

WHITE & CASE LLP
YAR R. CHAIKOVSKY (CA 175421)
yar.chaikovsky@whitecase.com
ANDY LEGOLVAN (CA 292520)
andy.legolvan@whitecase.com
AMIR JABBARI (CA 339097)
amir.jabbari@whitecase.com
3000 El Camino Real
2 Palo Alto Square, Suite 900
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2109
Telephone: (650) 213-0300
Facsimile: (650) 213-8158

ANNA B. NAYDONOV (*pro hac vice*)
anna.naydonov@whitecase.com
MARK DAVIES (*pro hac vice*)
mark.davies@whitecase.com
701 13th St NW # 600
Washington, DC 2005-3807
Telephone: (202) 626-3600
Facsimile: (202) 639-9355

Attorneys for
Defendant Anthropic PBC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CAMBRONNE INC., LISA BARRETTA,
PHILIP SHISHKIN, MATTHEW SACKS, and
MICHAEL KOCHIN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ANTHROPIC PBC

Defendant.

Case No. 5:25-cv-10897-PCP

Related Cases:
5:26-cv-04218-PCP
5:26-cv-04056-PCP
5:26-cv-04482-PCP
5:26-cv-04649-PCP

**DEFENDANT ANTHROPIC
PBC'S OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS'
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION
TO SET CONSOLIDATED
BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND
HEARING DATE (L.R. 7-11)**

Judge: Hon. P. Casey Pitts

1 Plaintiffs filed five separate cases against Anthropic, each raising a host of unique pleading
 2 deficiencies. Anthropic proposes to brief motions to dismiss in each case, with a staggered briefing
 3 schedule in the order Plaintiffs' counsel chose to file each case. In response, on the eve of
 4 Anthropic's deadline to file the motion to dismiss in *Cambronne*, the first filed of the cases,
 5 Plaintiffs move the Court to force Anthropic to file a consolidated brief for all five cases.

6 There is no good reason to adopt Plaintiffs' approach. The same reason Plaintiffs' counsel
 7 chose to join certain plaintiffs (*e.g.*, the *Kwon* or *Cruz* authors) but file separate actions for others
 8 (*e.g.*, *Cognella* and *Chicken Soup* publishers) is precisely why there is no good reason for
 9 consolidated briefing: each case raises unique pleading deficiencies—copyright ownership,
 10 standing, the necessity of joining third parties, *res judicata* under *Bartz*, and entitlement to statutory
 11 damages—which are more appropriately briefed in the factual context of the case each plaintiff
 12 chose to file. Relating the cases under Local Rule 3-12 does not change the picture. Relation assigns
 13 cases to one judge to avoid duplicative labor by multiple judges; it does not consolidate them or
 14 merge their pleadings. A party seeking to merge cases must make a showing specific to
 15 consolidation—relatedness alone does not supply it. *See Rothschild v. Pacific Cos.*, No. 23-cv-
 16 01721-LJC, 2024 WL 2112898, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2024) (relating two cases but denying
 17 consolidation where the movant conflated relatedness with consolidation). Plaintiffs make no such
 18 showing here. Rule 12 entitles Anthropic to respond to each complaint on its own terms, and
 19 Plaintiffs cite no authority that a relation order dictates the form of those responses.

20 The Court should deny Plaintiffs' request for consolidated briefing, keep the *Cambronne*
 21 briefing schedule in place,¹ adopt Anthropic's proposed schedule for the remaining cases, and, if
 22 convenient for the Court, hold consolidated or separate hearings on the five motions at the
 23 conclusion of briefing.

Case	Motion to Dismiss	Opposition	Reply
<i>Cambronne</i>	July 30, 2026	Sept. 28, 2026	Oct. 19, 2026
<i>Cognella</i>	Aug. 13, 2026	Oct. 5, 2026	Oct. 26, 2026
<i>Chicken Soup</i>	Aug. 27, 2026	Oct. 19, 2026	Nov. 2, 2026
<i>Kwon</i>	Sept. 10, 2026	Nov. 2, 2026	Nov. 16, 2026
<i>Cruz</i>	Sept. 24, 2026	Nov. 16, 2026	Nov. 30, 2026

28 ¹ The parties have already stipulated to the briefing schedule in *Cambronne*. *See* Dkt. 198.

* * *

Counsel for Plaintiffs—together with their co-counsel and client-intake partner, ClaimsHero—are pursuing a campaign of copyright suits against Anthropic on behalf of unique and disparately situated book publishers and authors. Thus far, they have filed five separate actions—*Cambronne*, *Cognella*, *Chicken Soup*, *Kwon*, *Cruz*—with some unknown number of suits and claims yet to be filed. *See Cambronne*, Dkt. 126 at 12 n.6 (“Plaintiffs’ counsel represents scores of additional authors and publishers”); *Cambronne*, Mar. 24, 2026 Hr’g Tr. on Mot. to Sever at 13:4–6 (“counsel will be filing more”); Hr’g Tr. at 74, *Bartz v. Anthropic*, No. 3:24-cv-5417-WHA (N.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2025) (ClaimsHero representative testifying that approximately 45,000 people created ClaimsHero accounts since the October 27, 2025 launch of its Anthropic campaign). That fragmentation is plaintiffs’ choice. They opted out of the *Bartz* class settlement to litigate on their own, and they did not bring a class action here.

