

Copyright and Collective Authorship

As technology makes it easier for people to work together, large-scale collaboration is becoming increasingly prevalent. In this context, the question of how to determine authorship – and hence ownership – of copyright in collaborative works is an important question to which current copyright law fails to provide a coherent or consistent answer. In *Copyright and Collective Authorship*, Daniela Simone engages with the problem of how to determine the authorship of highly collaborative works. Employing insights from the ways in which collaborators understand and regulate issues of authorship, the book argues that a recalibration of copyright law is necessary, proposing an inclusive and contextual approach to joint authorship that is true to the legal concept of authorship but is also more aligned with creative reality.

Dr. Daniela Simone is a Lecturer in Law at University College London, where she is also a Co-Director of the Institute of Brand and Innovation Law. Dr Simone holds BCL, MPhil and DPhil degrees from the University of Oxford. Prior to moving to the UK, she was awarded a BA/LLB (Hons I) degree from the University of Sydney, Australia, was admitted to the Supreme Court of New South Wales and worked as a lawyer for a global commercial law firm in Sydney.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-316-64909-1 — Copyright and Collective Authorship
Daniela Simone
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Cambridge Intellectual Property and Information Law

As its economic potential has rapidly expanded, intellectual property has become a subject of front-rank legal importance. Cambridge Intellectual Property and Information Law is a series of monograph studies of major current issues in intellectual property. Each volume contains a mix of international, European, comparative and national law, making this a highly significant series for practitioners, judges and academic researchers in many countries.

Series Editors

Lionel Bently

Herchel Smith Professor of Intellectual Property Law, University of Cambridge

Graeme Dinwoodie

Professor of Intellectual Property and Information Technology Law, University of Oxford

Advisory Editors

William R. Cornish, *Emeritus Herchel Smith Professor of Intellectual Property Law, University of Cambridge*

François Dessemondet, *Professor of Law, University of Lausanne*

Jane C. Ginsburg, *Morton L. Janklow Professor of Literary and Artistic Property Law, Columbia Law School*

Paul Goldstein, *Professor of Law, Stanford University*

The Rt Hon. Sir Robin Jacob, *Hugh Laddie Professor of Intellectual Property, University College London*

Ansgar Ohly, *Professor of Intellectual Property Law, Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich*

A list of books in the series can be found at the end of this volume.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-316-64909-1 — Copyright and Collective Authorship
Daniela Simone
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Copyright and Collective Authorship

Locating the Authors of Collaborative Work

Daniela Simone

University College London



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-316-64909-1 — Copyright and Collective Authorship
Daniela Simone
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi - 110025, India
103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781316649091

DOI: 10.1017/9781108186070

© Daniela Simone 2019

The author asserts her moral rights, including the right to be identified as the author of this work.

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2019

First paperback edition 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data

Names: Simone, Daniela, 1983– author.

Title: Copyright and collective authorship : locating the authors of collaborative work / Daniela Simone , University College London.

Description: Cambridge [UK] ; new York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2019. | Series: Cambridge intellectual property and information law | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018048870 | ISBN 9781107199958

Subjects: LCSH: Copyright. | Authorship. | Copyright – Art. | Wikipedia. |

User-generated content – Law and legislation. | Electronic encyclopedias.

Classification: LCC K1440 .S56 2019 | DDC 346.04/82–dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2018048870>

ISBN 978-1-107-19995-8 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-316-64909-1 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	page viii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	x
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xii
<i>Table of Statutes</i>	xx
1 Copyright Law and Collective Authorship	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Methodological Approach	6
1.3 A Roadmap	8
2 Authorship and Joint Authorship	15
2.1 The Concept of Authorship in the CDPA	17
2.2 The Joint Authorship Test	29
2.2.1 A Contribution That Is Not Distinct	30
2.2.2 Collaboration or Common Design	31
2.2.3 A Significant Contribution of the Right Kind	35
2.3 A Critique of the Application of the Joint Authorship Test	42
2.3.1 Factual Specificity	43
2.3.2 The Pragmatic Instrumental Approach	43
2.3.3 A Preoccupation with Aesthetic Neutrality	50
2.4 The Factual and the Normative Dimensions of the Joint Authorship Test	53
2.5 Copyright Scholarship: Theories of Authorship	58
2.5.1 The Romantic Author	59
2.5.2 Ginsburg’s Search for Copyright’s Author	62
2.5.3 Nimmer v Goldstein (and Beyond)	63
2.5.4 The Value of Social and Cultural Conceptions of Authorship	67
2.6 Conclusion	70
3 Wikipedia	72
3.1 Authorship Dynamics: Promoting Sharing	73
3.2 Copyright Subsistence on Wikipedia	78
3.2.1 Is Wikipedia (or Parts Thereof) an Original Literary Work?	78
3.2.2 Are Wikipedia Contributors Copyright Authors?	86
3.3 Copyleft Licences and the Ambivalent Role of Copyright Law	90
3.4 Insights for Copyright Law	95

