

[Letterhead of Boehmert & Boehmert]

BOEHMERT & BOEHMERT Kurfürstendamm 185 10707 Berlin

Sent in advance by fax, 040-428434097 No. of pages: 68

Hanseatisches Oberlandesgericht Hamburg
Sievekingplatz 2
20355 Hamburg

Your ref.

Your letter

Our ref.

Berlin,

DINN60007

November 30, 2015

File reference No.: 5 U 76/15

In the matter of

DIN Deutsches Institut für
Normung e.V.

vs.

Public.Resource.org, Inc. an Malamud,
Carl

we herewith furnish grounds for our petition of September 9, 2015, and respond to the Defendants' statement of grounds of appeal as follows:

The appeal of the Defendants is unfounded and must therefore be dismissed.

It is not right for the Defendants to proceed on the assumption that there is a lack of copyright protectability with regard to the disputed standards. Furthermore, Sec. 5 para. 3 German

Copyright Act (*Urhebergesetz* – UrhG) conforms with constitutional law and European Union law, and also ensures merely in a declaratory way the already existing copyright protection of the disputed DIN-EN standards. The Defendants argue against this, above all in political terms – and this unconvincingly as well – and for the most part fail to provide legal arguments in their statement of grounds of appeal. In particular, they fail to recognize the fact that the German legislators as well as other European legislators or regulators, while recognizing the obligation to publicize (*Publizitätsgebot*), clearly proceed on the assumption of copyright protectability with regard to the presently disputed private normative works (*private Normwerke*). Finally, the statement by the Defendants with respect to the lack of granting rights in favor of the Plaintiff is likewise unconvincing. As the Regional Court of Hamburg has convincingly established, the Plaintiff can successfully invoke the “presumption of conformity” (*Vermutungswirkung*) of Sec. 10 para. 3 UrhG, against which the Defendants have no substantiated counter-argument. The remarks concerning the supposed invalidity of the assignment of rights under antitrust law are not only irrelevant, but, in accordance with Sec. 531 Code of Civil Procedure (*Zivilprozeßordnung* – ZPO), they should additionally not even be taken into account at the appeal stage.

The politically charged nature of the statement of grounds of the appeal made by the Defendants is not surprising. The Defendants are by no means the independent and nonprofit players for whom they claim to be in the statement of grounds of appeal. Rather, one of the largest donors of the Defendants is the internet concern *Google*, and the latter has, due to its internet search engine *Google*, a great commercial interest in having as much valuable content as possible freely available in the internet. *Google* has provided massive support to the Defendants in recent years and is therefore prominently mentioned on the website of the Defendants, “public.resource.org”.

Evidence: Printout of “Public.resource.org” showing the category, “about,” **Appendix K47**.

One does not need to wonder why a one-person undertaking such as that of the Defendant would call into question the entire business model of the Plaintiff and of other standards organizations,

as it has been created by the German legislators. Behind all this there are – besides the altruistic motives asserted by the Defendant – important commercial interests of the world’s largest internet search engine.

In detail, we hereby respond to the statement of grounds of appeal as follows:

I. Copyright protectability of the DIN-EN standards	5
1. Standard of review: The respective entire work	5
2. Literary works according to Sec. 2 para. 1 No. 1, para. 2 UrhG	7
a) Copyright protection for the formulating and thinking of thoughts, as well as for the form and manner of collecting, categorizing and arranging of the material	7
b) Individuality is sufficient	8
c) The individual standards as literary works	12
aa) DIN EN 14781 (Appendix K 1 and Appendix K 7)	14
bb) DIN EN 14782 (Appendix K 2 and Appendix K 8)	16
cc) DIN EN 1400-1 German version (Appendix K 3 and Appendix K 9)	18
dd) DIN EN 1400-1 English version (Appendix K 4 and Appendix K 10)	20
ee) DIN EN 1400-2 German version (Appendix K 5 and Appendix K 11)	20
ff) DIN EN 1400-2 English version (Appendix K 6 and Appendix K 12)	21
gg) Additional reference to the submission at the first instance and to the Regional Court’s reasons for its decision	22
d) DIN standard 820 merely an abstract specification of style	23
3. Representations of a scientific or technical nature pursuant to Sec. 2 para. 1 No. 7, para. 2 UrhG	26
a) German Federal Court of Justice ruling: Mere individuality of a “minor character” is sufficient	26
b) The drawings in dispute are protected	27
II. Copyright protection is not excluded by Sec. 5 UrhG	34

1. DIN standards do not fall under Sec. 5 para. 1 UrhG	34
2. DIN standards do not fall under Sec. 5 para. 2 UrhG	35
a) DIN standards are not “other official works”	35
b) They are not a publication for official purposes	36
3. Sec. 5 para. 3 UrhG makes it clear that private normative works are copyright protected	37
4. There is no violation of the ‘obligation to publicize’	39
a) Obligation to publicize is taken into account in Sec. 5 para. 3 UrhG	39
b) Sec. 5 para. 3 UrhG as a necessity	42
c) Sec. 5 para. 3 UrhG is relative	43
d) Intermediate findings	46
2. There is no violation of European basic freedoms	46
a) Area of application does not apply	46
b) There is no negative impact	48
c) Findings regarding the basic freedoms	48
3. There is no violation of alleged transparency and ‘obligation to publicize’ under European Union law	49
4. There is no violation of the ‘precautionary principle’ under antitrust law	50
a) The Plaintiff is not granted any special or exclusive rights according to the meaning of Article 106 para. 1 TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union)	50
b) Sec. 5 para. 3 sent. 3 UrhG prevents abusive conduct	52
c) Price comparison shows that there is no abuse	52
5. No violation of the ban on implementation under state aid law	53
III. The active legal capacity of the Plaintiff	55
1. Supposition according to Sec. 10 para. 1, 3 UrhG	55
a) Copyright notices of the Plaintiff fulfill requirements of Sec. 10 para. 1, 3 UrhG	55

b) Copyright notices also apply to ‘making publicly accessible’ according to Sec. 19a UrhG	57
c) There is no secondary burden of proof on the part of the Plaintiff	59
2. Transfer of rights is not affected by Article 101 para. 2 TFEU or Sec. 134 German Civil Code (<i>Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch</i> - BGB) in connection with Sec. 1 Act Against Restraints of Competition (<i>Gesetz gegen Wettbewerbsbeschränkungen</i> – GWB)	61
a) Inadmissible submission (Sec. 531 Code of Civil Procedure (<i>Zivilprozessordnung</i> – ZPO)	61
b) Transfer of rights occurs outside of the CEN-CENELEC Guide (reference documents published by the European Committee for Standardization (CEN), the European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardization (CENELEC))	62
c) Furthermore: In any case, partial invalidity of regulation No. 5.1 of CENCENELEC Guide	63
d) Moreover: The challenged provision is not in violation of cartel law	63