BMG RIGHTS MANAGEMENT (US) LLC V. COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

— F.3d —, 2018 WL 650316 (4th Cir. Feb. 1, 2018)

Motz, Circuit Judge:

BMG Rights Management (US) LLC ("BMG"), which owns copyrights in musical compositions, filed this suit alleging copyright infringement against Cox Communications, Inc. and CoxCom, LLC (collectively, "Cox"), providers of high-speed Internet access. BMG seeks to hold Cox contributorily liable for infringement of BMG's copyrights by subscribers to Cox's Internet service. Following extensive discovery, the district court held that Cox had not produced evidence that it had implemented a policy entitling it to a statutory safe harbor defense and so granted summary judgment on that issue to BMG. After a two-week trial, a jury found Cox liable for willful contributory infringement and awarded BMG $25 million in statutory damages. Cox appeals, asserting that the district court erred in denying it the safe harbor defense and incorrectly instructed the jury. We hold that Cox is not entitled to the safe harbor defense and affirm the district court's denial of it, but we reverse in part, vacate in part, and remand for a new trial because of certain errors in the jury instructions.

I.

A.

Cox is a conduit Internet service provider ("ISP"), providing approximately 4.5 million subscribers with high-speed Internet access for a monthly fee. Some of Cox's subscribers shared and received copyrighted files, including music files, using a technology known as BitTorrent. ...

Cox's agreement with its subscribers reserves the right to suspend or terminate subscribers who use Cox's service "to post, copy, transmit, or disseminate any content that infringes the patents, copyrights ... or proprietary rights of any party." To enforce that agreement and protect itself from liability, however, Cox created only a very limited automated system to process notifications of alleged infringement received from copyright owners. Cox's automated system rests on a thirteen-strike policy that determines the action to be taken based on how many notices Cox has previously received regarding infringement by a particular subscriber. The first notice alleging a subscriber's infringement produces no action from Cox. The second through seventh notices result in warning emails from Cox to the subscriber. After the eighth and ninth notices, Cox limits the subscriber's Internet access to a single webpage that contains a warning, but the subscriber can reactivate complete service by clicking an acknowledgement. After the tenth and eleventh notices, Cox suspends services, requiring the subscriber to call a technician, who, after explaining the reason for suspension and advising removal of infringing content, reactivates service. After the twelfth notice, the subscriber is suspended and directed to a specialized technician, who, after another warning to cease infringing conduct, reactivates service. After the thirteenth notice, the subscriber is again suspended, and, for the first time, considered for termination. Cox never automatically terminates a subscriber.

The effectiveness of Cox's thirteen-strike policy as a deterrent to copyright infringement has several additional limitations. Cox restricts the number of notices it will process from any copyright holder or agent in one day; any notice received after this limit has been met does not count in Cox's graduated response escalation. Cox also counts only one notice per subscriber per day. And Cox resets a subscriber's thirteen-strike counter every six months.

BMG, a music publishing company, owns copyrights in musical compositions. To protect this copyrighted material, BMG hired Rightscorp, Inc., which monitors BitTorrent activity to determine when infringers share its clients' copyrighted works. When Rightscorp identifies such sharing, it emails an infringement notice to the alleged infringer's ISP (here, Cox). The notice contains the name of the copyright owner (here, BMG), the title of the copyrighted work, the alleged infringer's IP address, a time stamp, and a statement under penalty of perjury that Rightscorp is an authorized agent and the notice is accurate.

Rightscorp also asks the ISP to forward the notice to the allegedly infringing subscriber, since only the ISP can match the IP address to the subscriber's identity. For that purpose, the notice contains a settlement offer, allowing the alleged infringer to pay twenty or thirty dollars for a release from liability for the instance of infringement alleged in the notice. Cox has determined to refuse to forward or process notices that contain such settlement language. When Cox began receiving Rightscorp notices in the spring of 2011 (before Rightscorp had signed BMG as a client), Cox notified Rightscorp that it would process the notices only if Rightscorp removed the settlement language. Rightscorp did not do so. Cox never considered removing the settlement language itself or using other means to inform its subscribers of the allegedly infringing activity observed by Rightscorp.

Rightscorp continued to send Cox large numbers of settlement notices. In the fall of 2011, Cox decided to "blacklist" Rightscorp, meaning Cox would delete notices received from Rightscorp without acting on them or even viewing them. BMG hired Rightscorp in December 2011 — *after* Cox blacklisted Rightscorp. Thus, Cox did not ever view a single one of the millions of notices that Rightscorp sent to Cox on BMG's behalf.

B.

On November 26, 2014, BMG initiated this action against Cox. BMG alleged that Cox was vicariously and contributorily liable for acts of copyright infringement by its subscribers. ...

The jury found Cox liable for willful contributory infringement and awarded BMG $25 million in statutory damages. Cox appeals ...

II.

We first address Cox's contention that the district court erred in denying it the § 512(a) DMCA safe harbor defense. ...

A.