vi Contents

4	Australian Indigenous Art	100
4.1	Indigenous Art	102
4.1.1	Authorship Dynamics: Building and Sustaining Cultural Identity	102
4.1.2	Background to the Issue of Protecting Indigenous Cultural Expressions	105
4.2	Protecting Indigenous Art with Copyright	109
4.2.1	Cases Prior to <i>Bulun Bulun</i>	110
4.2.2	<i>Bulun Bulun</i>	112
4.2.3	<i>Bulun Bulun</i> 's Limited Legacy	115
4.3	Other Solutions for the Protection of Indigenous Cultural Expressions	122
4.3.1	Protocols and Codes of Conduct	123
4.3.2	Collective/Certification Trade Marks	124
4.3.3	Contract	125
4.3.4	Sui Generis Legislation	126
4.4	Insights for Copyright Law	127
5	Scientific Collaborations	131
5.1	Authorship Dynamics: Constructing Authority	132
5.2	Regulating Scientific Authorship with Private Ordering	139
5.2.1	Biomedical Science Collaborations: An Authorship Crisis	139
5.2.2	Particle Physics Collaborations: The Bureaucratisation of Authorship	145
5.3	The Application of Copyright Law	148
5.4	Insights for Copyright Law	154
6	Film	159
6.1	Authorship Dynamics: The Pragmatic Value of Authorship	161
6.2	The Subsistence of Copyright	169
6.2.1	A Brief Historical Note	170
6.2.2	Explaining the Complexity of Film Copyright	171
6.2.3	Film as a First Fixation	176
6.2.4	Film as a Dramatic Work	180
6.2.5	The Pitfalls of Pragmatic Reasoning	187
6.3	Private Ordering	192
6.4	Insights for Copyright Law	196
7	Characteristics of Collective Authorship and the Role of Copyright Law	201
7.1	The Nature of Collective Authorship	201
7.2	The Meaning of Authorship for Each Collective Authorship Group	204
7.2.1	Different Meanings of Authorship	205
7.2.2	Authorship Signifies Responsibility for the Work	206
7.2.3	Authorship Signals Status within a Particular Community	208
7.2.4	Power Dynamics Affect the Attribution of Authorship	209
7.3	The Gap between Copyright Law's Assumptions about Authorship and Creative Reality	210
7.4	Bridging the Gap between Copyright Law and Creative Reality with Private Ordering	213
7.4.1	Successful Examples	213

Contents	vii
7.4.2 Less Successful Examples	215
7.4.3 The Benefits and Limitations of Relying upon Private Ordering	216
7.5 The Role of Copyright Law and Its Concepts	224
7.6 Summary	229
8 An Inclusive, Contextual Approach to the Joint Authorship Test	231
8.1 The Relevance of Social Norms	233
8.2 The Dangers of Deferring to Social Norms	238
8.3 A Framework for Considering Social Norms	241
8.4 Revisiting the Critique of the Joint Authorship Test	246
8.4.1 Factual Specificity	246
8.4.2 The Preoccupation with Aesthetic Neutrality	246
8.4.3 The Pragmatic Instrumental Approach	247
8.5 An Inclusive and Contextual Approach to the Joint Authorship Test	250
8.6 Alternative Approaches to Joint Ownership	256
8.6.1 The Current Approach to Joint Ownership	257
8.6.2 A View from the United States	262
8.6.3 A Proposal for a Modest Legislative Amendment	266
8.7 Final Note	269
<i>Bibliography</i>	273
<i>Index</i>	294

Acknowledgements

This book would not have been possible without the support of many people. I owe a great debt of gratitude to Graeme Dinwoodie, who supervised my DPhil thesis, for his formidable expertise, great generosity, unwavering support and dynamism. Also to Mireille van Eechoud and Dev Gangjee who made the viva voce examination a thought-provoking and enjoyable experience, which has been a great resource in shaping this book.

