

Nos. 09-1439, 09-1956

---

---

In the  
**United States Court of Appeals**  
for the **First Circuit**

---

TMTV, CORP.,  
*Plaintiff -Appellee/Cross-Appellant,*

v.

MASS PRODUCTIONS, INC.; EMMANUEL LOGRONO, a/k/a Sunshine Logrono;  
GILDA SANTINI, CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP LOGRONO-SANTINI,  
*Defendants-Appellants/Cross-Appellees,*

A-Z INSURANCE CO.,  
*Defendant.*

On Appeal from the  
United States District Court of Puerto Rico, San Juan

---

**PRINCIPAL AND RESPONSE BRIEF  
OF APPELLEE/CROSS-APPELLANT**

---

FREDDIE OSCAR TORRES-GOMEZ, ESQ.  
LAW OFFICE OF ROBERTO SUEIRO  
PMB 397  
100 GRAN PASEOS BLVD.  
SUITE 112  
SAN JUAN, PR 00926  
(787) 403-6754

ROBERTO SUEIRO-DEL VALLE, ESQ.  
ROBERTO SUEIRO DEL VALLE LAW  
OFFICES  
170 CALLE TULIPAN  
URB. SAN FRANCISCO  
SAN JUAN, PR 00927-4712  
(787) 753-4712

*Counsel for Appellee/Cross-Appellant*

**ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED**

---

---

## **I. RULE 26.1 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

TMTV, Inc. is a private corporation wholly owned by individual shareholders. It has no parent corporation. No publicly held corporation owns 10% or more of its stock.

**II. TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. RULE 26.1 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ..... i

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... ii

III. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....v

IV. REASONS WHY ORAL ARGUMENT SHOULD BE HEARD ..... xii

V. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT .....1

VI. ISSUES PRESENTED .....2

    A. Principal Brief of Cross Appeal .....2

    B. Response Brief to Appeal.....2

VII. STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....3

VIII. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS .....6

IX. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS.....16

    A. Principal Brief of the Cross-Appeal .....16

    B. Response Brief to the Mass Appeal .....17

X. STANDARDS OF REVIEW.....18

XI. ARGUMENTS OF THE CROSS-APPEAL .....19

    A. THE DISTRICT COURT IMPROPERLY AMENDED THE ORIGINAL JUDGMENT WHILE APPLYING THE ONE SATISFACTION RULE .....19

        Damages under the Copyright Act..... 19

        The One Satisfaction Rule..... 20

B.	THE DISTRICT COURT IMPROPERLY DENIED ATTORNEYS’ FEES TO TMTV AS A PREVAILING PARTY .....	34
	Prevailing Defendants under 17 U.S.C. §505 .....	34
	Entitlement to Attorney’s Fees.....	35
	The Common Core of Facts and Legal Theories .....	36
XII.	ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO MASS’S APPEAL BRIEF .....	43
A.	THE DISTRICT COURT CORRECTLY DECLARED TMTV AS SOLE OWNER OF “20 PISOS” AND THE UNAUTHORIZED DERIVATIVE WORK “EL CONDOMINIO” .....	43
1.	FIXATION.....	43
	Introduction.....	43
	The authorship matter .....	44
	The brain storming session .....	45
2.	SUBSTANTIAL SIMILARITY .....	53
	Copyrightability .....	53
	Substantial similarity .....	55
	Argument .....	57
3.	STANDING .....	64
	The Validity of the Transfer .....	65
	Defendant’s lack of standing .....	66
	Argument .....	67

B.	THE DISTRICT COURT WAS CORRECT IN AWARDING PREJUDGMENT INTERESTS.....	70
	Prejudgment Interests .....	70
	Interests Rates Applied.....	72
	Argument.....	73
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	76
XIV.	CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.....	79
XV.	CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE .....	80
XVI.	ADDENDUM.....	81

