date of the 1999 Agreement until its termination, which time period includes DeVito's delivery  
12 of the Work to the writers of the Play in January 2004. The basis for an implied license therefore  
13 cannot be found in the circumstances surrounding delivery of the Work to the writers of the Play,  
14 but only in the facts that DeVito continued to receive royalty payments and personally attended  
15 productions of the Play after the 1999 Agreement had terminated without ever objecting to the  
16 (albeit minimal) use of the Work therein, which DeVito would have recognized. *See supra*,  
17 discussion concerning *de minimis* copying. When DeVito's delivery of the Work and his intent  
18 when doing so are discounted as irrelevant (because the express license was then in effect), the  
19 only evidence as to implied license was DeVito's attendance at the Play in La Jolla in 2004 and  
20 on Broadway in 2005 and his receipt of royalties without objection. These factors must be  
21 considered as part of the totality of the parties' conduct. *See* 3 Melville B. Nimmer & David  
22 Nimmer, *Nimmer on Copyright* § 10.03[A][7], at 10-55 (2015). Neither the Court's Instructions,  
23 nor the evidence, nor the parties' closing arguments, focused on these facts. The Court, the  
24

1 parties, and the jury therefore failed to focus on the factual issues directly relevant to implied  
2 license as directed by the Court of Appeals. For all of these reasons, the Court grants the motion  
3 for a new trial on the implied license issue, as well.

#### 4 CONCLUSION

5 The Court appreciates the jury's service in this complex case. Comparisons of a several-  
6 hundred-page book to a several-hour play are tedious and complex. Those comparisons are  
7 made even more difficult when they must be guided by over 40 pages of technical legal  
8 instructions. Even for a court, such a task is difficult, because the law in this area is not totally  
9 clear in all respects. The Court therefore appreciates the difficulty of the task with which the  
10 jury was charged, but the law and evidence compels the result the Court reaches today.

11 Defendants are entitled to a judgment as a matter of law on the fair use issue. Even if they were  
12 not, a new trial would be required on the implied nonexclusive license issue and the damages  
13 award.

14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Vacate (ECF No. 1108) is GRANTED.


15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law  
16 (ECF No. 1112) is GRANTED IN PART as to fair use but is otherwise denied.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion for New Trial (ECF No. 1113) is  
18 GRANTED IN PART with respect to Questions 1 and 4 of the Verdict but is otherwise denied.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall enter judgment and close the case.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated this 13th day of June, 2017.



22  
23 ROBERT C. JONES  
United States District Judge