I have been fortunate to be able to develop my ideas as a result of lively discussions with many scholars and friends. I am grateful for feedback from participants at the Intellectual Property Scholars Conference (DePaul University, 2011); the Authorship Dynamics and the Dynamic Work HERA Workshop (University of Cambridge, 2012); the Oxford Intellectual Property Discussion Group (2014) and graduate conferences at Queen Mary, King's College London and Oxford. Observations great and small from a number of intellectual property scholars have helped enormously in the development of this book, in particular, the anonymous reviewers of the manuscript, Isabella Alexander, Tanya Aplin, Barton Beebe, Lionel Bently, Laura Biron, Catherine Bond, Kathy Bowrey, Christopher Buccafusco, Robert Burrell, Pascale Chapdelaine, Elena Cooper, Giuseppina D'Agostino, Richard Danbury, Séverine Dusollier, Ilanah Fhima, Matt Fisher, Michael Fraser, Robert Gomulkiewicz, Jonathan Griffiths, Michael Handler, Emily Hudson, Marta Iljadica, Sir Robin Jacob, Phillip Johnson, Barbara Lauriat, Yin Harn Lee, Brigitte Lindner, Luke McDonagh, Poorna Mysoor, Justine Pila, Graham Reynolds, Mark Rose, Uma Suthersanen, Dilan Thampapillai, David Vaver and Kimberlee Weatherall.

I would be remiss not to thank the members of the Oxford Intellectual Property Research Centre, the fantastic group of intellectual property doctoral students at the University of Oxford and members of the Oxford Law Faculty for many conversations on fine points of copyright law as well as broader philosophical issues. Whilst at Oxford, I also benefited from the support and assistance of many scholars,

administrators and librarians at the Faculty of Law, Worcester College and the International Office.

I am particularly grateful to the University of Sydney for a visiting period in March–April 2017, which allowed me to make useful progress on this book and to discuss my work with some of Sydney’s vibrant intellectual property community. I am thankful to the Arts Law Centre of Australia, especially Robyn Ayres and Alida Stanley, for useful discussions about the protection of Indigenous art in the early stages of this project.

The difficult task of turning a thesis into a book was made immeasurably easier by research assistance and attentive proof-reading from the wonderful Lynne Chave, as well as the support and guidance of many colleagues and friends at University College London.

I would like to express my gratitude to the many extraordinary teachers who have encouraged and inspired me over the years, particularly, Deirdre Coleman, Elaine Moore, Mary Crock, Peter Gerangelos, Hilary Astor, and Patricia Loughlan.

To Mum and Dad, your selfless love created the many opportunities with which my life has been blessed. Thank you for being a constant source of strength and support. Mike and Tonia (Leo and Olivia); Nick and Steph; Cath – thank you so much for your love, support and encouragement at every difficult turn. Thanks to my grandparents; to Juliet, Peter, Chris; and Sr Teresita for their thoughtfulness and kind prayers. To Alicia, Amanda, Annie, Bipana, Chloe, Erie, Jen, Laura, Leo, Maria, Megan, Nahal, Natasa, Rani, Sam, Sarah, Tania and Vasiliki – a big thank you for sharing the ups and downs of this project with me. I very much appreciate the kindness and hospitality of Cristina, Luciano, Alessandro and friends in Genoa. Finally, words cannot adequately express my gratitude to Andrea, who has been there on every step of this journey, rigorously challenging my ideas and always believing in me.

Some of the research this book draws upon has been published in an earlier form: ‘Copyright or Copyleft? Wikipedia as a Turning Point for Authorship’ (2014) 25(1) King’s LJ 102, ‘Dreaming Authorship: Copyright Law and the Protection of Indigenous Cultural Expressions’ (2015) 37(4) EIPR 240 and ‘Recalibrating the Joint Authorship Test: Insights from Scientific Collaborations’ (2013) 26(1) IPJ 111.

The law is stated as at 1 September 2018.