The DMCA provides a series of safe harbors that limit the copyright infringement liability of an ISP and related entities. As a conduit ISP, Cox seeks the benefit of the safe harbor contained in 17 U.S.C. § 512(a). To fall within that safe harbor, Cox must show that it meets the threshold requirement, common to all § 512 safe harbors, that it has "adopted and reasonably implemented ... a policy that provides for the termination in appropriate circumstances of subscribers ... who are repeat infringers." 17 U.S.C. § 512(i)(1)(A).

Cox's principal contention is that "repeat infringers" means *adjudicated* repeat infringers: people who have been held liable by a court for multiple instances of copyright infringement. ...

Cox contends that because the repeat infringer provision uses the term "infringer" without modifiers such as "alleged" or "claimed" that appear elsewhere in the DMCA, "infringer" must mean "adjudicated infringer." But the DMCA's use of phrases like "alleged infringer" in other portions of the statute indicates only that the term "infringer" alone must mean something different than "alleged infringer," otherwise, the word "alleged" would be superfluous. Using the ordinary meaning of "infringer," however, fully accords with this principle: someone who *actually* infringes a copyright differs from someone who has merely *allegedly* infringed a copyright, because an allegation could be false. The need to differentiate the terms "infringer" and "alleged infringer" thus does not mandate Cox's proposed definition. ...

Similarly, the DMCA itself provides that ISPs who store copyrighted material are generally not liable for removing "material or activity *claimed to be infringing or* based on facts or circumstances from which *infringing activity is apparent*, regardless of whether the material or activity is *ultimately determined to be infringing*." *Id.* § 512(g)(1) (emphases added). This provision expressly distinguishes among three categories of activity: activity merely "claimed to be infringing," actual "infringing activity" (as is apparent from "facts or circumstances"), and activity "ultimately determined to be infringing." The distinction between "infringing activity" and activity "ultimately determined to be infringing" in § 512(g) shelters ISPs from being liable for taking down material that *is* "infringing," even if no court "ultimately determine[s]" that it is infringing — because, for example, the copyright holder simply does not file a lawsuit against the person who uploaded the infringing material. As this provision illustrates, Congress knew how to expressly refer to adjudicated infringement, but did not do so in the repeat infringer provision. That suggests the term "infringer" in § 512(i) is not limited to adjudicated infringers.

The legislative history of the repeat infringer provision supports this conclusion. Both the House Commerce and Senate Judiciary Committee Reports explained that "those who repeatedly or flagrantly abuse their access to the Internet through disrespect for the intellectual property rights of others should know that there is a realistic threat of losing that access." H.R. Rep. No. 105-551, pt. 2, at 61 (1998); S. Rep. No. 105-190, at 52 (1998). This passage makes clear that if persons "abuse their access to the Internet through disrespect for the intellectual property rights of others" — that is, if they infringe copyrights — they should face a "realistic threat of losing" their Internet access. The passage does not suggest that they should risk losing Internet access only once they have been sued in court and found liable for multiple instances of infringement. Indeed, the risk of losing one's Internet access would hardly constitute a "realistic threat" capable of deterring infringement if that punishment applied only to those *already* subject to civil penalties and legal fees as adjudicated infringers. ...

Accordingly, we reject Cox's argument that the term "repeat infringers" in § 512(i) is limited to adjudicated infringers.

B.

Section 512(i) thus requires that, to obtain the benefit of the DMCA safe harbor, Cox must have reasonably implemented "a policy that provides for the termination in appropriate circumstances" of its subscribers who repeatedly infringe copyrights. 17 U.S.C. § 512(i)(1)(A). We are mindful of the need to afford ISPs flexibility in crafting repeat infringer policies, and of the difficulty of determining when it is "appropriate" to terminate a person's access to the Internet. At a minimum, however, an ISP has not "reasonably implemented" a repeat infringer policy if the ISP fails to enforce the terms of its policy in any meaningful fashion. Here, Cox formally adopted a repeat infringer "policy," but, both before and after September 2012, made every effort to avoid reasonably implementing that policy. Indeed, in carrying out its thirteen-strike process, Cox very clearly determined *not* to terminate subscribers who in fact repeatedly violated the policy.

The words of Cox's own employees confirm this conclusion. In a 2009 email, Jason Zabek, the executive managing the Abuse Group, a team tasked with addressing subscribers' violations of Cox's policies, explained to his team that "if a customer is terminated for DMCA, you are able to reactivate them," and that "[a]fter you reactivate them the DMCA 'counter' restarts." The email continued, "This is to be an unwritten semi-policy." Zabek also advised a customer service representative asking whether she could reactivate a terminated subscriber that "[i]f it is for DMCA you can go ahead and reactivate." Zabek explained to another representative: "Once the customer has been terminated for DMCA, we have fulfilled the obligation of the DMCA safe harbor and can start over." He elaborated that this would allow Cox to "collect a few extra weeks of payments for their account. ;-)." Another email summarized Cox's practice more succinctly: "DMCA = reactivate." As a result of this practice, from the beginning of the litigated time period until September 2012, Cox *never* terminated a subscriber for infringement without reactivating them.

