

Index

- Accidents
 - Comparison to development of the tort of negligence, 46–50
 - Growth, 30–40
 - Minimising social cost, 51–55
 - Nature of, 2–4, 9–12, 20
 - Prevalence, 12–15
 - Taxonomy, 15–19
- Compulsory licensing, 97–99
- Creative risk. *See* Accidents
- De Acosta v Brown*, 119–21
- Defences, 101–2
- Exceptions and Limitations. *See* Defences
- Field v Google*, 117–18
- Inadvertent infringement, 4, 19, 31, 103
- Incentive-Access tradeoff, 11–12
- Infringement Analysis, 99–101
- Intention liability rules. *See* No liability rules
- IP marking, 3
- Negligence
 - A proposed liability regime, 105–8
 - Activity levels, 67–68
 - Administrative cost, 62–64
 - Application to independent invention, 112–16
 - Application to IP triangles, 119–21
 - Application to orphan works, 109–12
 - Application to strategic behaviour, 116–18
- Economic case for (evaluation), 72–74
- Effect of externalities, 68–72
- Equitable distribution of cultural risk, 51–81
- Error cost, 64–67
- Fairness of, 82–92
- Incentives for bilateral care, 57–59
- Justification in IP (Brief), 4–6
- Reform proposals in IP, 20, 26–29
- No liability rules
 - Academic proposals in IP, 26
 - Notice, 37–40
- Property rules and liability rules, 23
- Proprietary nature of IP rights, 124
- Rambus v Infineon*, 18, 117
- Remedies (Modifications to), 103–5
- Research in Motion (BlackBerry Case), 2, 112–16
- Rules versus standards, 93–97
- Strict liability
 - Causation argument, 83–86
 - Historical development, 41–46
 - Justifications in IP, 21–23
 - Property argument, 86–88
 - Reciprocity argument, 90–92
 - Terminology, 21
 - Wrongfulness (fault) argument, 88–90
- Tortious nature of IP liability, 125–26
- University of Michigan (Orphan Works Project), 1, 109–12