Abbreviations

1911 Act	Copyright Act 1911
1956 Act	Copyright Act 1956
Bently et al.	L Bently, B Sherman, D Gangjee and P Johnson, <i>Intellectual Property Law</i> (OUP 2018)
Berne	Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works of 9 September 1886
Copinger et al.	KM Garnett, G Davies, G Harbottle, WA Copinger and EP Skone James, <i>Copinger and Skone James on Copyright</i> (16th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2011)
Cornish et al.	W Cornish, D Llewelyn and T Aplin, <i>Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyright, Trade Marks and Allied Rights</i> (8th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2013)
CDPA	Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988
Database Directive	Directive 96/9/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 1996 on the Legal Protection of Databases
Gregory Report	‘Report of the Board of Trade Copyright Committee’ (Her Majesty’s Stationery Company October 1952) Cmd 8662
InfoSoc Directive	Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society
IPQ	Intellectual Property Quarterly
JIPLP	Journal of Intellectual Property Law and Practice
Laddie et al.	H Laddie, P Prescott and M Vitoria, <i>The Modern Law of Copyright and Designs</i> (4th edn, LexisNexis 2011)

Rental and Related Rights Directive	Directive 2006/115/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on rental right and lending right and on certain rights related to copyright in the field of intellectual property (codified version) (replacing Council Directive 92/100/EEC of 19 November 1992 on rental and lending right and on certain rights relating to copyright in the field of intellectual property)
Senate Report	Australian Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, <i>Indigenous Art – Securing the Future: Australia’s Indigenous Visual Arts and Craft Sector</i> (June 2007)
Term Directive	Directive 2006/116/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on the term of protection of copyright and related rights (codified version) (repealing and replacing Council Directive 93/98/EEC of 29 October 1993 harmonizing the term of protection of copyright and certain related rights)
TRIPS	Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights 1994

Table of Cases

Note: Locators followed by ‘n’ denote a reference in the footnotes to the text.

United Kingdom

- Abraham Moon v Thornber* [2012] EWPCC 37, [2013] FSR 17, 24n49, 25n51, 26n70
- Adventure Film Productions v Tully* [1993] EMLR 376 (Ch), 177n123
- Anacon v Environmental Research* [1994] FSR 359 (Ch), 175n109
- Anya v Wu* [2004] EWCA Civ 755, 148n95, 150n105, 154n126, 155n127, 222n86
- Baigent v Random House Group* [2006] EWHC 719, [2006] EMLR 16, 81n55
- Baigent v Random House Group* [2007] EWCA Civ 247, [2008] EMLR 7, 81n55
- Bamgboye v Reed* [2002] EWHC 2922, [2004] 5 EMLR 61, 25n54, 27n78, 28n83, 32n102, 33n106, 33n107, 37n131, 37n134, 40, 40n152, 44n172, 48n193, 56n242, 87n85, 138n49, 156n130, 209n25, 258n158
- Beckingham v Hodgins* [2002] EWHC 2143 (Ch), [2002] EMLR 45, 30, 30n90, 31n95, 33, 33n106, 35n118, 35n119, 37, 37n128, 37n132, 44n171, 47n187, 47n189, 52, 56n243, 88, 89, 156n130, 183n165, 185n176, 257n154, 258n157, 260n173
- Beckingham v Hodgins* [2003] EWCA Civ 143, [2003] EMLR 18, 30n90, 32, 32–33n104, 33, 33n106, 88, 89, 150n102, 156n130, 182n164, 251n121
- Beechwood House Publishing t/a Binley's v Guardian Products* [2010] EWPCC 1200, 85n73
- Beggars Banquet Records v Carlton Television* [1993] EMLR 349 (Ch), 177n124
- Biotrading and Financing Oy v Biohit* [1996] FSR 393 (Ch), 80n45, 80n46
- Biotrading and Financing Oy v Biohit* [1998] FSR 109 (CA), 80n45, 80n46