### III. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

#### Cases

<u>Aero Prods. Int’l, Inc. v. Intex Rec. Corp.</u> , 466 F.3d 1000 (2006) .....	32
<u>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</u> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	18, 44
<u>Apple Barrel Productions Inc. v. Beard</u> , 730 F.2d. 384 (5th Cir. 1984) .....	53, 58
<u>Arnstein v. Porter</u> , 154 F.2d 464 (2d Cir. 1946) .....	55
<u>Arthur Rutenberg Homes, Inc. v. Maloney</u> , 891 F. Supp. 1560 (M.D. Fla. 1995) .....	72
<u>Atari, Inc. v. North American Philips Consumer Electronics Corp.</u> , 672 F.2d 607 (7th Cir. 1982) .....	56, 62
<u>Billy-Bob Teeth, Inc.</u> , 329 F.3d 586 (7th Cir.2003) .....	69
<u>Boisson v. Bonian</u> , 273 F3d. 262 (2d. Cir. 2001) .....	53, 54, 63
<u>BUC Int’l Corp. v. Int’l Yatch Council Ltd.</u> , 517 F.3d 1271 (11th Cir. 2008) .....	23, 29
<u>Celestial Arts v. Neyler</u> , 339 F. Supp. 1018 (1971) .....	28
<u>Cement Div. Nat’l Gypsum Co. v. City of Milwaukee</u> , 950 F.Supp. 904 (E.D.Wis. 1996) .....	72
<u>Childress v. Taylor</u> , 945 F.2d 500 (2nd Cir. 1991) .....	45, 52
<u>Chilsom v. UHP</u> , 205 F.3d 731 (4th Cir. 2000) .....	22, 23, 25, 33, 34, 76

<u>Cipes v. Mikasa, Inc.</u> , 379 F.Supp. 2d 84 (2005) .....	71, 72
<u>Columbia Pictures v. Krypton Broadcasting, Inc.</u> , 106 F3d 284 (9th Cir. 2001) .....	20
<u>Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid</u> , 490 U.S. 730 (1989).....	44, 52
<u>Concrete Machinery Company v. Classic Lawn Ornaments</u> , 843 F 2d. 600 (1st Cir 1988).....	53, 58
<u>Cream Records v. Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co.</u> , 754 F.2d 826 (9th Cir. 1985) .....	19, 20, 33
<u>Crosspointe, LLC v. Integrated Computing, Inc.</u> , 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35516 Subsequent appeal at <u>Crosspointe</u> , <u>L.L.C. v. Integrated Computing, Inc.</u> , 2006 U.S. App. LEXIS 24843 (11th Cir. Fla., Oct. 4, 2006) .....	35
<u>Crown Awards v. Disc. Trophy &amp; Co.</u> , 564 F. Supp. 2d 290(2008) .....	35
<u>Data Gen. Corp. v. Grumman</u> , 36 F. 3d 1147 (1st Cir. 1994).....	71, 72
<u>Erickson v. Trinity Theatre, Inc.</u> , 13 F.3d 1061 (7th Cir. 1994) .....	45
<u>Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.</u> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991).....	55
<u>Fogerty v. Fantasy Inc.</u> , 510 U.S. 517 (1994).....	34, 35
<u>Folsom v. Marsh</u> , 9 F.Cas. 342 No.4901 (C.C.D. Mass. 1841).....	56
<u>Frank Music Corp. v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc.</u> , 886 F.2d 1545 (9th Cir. 1989) .....	72