The initial *Cambronne* case has six author plaintiffs, who each testified before the *Bartz* court at the November 25, 2025 evidentiary hearing in *Bartz*. Anthropic filed a motion to dismiss *Cambronne* on grounds unique to those author plaintiffs. Dkt. 96. Rather than oppose, the plaintiffs amended the complaint and agreed to stay pleadings challenges until severance was decided. Since the severance ruling, Anthropic and the *Cambronne* plaintiffs agreed to a briefing schedule, with Anthropic’s motion due in two days (July 30). Dkt. 198. After *Cambronne*, counsel then filed two cases on behalf of publisher plaintiffs—*Cognella* and *Chicken Soup*—comprising over 500 works, each raising new and discrete issues unique to their works, registrations, and ownership structure. Counsel then filed *Kwon* and *Cruz* on behalf of dozens of individual authors and asserting approximately 80 works each—raising even further issues unique to the makeup of works, registrations, authors, and publishers at issue.

Though each case raises similar claims against Anthropic—sufficient to warrant case-relation before the same Judge—each case’s unique selection and composition of plaintiffs and asserted works invariably requires a bespoke responsive pleading. Plaintiffs’ decision that Anthropic should move to dismiss all five of their counsel’s successively filed cases as one should be rejected.

1 Anthropic's investigation into the unique posture of *Cambronne*, *Cognella*, *Chicken Soup*,
2 *Kwon*, and *Cruz* is ongoing—further underlying the prejudice of Plaintiffs' insistence on treating
3 them all as one. Indeed, Anthropic's investigation to date reveals unique, non-crosscutting
4 pleadings challenges inherent in counsel's selection of plaintiffs and works across the cases. For
5 example, some cases, such as *Cognella* and *Chicken Soup*, are single-plaintiff publisher cases—
6 raising unique copyright ownership and standing issues as to the omitted authors listed as owners
7 on the copyright registrations. *Cruz* and *Kwon* compound the problem: *Cruz* names 28 plaintiffs
8 and *Kwon* names 34, and many of their works are registered to publishers—such as Wiley, McGraw
9 Hill, and Princeton University Press—rather than to the plaintiffs or to non-plaintiff co-authors.
10 Each plaintiff's standing and ownership must be assessed individually. Only the legal or beneficial
11 owner of an exclusive right may sue. 17 U.S.C. § 501(b); *Silvers v. Sony Pictures Entm't, Inc.*, 402
12 F.3d 881, 884 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc). Whatever the response to these deficiencies—to date,
13 counsel has not addressed them—there is no suggestion they must be addressed in consolidated
14 briefing with differently situated plaintiffs.

15 Further, some plaintiffs in *Chicken Soup* and *Kwon* assert works whose claims were
16 adjudicated by the *Bartz* settlement because the works were not opted out—raising unique *res*
17 *judicata* defenses not relevant to the other cases. Some works in *Cognella* and *Chicken Soup* were
18 not registered at the time of alleged infringement—verifiable by the judicially noticeable
19 registrations—raising a ripe pleadings challenge to their claims for statutory damages. And some
20 works in *Chicken Soup* may be part of a co-pending bankruptcy estate, *see In re Chicken Soup for*
21 *the Soul Entm't*, Nos. 24-bk-11442 (June 28, 2024), potentially raising further unique standing
22 issues relevant only to that case.

23 The scale of this problem is not hypothetical. Anthropic's first motion to dismiss in this
24 litigation supported a single standing defect with five registrations, one per challenged work. *See*
25 *Mot. to Dismiss*, LeGolván Decl. Exs. A–E, Dkt. 96. The related cases put nearly 700 more
26 copyrights at issue. A work-by-work ownership record of that scope, presented in a single brief,
27 would serve neither the Court nor the parties.

28 Anthropic intends to investigate and appropriately raise pleadings deficiencies in each

1 action, tailored to the parties, claims, and facts of each case—in the order counsel chose to file
2 them, and staggered appropriately to give Anthropic sufficient opportunity to investigate and brief
3 each motion. It might be that some issues will be similar between one case and another—the parties
4 and the Court are well equipped to ensure consistency and avoid repetition of labor. But that is not
5 a reason to deliberately file five separate cases according to their unique makeup—with some
6 unknown number of additional cases yet to be filed—and then force Anthropic to treat them as
7 identical before the deficiencies have been fully investigated, briefed, and decided.

8
9 Date: July 28, 2026

WHITE & CASE LLP

10
11 By: /s/ Yar R. Chaikovsky

12 Yar R. Chaikovsky
13 Anna B. Naydonov
14 Mark Davies
15 Andy LeGolyan
16 Amir Jabbari
17 *Attorneys for Defendant Anthropic PBC*
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28