- Blacklock v Peterson* [1915] 2 Ch 376, 22n33
- BP Refinery (Westernport) Pty Ltd v President, Councillors and Ratepayers of the Shire of Hastings* (1977) 52 ALJR 20, (1977) 180 CLR 266 (PC), 114n66, 261n174
- Brighton v Jones* [2004] EWHC 1157, [2005] FSR 288, 26n63, 31n96, 32, 32n99, 32n101, 38n141, 39n144, 40, 41, 41n153, 43n164, 45, 46n184, 46–47n185, 47, 47n186, 47n187, 48n192, 79n40, 117n82, 148n96, 158n138, 182n163, 183n168, 183n169, 185n178, 260n173, 262n182
- Brown v Mcasso* [2005] FSR 846 (EWPC), 30n92, 32n102, 33n106, 35n117, 37, 37n131, 37n133, 43n164, 52, 56n242, 56n244, 87n85, 209n25
- Brown v Mcasso* [2005] EWCA Civ 1546, [2006] FSR 480, 35n117
- Brutus v Cozens* [1973] AC 854 (HL), 57n247
- Cala Homes v Alfred McAlpine Homes* [1995] EWHC 7, [1995] FSR 818, 20n22, 30n92, 36n127, 39n147, 40n151, 41, 41n154, 41n155, 42, 50n205, 62, 63, 80n44, 86n78, 118, 118n85, 119n86, 119n89, 148n97, 157, 157n132, 157n135, 207, 207n19, 255, 258n161
- Cescinsky v Routledge* [1916] 2 KB 325, 258n162, 259n167, 259n169, 263n192
- Century Communications v Mayfair Entertainment* [1993] EMLR 335, 177n124
- Chapman v Smith* (1754) 2 Ves Sen 506, 28 ER 324 (Ch), 244n84
- Chappell v Redwood Music* [1980] 2 All ER 817, [1981] RPC 337 (HL), 184n172
- Coffey v Warner/Chappell Music* [2005] EWHC 449 (Ch), [2005] FSR 34, 57n248, 84n65, 176n111, 252n127
- Confetti Records v Warner Music UK Ltd* [2003] EWHC 1274 (Ch), 262n183
- Creation Records v News Group Newspapers* [1997] EMLR 444 (Ch), 109n38, 172, 173n93
- Cummins v Bond* (1926) 1 Ch 167, 20, 248n104
- Designers Guild Ltd v Russell Williams (Textiles) Ltd* [2001] 1 WLR 2416, [2001] FSR 11, 36n126
- Donoghue v Allied Newspapers* [1938] 1 Ch 106 (Ch), 26n61, 32n99, 41n153, 41n158, 48n196, 86n77, 117n82, 148n96, 148n98, 157n135, 184n175
- Dramatico Entertainment v British Sky Broadcasting* [2012] EWHC 268, [2012] RPC 27, 180n150
- Elanco Products v Mandops (Agrochemical Specialists)* [1980] RPC 213 (CA), 22n33, 80n49
- Electronic Techniques v Critchley* [1997] FSR 401 (Ch), 175n109

xiv Table of Cases

- Express Newspapers Plc v News (UK) Ltd* [1991] FSR 36 (Ch), 261n175
- Exxon v Exxon Insurance* [1982] Ch 119 (CA), 22n34, 52n220, 78–79n37
- Fisher v Brooker and Onward Music* [2006] EWHC 3239, [2007] FSR (12) 255, 32n102, 35, 37n133, 56, 56n244, 87, 209n25
- Fisher v Brooker* [2009] UKHL 41, [2009] 1 WLR 1764, 44n172, 138n49, 183n166, 258n158, 260n173
- Football Association Premier League v Panini UK* [2004] FSR 1 (CA), 173n93
- Football Association Premier League v QC Leisure (No 2)* [2008] EWHC 1411 (Ch), 177n120
- Football League v Littlewoods Pools* [1959] Ch 637, 22n33
- Francis Day and Hunter v 20th Century Fox* [1940] AC 112 (PC), 78–79n37
- Fylde Microsystems v Key Radio Systems* [1998] FSR 449 (Ch), 26n64, 32n99, 35n119, 39n145, 40n149, 46–47n185, 52n221, 86, 113n61, 148n96, 157n137, 185
- George Hensher v Restawile Upholstery* [1976] AC 64 (HL), 51n210, 51n211
- Godfrey v Lees* [1995] EMLR 307 (Ch), 29n89, 35n116, 35n118, 46n184, 50n205, 81n53, 86n76, 87n85, 138n48, 260n173, 262n181
- Green v Broadcasting Corp New Zealand* [1989] 2 All ER 1056, 80n46, 180n146
- Griggs v Evans* [2003] EWHC 2914 (Ch), [2004] FSR 31, 192n222, 261n178
- Hadley v Kemp* [1999] EMLR 589 (Ch), 26n63, 29n89, 30n90, 32n99, 32n100, 32n101, 36n127, 37, 37n132, 38n140, 39n143, 39n148, 40, 45, 45n179, 46n184, 46–47n185, 47, 47n186, 48n191, 48n192, 52n223, 56n243, 86n76, 86n79, 121n98, 156n130, 157n136, 158n138, 182n163, 185n176, 235n22
- Hatton v Kean* (1859) 7 CB NS 268, 141 ER 819, 40n149, 40n151, 45n178, 248n104
- Hayes v Phonogram* [2002] EWHC 2062 (Ch), [2003] ECDR 11, 35n118, 42n161, 47n187
- Hollinrake v Truswell* [1894] 3 Ch 420 (CA), 52, 78–79n37
- Hughes v Paxman* [2007] RPC 2, 267n214
- Interlego v Tyco Industries* [1989] AC 217 (PC), 26n67, 79n39, 80n46, 81n51, 118n85, 217n52, 235n21
- IPC Media v Highbury-Leisure Publishing* [2004] EWHC 2985, [2005] FSR 20, 57n248, 80n46, 81n53, 84n65, 176n111
- Kelly v Cinema Houses Ltd* [1928–35] MCC 362, 172n83
- Kenrick v Lawrence* (1890) 25 QBD 99, 113n61, 119n86
- King Features Syndicate v O and M Kleeman* [1941] AC 417 (HL), 172n84
- LA Gear v Hi-Tec Sports* [1992] FSR 121 (CA), 79