<u>Fred Riley Home Bldg. Corp. v. Cosgrove,</u> 883 F.Supp. 1478 (D. Kan. 1995) .....	52
<u>Goldman v. Healthcare Mgt. Sys., Inc.,</u> 559 F.Supp.2d 853 (W.D. Mich. 2008) .....	71
<u>Gorenstein Enter., Inc. v. Quality Care-USA, Inc.,</u> 874 F.2d 431 (7th Cir. 1989) .....	72
<u>Grubb v. KMS Patriots, L.P.,</u> 88 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 1996).....	57
<u>Harris v. Union Elec. Co.,</u> 846 F.2d 482 (8th Cir. 1988) .....	22
<u>Historical Research v. Cabral,</u> 80 F.3d 377 (9th Cir. 1996) .....	34, 35
<u>Howard v. General Cable Corp.,</u> 674 F.2d 351 (5th Cir. 1982) .....	22
<u>Imperial Residential Design, Inc. v. Palms Development Group,</u> 70 F.3d 96 (11th Cir. 1995) .....	66
<u>Jackson v. Axton,</u> 25 F.3d 884 (9th Cir. 1994) .....	35
<u>Jorge Rivera Surillo &amp; Co. v. Falconer Glass Indus., Inc.,</u> 37 F.3d 25 (1st Cir. 1994).....	49, 51
<u>Junker v. Eddings,</u> 396 F.3d 1359 (2005) .....	32
<u>Kingsvision Pay-Per-View, Ltd. v. Valles,</u> No. EP-00-CA-179-DB, 2001 WL 682205 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2001) .....	20
<u>Kleier Adver., Inc. v. Premier ,Inc.,</u> 921 F.2d 1036 (10th Cir. 1990) .....	71, 73
<u>Knitwaves v. Lollytogs Ltd.,</u> 71 F. 3d. 996 (2d. Cir. 1995) .....	53, 54, 63

<u>Magnuson v. Video Yesteryear,</u> 85 F.3d 1424 (9th Cir. 1996) .....	66
<u>Malaco Inc. v. Cooper,</u> 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12069 (2002) .....	20
<u>MCA, Inc. v. Wilson,</u> 677 F2d 180 (2d Cir. 1981) .....	20, 33
<u>McDermott, Inc. v. AmClyde,</u> 511 U.S. 202 (1994).....	20, 21, 22
<u>McRoberts Software, Inc. v. Media 100, Inc.,</u> 329 F.3d 557 (7th Cir. 2003) .....	71
<u>Monroig v. RMM Records &amp; Video Corp.,</u> 194 F.R.D. 388 (D.P.R. 2000) .....	66
<u>Motta v. Samuel Weiser, Inc.,</u> 768 F.2d 481 (1st Cir. 1985).....	65
<u>Murray v. Shaw Indus., Inc.,</u> 900 F.Supp. 46 (D.Mass. 1997).....	70
<u>Nelson-Salabes, Inc. v. Morningside Dev.,</u> 284 F3d 505 (4th Cir. 2002) .....	20, 33
<u>Peter Pan Fabrics, Inc. v. Martin Weiner Corp.,</u> 274 F.2d 487 (2d Cir. 1960) .....	57
<u>Playboy Enter., Inc. v. Dumas,</u> 53 F.3d 549 (2nd Cir. 1995), <u>cert. den.</u> 516 U.S. 1010, 116 S.Ct. 567, 133 L.Ed.2d 491 (1995).....	66, 67
<u>Polar Bear Prods., Inc. v. Timex Corp.,</u> 384 F.3d 700 (9th Cir. 2004) .....	71
<u>Robert R. Jones Assoc., Inc. v. Nino Homes,</u> 858 F.2d 274 (6 Cir. 1988) .....	71

<u>RSO Records, Inc. v. Peri,</u> 596 F. Supp. 849 (S.D.N.Y. 1984) .....	20
<u>Sabree v. United Bhd. of Carpenters &amp; Joiners Local No. 33,</u> 921 F.2d 396 (1st Cir. 1990).....	18
<u>Salve Regina College v. Russell,</u> 499 U.S. 225 (1991).....	18
<u>Segrets, Inc. v. Gillman Knitwear Co., Inc.,</u> 207 F.3d 56 (1st Cir. 2000).....	57, 60
<u>Sid &amp; Marty Kroft Television Productions, Inc. v. McDonald’s Corp.,</u> 563 F.2d 1157 (9th Cir. 1977) .....	55, 63
<u>Silver Ring Splint Co. v. Digisplint, Inc.,</u> 567 F. Supp. 2d 847 (2008) .....	35
<u>TMTV Corp. v. Mass Prods.,</u> 345 F. Supp. 2d 196 (2004) .....	44
<u>TMTV Corp. v. Mass Prods.,</u> 453 F. Supp. 2d 378 (2004) .....	44
<u>TVT Records v. Island Def Jam Music Group,</u> 279 F. Supp. 2d 366 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) .....	72
<u>Twentieth Century Fox v Marathon Music &amp; Video,</u> 429 F.3d 869 (9th Cir, 2005) .....	34, 36, 41
<u>Webb v. Sloan,</u> 330 F.3d 1158 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	35
<u>West Va. V. United States,</u> 479 U.S. 305 (1982).....	70
<u>Westinghouse Credit Corp. v. M/V New Orleans,</u> 39 F.3d 553 (5th Cir. 1994) .....	22, 23, 26, 34
<u>Whitman v. Miles,</u> 387 F.3d 68 (1st Cir. 2004).....	18

