

VIA EMAIL

April 26, 2018

The Honorable Robert Goodlatte  
Chairman  
House Committee on the Judiciary  
2138 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Jerrold Nadler  
Ranking Member  
House Committee on the Judiciary  
2109 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Members of the House Committee on the Judiciary

Dear Chairman Goodlatte, Ranking Member Nadler, and Members of the Committee,

We are attorneys, engineers, and activists who defend Internet users—thousands of your constituents who use the Internet at home and work every day—against abusive legal threats. We write to express our grave concerns about the “Copyright Alternative in Small Claims Enforcement Act,” H.R. 3945 (the CASE Act). Though it’s well-intentioned, this bill would re-ignite the nationwide problem of copyright trolling, just as the federal courts are quelling this abusive practice.

Copyright trolls are plaintiffs who, in the words of a U.S. Magistrate Judge, file infringement lawsuits “as a profit-making scheme rather than as a deterrent.”<sup>1</sup> These suits typically involve pornography or independent films that performed poorly. They “rely on poorly substantiated form pleading and are *targeted indiscriminately at non-infringers as well as infringers.*” They use “the threat of statutory damages of up to \$150,000 for a single download, tough talk, and technological doublespeak . . . to intimidate even innocent defendants into settling.”<sup>2</sup> Some also use the stigma of being publicly associated with pornography downloads to coerce settlements. By targeting thousands of defendants at once and demanding cash settlements priced below the cost of a legal defense, copyright trolls can turn significant profit whether or not their claims would actually hold up in court.

**The scope of this problem is staggering.** Between 2014 and 2016, copyright troll lawsuits constituted just under 50% of all copyright cases on the federal dockets. These cases

---

<sup>1</sup> *Malibu Media, LLC v. John Doe*, No. 8:15-cv-3185, ECF No. 36, Report and Recommendation (D. Md. Jan. 5, 2018).

<sup>2</sup> Matthew Sag and Jake Haskell, *Defense Against the Dark Arts of Copyright Trolling*, 103 Iowa L. Rev. 571, 573 (2018).

The Honorable Robert Goodlatte  
The Honorable Jerrold Nadler  
Members of the House Committee on the Judiciary  
April 26, 2018  
Page 2 of 4

dominated the copyright dockets of judicial districts in eighteen states.<sup>3</sup> Since 2010, researchers have conservatively estimated the number of people targeted at over 170,000.<sup>4</sup>

**Copyright trolling has a human cost.** Targets of this scheme have included elderly retirees who don't use the Internet, who are often coerced into paying settlements. Others are recent immigrants and temporary workers whose limited knowledge of the U.S. court system makes them easy targets, and deployed servicemembers who may fail to respond to a summons.

Still others are homeowners, apartment managers, and leaseholders—the person whose name is on the Internet service bill. Copyright trolls force them to choose between paying a cash settlement or becoming part of the shakedown by interrogating their tenants, family members, roommates, or houseguests about their Internet use, despite having no legal responsibility to police that use.

**The federal courts are reining in these abuses** by demanding specific and reliable evidence of infringement—more than boilerplate allegations—before issuing subpoenas for the identity of an alleged infringer. Some federal courts have also undertaken reviews of copyright troll plaintiffs' communications with their targets with an eye to preventing coercion and intimidation. These reforms have reduced the financial incentive for the abusive business model of copyright trolling.

**The CASE Act threatens to derail this progress** by creating an alternative forum where these carefully crafted protections will not apply. Under the CASE Act's provisions, legally unsophisticated defendants—the kind most often targeted by copyright trolls—are likely to find themselves bound by the judgments of a non-judicial body in faraway Washington, D.C., with few if any avenues for appeal. The statutory damages of up to \$30,000 proposed in the CASE Act, while less than the \$150,000 maximum in federal court, are still a daunting amount for many people in the U.S., more than high enough to coerce Internet users into paying settlements of \$2,000–\$8,000. Under the Act, a plaintiff engaged in copyright trolling would not need to show any evidence of actual harm in order to recover statutory damages. And unlike in the federal courts, statutory damages could be awarded under the CASE Act even for copyrights that are not registered with the Copyright Office before the alleged infringement began. This means that copyright trolls will be able to threaten home Internet users with life-altering damages—and profit from those threats—based on works with no commercial or artistic value.