- Ladbroke v William Hill* [1964] 1 WLR 273, [1964] 1 All ER 465 (HL), 22n33, 24n48, 78n36
- Lauri v Renad* [1892] 3 Ch 402, 44n170, 257, 257n154, 258n156, 258n161
- Levy v Rutley* (1871) LR 6 CP 523, (1871) 24 LT 621, 31, 31n95, 32, 32n103, 45, 45n178, 80n47, 88n86, 149n100
- L'Oréal v Bellure* [2007] EWCA Civ 968, 22n34, 25n58
- Lucasfilm v Ainsworth* [2008] EWHC 1878, [2009] FSR 103, 26n67, 51, 51n218, 171n82, 172, 173, 173n92, 174, 174n99, 175n105, 182n159, 184, 190n209
- Lucasfilm v Ainsworth* [2009] EWCA Civ 1328, [2010] Ch 503, 173n92, 173n96, 253n130, 261n177
- Lucasfilm v Ainsworth* [2011] UKSC 39, [2012] 1 AC 208, 173, 173n96, 253n130
- MacMillan v Cooper* (1924) 40 TLR 186 (PC), 81, 81n52
- MacMillan Publishers v Thomas Reed Publications* [1993] FSR 455 (Ch), 82, 89, 97n132, 243n75
- Mail Newspapers v Express Newspapers* [1987] FSR 90 (Ch), 44n170, 257n155
- Martin v Kogan* [2017] EWHC 2927 (IPEC), 25n52, 31n96, 32n99, 35n117, 36, 37n136, 38n139, 39, 39n147, 40, 42, 42n161, 47n186, 48n193, 56, 67n299, 87n81, 88, 150n103, 157n133, 182n164, 183n168
- Massine v de Basil* [1936–45] MCC 223 (CA), 261n177
- Mei Fields Designs v Saffron Cards and Gifts* [2018] EWHC 1332, 25n53
- Merchandising Corporation of America v Harpbond* [1983] FSR 32 (CA), 109n38, 172n85
- Millar v Taylor* (1769) 4 Burr 2303, 98 ER 201 (Ct of KB), 244n82
- Minder Music v Sharples* [2015] EWHC 1454, 35n119, 42n161
- Mirage Studios v Counter-Feat Clothing* [1991] FSR 145 (Ch), 172n84
- Moyyna v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions* [2003] UKHL 44, [2003] 1 WLR 1929, 57n247
- Newspaper Licensing Agency v Meltwater* [2011] EWCA 890, 23n43, 24n48, 78–79n37
- Noah v Shuba* [1991] FSR 14 (Ch), 150n105, 151n107, 155n127, 222n86, 250n118
- Norowzian v Arks (No 1)* [1998] FSR 394 (Ch), 51, 51n217, 176n114, 177n120, 181, 184
- Norowzian v Arks (No 2)* [2000] FSR 363 (CA), 160n7, 175n105, 180, 180n145, 181, 181n152, 198
- Nova Productions Limited v Mazooma Games* [2006] EWHC24, 180n147
- Nova Productions Limited v Mazooma Games* [2007] EWCA Civ 219, [2007] RPC 25, 180n147