<u>Wilcom Pty. Ltd. v. Endless Visions,</u> 128 F.Supp.2d 1027 (E.D. Mich. 1998) .....	17
---	----

**Statutes**

17 U.S.C. § 101 et seq.....	1
17 U.S.C. § 106.....	16, 32, 77
17 U.S.C. § 106(1) .....	16, 23
17 U.S.C. § 106(2) .....	16, 23
17 U.S.C. § 106(3) .....	16, 25
17 U.S.C. § 106(4) .....	16, 25
17 U.S.C. § 106(5) .....	16, 25
17 U.S.C. § 201 .....	65, 69
17 U.S.C. § 412.....	35
17 U.S.C. § 501.....	19
17 U.S.C. § 504 et seq.....	19
17 U.S.C. § 504.....	20
17 U.S.C. § 505.....	6, 16, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 42
28 U.S.C. § 1291.....	1
28 U.S.C. § 1338.....	1
28 U.S.C. § 1961.....	72
28 U.S.C. § 1961(a) .....	72
P.R. Laws Ann. Tit. 7, § 2008 (2006).....	75

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 50 ..... 1  
Fed. R. Civ. P. 59 ..... 1  
L. Civ. R. 54 ..... 42, 43

**Other Authorities**

Comment, “Prejudgment Interest: Survey and Suggestions,” 77 Nw. U.L.  
REV. 198 (1982) ..... 70

MELVILLE B. NIMMER AND DAVID NIMMER, NIMMER ON COPYRIGHT, Mathew  
Bender (2002) ..... 72  
    12.04 [C][3] ..... 19, 33  
    13.03 [A][2] ..... 56

#### **IV. REASONS WHY ORAL ARGUMENT SHOULD BE HEARD**

Pursuant to local rule 34.0(a) F.R.A.P., plaintiff TMTV hereby requests Oral Arguments because the award of Pre Judgment Interests for a Copyright case and the application of the One Satisfaction rule to separate infringements of copyright have not been previously addressed fully by this Honorable Court of Appeals.

## V. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

The U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico had jurisdiction over the underlying case, Civil No. 00-1338, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §101 et seq. and 28 U.S.C. §1338.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit has jurisdiction over this appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1291. The District Court has entered Final Judgment Disposing all of the parties' claims except the dismissal of Defendants Counterclaim.

The Final Judgment in the District Court was entered on January 30, 2009 (*See* Addendum 55, Docket #408). Thereafter, on February 10, 2009 and February 18, 2009, the parties filed post-Judgment motions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. R50 and R59 (*See* Appendix 1205-1285, Docket #409 and 413). The District Court adjudged those motions via orders entered on March 27, 2009, resulting in an Amended Judgment on that same date (*See* Addendum 56-65, Dockets #432-434).

Mass Productions, Inc. (Mass Productions), Emanuel Logroño (Logroño) and Gilda Santini (Santini) filed a Notice of Appeal on March 3, 2009, that was subsequently amended, on April 27, 2009 (*See* Appendix 1294-1295, Docket #419 and Appendix 1449-1450, Docket #445). On July 8, 2009, Mass filed a Second Amended Notice of Appeal (*See*, App. 1452-1454, Docket #473).

The balance of the brief has been eliminated for this sample. For a copy of the complete brief please call our office. Thank you.