The CASE Act also **gives the Copyright Office the authority to issue subpoenas** for information about Internet subscribers. The safeguards for Internet users' privacy established in the federal courts will not apply. In fact, the bill doesn't even require that a

---

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 573 n.1.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 578 n.17.

The Honorable Robert Goodlatte  
The Honorable Jerrold Nadler  
Members of the House Committee on the Judiciary  
April 26, 2018  
Page 3 of 4

copyright holder state a plausible claim of copyright infringement before requesting a subpoena—a basic requirement in federal court. Given that the Copyright Office views copyright holders as its “customers,”<sup>5</sup> we fear that the Office will not protect the privacy of home and business Internet subscribers against invasion by copyright holders who build a business based on monetizing litigation threats, including those who threaten to publicly accuse their targets of viewing pornography.

Another troubling provision of the CASE Act would permit the Copyright Office to dispense with even the minimal procedural protections established in the bill for claims of \$5,000 or less. These “smaller claims”—which are still at or above the largest allowed in small claims court in 21 states—could be decided by a single “Claims Officer” in a **summary procedure on the slimmest of evidence**, yet still produce judgments enforceable in federal court with no meaningful right of appeal.

Finally, the federal courts are extremely cautious when granting default judgments, and regularly set them aside to avoid injustice to unsophisticated defendants. **Nothing in the CASE Act requires the Copyright Office to show the same concern for the rights of defendants.** At minimum, a requirement that small claims procedures cannot commence unless defendants affirmatively opt in to those procedures would give the Copyright Office an incentive to ensure that defendants’ procedural and substantive rights are upheld. A truly fair process will be attractive to both copyright holders and those accused of infringement.

We recognize that federal litigation can be expensive, making the pursuit of many small-dollar-value claims impractical for copyright holders. But we believe that much of that expense results from procedures that promote fairness, refined through decades of use. Creating a new, parallel system that allows copyright holders to dispense with those procedures invites abuse, especially given the Copyright Office’s institutional bias.

In attempting to solve a problem for some copyright holders, Congress must not create new incentives for unscrupulous litigation businesses to abuse and exploit ordinary Internet users. As advocates for your constituents, we ask you to oppose the CASE Act.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell L. Stoltz  
Electronic Frontier Foundation  
San Francisco, CA

Ernesto Falcon  
Electronic Frontier Foundation  
San Francisco, CA

Kathleen Lu  
Attorney  
San Francisco, CA

Steve Vondran  
Vondran Legal  
San Francisco, CA

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.copyright.gov/about/office-register/meyer-lecture.pdf>.

The Honorable Robert Goodlatte  
The Honorable Jerrold Nadler  
Members of the House Committee on the Judiciary  
April 26, 2018  
Page 4 of 4

Tuna Mecit  
Attorney  
Silver Spring, MD

Joseph A. Bahgat  
The Privacy Firm  
Philadelphia, PA

Catherine R. Gellis  
Attorney  
Sausalito, CA

Lewis Page  
Page Law Firm  
Birmingham, AL

James S. Tyre  
Law Offices of James S. Tyre  
Culver City, CA

Nicholas J. Jollymore  
Jollymore Law Office, P.C.  
San Francisco, CA

Erin K. Russell  
The Russell Firm  
Chicago, IL

Katrina Brede  
POV Legal  
Seattle, WA

Billy Joe Mills  
FirmEquity LLC  
Chicago, IL

Benjamin Kailin  
FirmEquity LLC  
Chicago, IL

Rick McLeod  
Attorney  
Woodland, WA

J. Christopher Lynch  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Spokane, WA

Nicholas Ranallo  
Ranallo Law Office  
New York and California

Delvan Neville  
Computer Forensics Examiner  
Corvallis, OR

Jeffrey Antonelli  
Antonelli Law Firm  
Chicago, IL