xvi Table of Cases

- O'Neill v Paramount* [1983] CAT 235, 172n83
Powell v Head (1879) 12 Ch D 686, 44n173, 257n154, 258n161, 258n162, 259n168, 263n191
R v Higgs [2008] EWCA 1324, [2009] 1 WLR 73, 177n120
Redwood Music v Chappell (1982) RPC 109 (QB), 30–31n94, 80n48
Rexnold v Ancon [1983] FSR 245 (HC), 80n46
Robin Ray v Classic FM [1998] FSR 622 (Ch), 20n22, 29n89, 39n147, 41, 41n156, 48n196, 79n40, 86n76, 86n78, 117n82, 119n89, 148, 156n131, 157n132, 157n133, 192n222, 261n174, 261n178
Samuelson v Producers Distributing [1932] 1 Ch 201, (1932) 48 RPC 580, 55n240, 221n79
SAS Institute Inc v World Programming Ltd [2013] EWHC 69 (Ch), 26n70
SAS Institute v World Programming [2013] EWCA Civ 1482, [2014] RPC 8, 17n5, 24, 24n50, 36n126
Sandman v Panasonic [1998] FSR 651 (Ch), 175n109
Sawkins v Hyperion Records [2005] EWCA 565, [2005] 1 WLR 3281, 26n66, 50n207, 51, 81n51, 81n54, 117n80, 118n85, 121n98, 217n52, 235n21
Shelley Films v Rex Features [1994] EMLR 134, 172
Slater v Wimmer [2012] EWPC 7, 177n125, 177n126, 178, 179n135, 198, 198n262, 198n264, 199n265, 254n138, 258
Spelling Goldberg Productions v BPC Publishing [1981] RPC 283 (CA), 176, 177n120
Springfield v Thame (1903) 89 LT 242 (Ch), 31
Stuart v Barrett [1994] EMLR 448 (Ch), 35n118, 37n135, 42n161, 44n171, 48n191, 50n205, 86n79, 87n83, 87n85, 257n154, 258n157
Sweeney v Macmillan Publishers [2002] RPC 35 (Ch), 80n43, 80n44
Tate v Fullbrook [1908] 1 KB 821 (CA), 41n159, 184n175, 185n178
Tate v Thomas [1921] 1 Ch 503, 41n159, 185n178
Taylor v Maguire [2013] EWHC 3804, [2014] ECDR 4, 24n49, 25n51
Taylor v Rive Droite Music [2004] EWHC 1605, [2004] All ER 88, 79n41
Temple Island Collections v New English Teas [2012] EWPC 1, [2012] All ER 49, 24n49, 25n51, 185n181
The Reject Shop v Manners [1995] FSR 870 (DC), 79n39
Ultra Marketing v Universal Components [2004] EWHC 468, [2004] All ER 229, 80n45
University of London Press v University Tutorial Press [1916] 2 Ch 601 (Ch), 20, 22n33, 24n48, 78n36
Walter v Lane [1900] AC 539 (HL), 20n23, 20n24, 26n62, 62n271
Waterlow Directories v Reed Information Services [1992] FSR 409 (Ch), 22n33
Wiseman v George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd [1985] FSR 525 (Ch), 46–47n185, 52n222, 55n240, 149n100, 221n79