Cox nonetheless contends that it lacked "actual knowledge" of its subscribers' infringement and therefore did not have to terminate them. That argument misses the mark. The evidence shows that Cox *always* reactivated subscribers after termination, regardless of its knowledge of the subscriber's infringement. Cox did not, for example, advise employees *not* to reactivate a subscriber if the employees had reliable information regarding the subscriber's repeat infringement. An ISP cannot claim the protections of the DMCA safe harbor provisions merely by terminating customers as a symbolic gesture before indiscriminately reactivating them within a short timeframe.

In September 2012, Cox abandoned its practice of routine reactivation. An internal email advised a new customer service representative that "we now terminate, for real." BMG argues, however, that this was a change in form rather than substance, because instead of terminating and then reactivating subscribers, Cox simply stopped terminating them in the first place. The record evidence supports this view. Before September 2012, Cox was terminating (and reactivating) 15.5 subscribers per month on average; after September 2012, Cox abruptly began terminating *less than one* subscriber per month on average. From September 2012 until the end of October 2014, the month before BMG filed suit, Cox issued only 21 terminations in total. Moreover, at least 17 of those 21 terminations concerned subscribers who had either failed to pay their bills on time or used excessive bandwidth (something that Cox subjected to a strict three-strike termination policy). Cox did not provide evidence that the remaining four terminations were for repeat copyright infringement. But even assuming they were, they stand in stark contrast to the over 500,000 email warnings and temporary suspensions Cox issued to alleged infringers during the same time period.

Moreover, Cox dispensed with terminating subscribers who repeatedly infringed *BMG's* copyrights in particular when it decided to delete automatically all infringement notices received from BMG's agent, Rightscorp. As a result, Cox received none of the millions of infringement notices that Rightscorp sent to Cox on BMG's behalf during the relevant period. Although our inquiry concerns Cox's policy toward all of its repeatedly infringing subscribers, not just those who infringed BMG's copyrights, Cox's decision to categorically disregard all notices from

Rightscorp provides further evidence that Cox did not reasonably implement a repeat infringer policy.

BMG also provided evidence of particular instances in which Cox failed to terminate subscribers whom Cox employees regarded as repeat infringers. For example, one subscriber "was advised to stop sharing ... and remove his PTP programs," and a Cox employee noted that the subscriber was "well aware of his actions" and was "upset that 'after years of doing this' he is now getting caught." Nonetheless, Cox did not terminate the subscriber. Another customer was advised that "further complaints would result in termination" and that it was the customer's "absolute last chance to ... remove ALL" file-sharing software. But when Cox received another complaint, a manager directed the employee *not* to terminate, but rather to "suspend this Customer, one LAST time," noting that "[t]his customer pays us over $400/month" and that "[e]very terminated Customer becomes lost revenue."

Cox responds that these post-September 2012 emails do not necessarily "*prove* actual knowledge of repeat infringement." Again, that argument is misplaced. Cox bears the burden of proof on the DMCA safe harbor defense; thus, Cox had to point to evidence showing that it reasonably implemented a repeat infringer policy. The emails show that Cox internally concluded that a subscriber should be terminated after the next strike, but then declined to do so because it did not want to lose revenue. In other words, Cox failed to follow through on its own policy. Cox argues that these emails only concerned "four cases," and that "occasional lapses" are forgivable. But even four cases are significant when measured against Cox's equally small total number of relevant terminations in this period — also four. More importantly, Cox did not produce any evidence of instances in which it *did* follow through on its policy and terminate subscribers after giving them a final warning to stop infringing.

In addition, Cox suggests that because the DMCA merely requires termination of repeat infringers in "appropriate circumstances," Cox decided not to terminate certain subscribers only when "appropriate circumstances" were lacking. But Cox failed to provide evidence that a determination of "appropriate circumstances" played *any* role in its decisions to terminate (or not to terminate). Cox did not, for example, point to any criteria that its employees used to determine whether "appropriate circumstances" for termination existed. Instead, the evidence shows that Cox's decisions not to terminate had nothing to do with "appropriate circumstances" but instead were based on one goal: not losing revenue from paying subscribers.

Cox failed to qualify for the DMCA safe harbor because it failed to implement its policy in any consistent or meaningful way — leaving it essentially with no policy. Accordingly, the district court did not err in holding that Cox failed to offer evidence supporting its entitlement to the § 512(a) safe harbor defense and therefore granting summary judgment on this issue to BMG.

QUESTIONS

1. Remember that the § 512(a) safe harbor, on which ISPs like Cox rely, does *not* have a notice-and-takedown procedure like the one jn the § 512(c) safe harbor for hosts of online content. So why was Rightscorp sending Cox notices of claimed infringement, and why does the court care?
2. Is *BMG v. Cox* consistent with *Perfect 10 v. CCBill*?