European Union

- C-203/02 *British Horseracing Board v William Hill* [2004] ECR I-10415, [2005] RPC 260, 85, 85n73
- C-444/02 *Fixtures Marketing Ltd v Organismos Prognostikon Agnon Podosfairou AE* [2004] ECR I-10549, 84n68, 84n69, 85n72
- C-545/07 *Apis-Hirstovich EOOD v Ladorka AD* [2009] ECR I-1627, 84n68
- C-5/08 *Infopaq International v Danske Dagblades Forening* [2009] ECR I-6569, 5n25, 17n5, 19, 22-25, 22n35, 22n36, 23n42, 24n47, 26n68, 36, 36n126, 39n142, 57, 57n249, 78n36, 78-79n37, 81, 81n56, 83, 83n63, 144n80, 173n93, 175, 217n52
- C-403/08 and C-429/08 *Football Association Premier League v QC Leisure* [2012] 1 CMLR 29, [2012] ECDR 8, 23n40, 24n47, 26, 26n65, 177n120, 180n149
- C-393/09 *Bezpečnostní a softwarová asociace v Ministerstvo Kultury (BSA)* [2011] ECDR 3, [2011] FSR 18, 23n39, 23n42, 24n47, 25n56, 26, 26n65
- C-145/10 *Painer v Standard Verlags* [2012] ECDR 6, 23n42, 25n51, 25n56, 27n71, 63n274, 81n56, 185n181
- C-277/10 *Luksan v Van der Let* [2013] ECDR 5, 19n15
- C-604/10 *Football Dataco v Yahoo! UK* [2012] ECDR 10, 23, 23n41, 23n42, 23n43, 24n50, 85n74
- C-310/17 *Levola Hengelo BV v Smilde Foods BV* EU:C:2018:899, 5n25, 24n47, 176n110

Australia

- Aboriginal Sacred Sites Protection Authority v Maurice; Re the Warumbingu Land Claim* [1986] FCA 90, (1986) 10 FCR 104 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 122n104
- Acohs v Ucorp* [2010] FCA 57 (Fed. Ct. of Australia); [2012] FCAFC 16 (Full Fed. Ct. of Australia), 30n90, 34n114, 100-101n1
- Aristocrat Leisure Industries v Pacific Gaming* [2000] FCA 1273 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 121n97
- Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Australian Dreamtime Creations* [2009] FCA 1545 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 122n108
- Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Nooravi* [2008] FCA 2021 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 122n108
- BP Refinery (Westernport) Pty Ltd v Hastings Shire Council* (1977) 180 CLR 266 (PC), 114n66, 261n174
- Bulun Bulun v Nejlam Investments* (unreported, Fed. Ct. of Australia, Darwin 1989), 103n12, 110n42

xviii Table of Cases

- Bulun Bulun v R & T Textiles* (1998) 86 FCR 244 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 43n165, 101, 109, 112–122, 128–130, 207, 207n19, 228, 255, 255n144
- Burge v Swarbrick* [2007] HCA 17 (High Court of Australia), 50n208
- Foster v Mountford* [1976] 29 FLR 233 (NT SC), 122n100, 122n104
- IceTV Pty Ltd v Nine Network Australia Pty Ltd* [2009] HCA 14, (2009) 239 CLR 458 (High Court of Australia), 5n23, 100–101n1, 117n83
- Kalamazoo v Compact Business Systems* (1983) 5 IPR 213 (Qld SC), 120n96
- Milpurrru v Indofurn Pty Ltd* (1994) 54 FCR 240 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 104n14, 109n35, 110–112, 111n50, 113, 116n78, 122n102, 128, 202n4
- Milwell v Olympic Amusement* (1999) 85 FCR 436 (Full Fed. Ct. of Australia), 34n114, 119n86, 121n97
- Neowarra v Western Australia* [2003] FCA 1402 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 114n63
- Primary Healthcare v Federal Commissioner of Taxation* [2010] FCA 419 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 30n90, 100–101n1
- Prior v Lansdowne Press* [1977] RPC 511, [1977] FLR 59 (Vic SC), 44n171, 149n100, 258n157, 258n161
- Sega Enterprises v Galaxy Electronics* (1996) 35 IPR 161, (1997) 37 IPR 462 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 120–121, 120n96, 121n97
- Stevens v Kabushiki Kaisha Sony Computer Entertainment* [2005] HCA 54, 224 CLR 193 (High Court of Australia), 121n97
- Telstra v Phone Directories* [2010] FCA 44 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), [2010] FCAFC 149 (Full Fed. Ct. of Australia), 2n12, 5n23, 34n114, 43n165, 82n61, 100–101n1, 117n83, 122n100
- Western Australia v Ward* [2002] HCA 28, (2002) 213 CLR 1 (High Court of Australia), 114n63
- Victoria Park Racing & Recreation Grounds Co Ltd v Taylor* [1937] HCA 45, (1937) 58 CLR 479 (High Court of Australia), 22n34
- Yumbulul v Reserve Bank of Australia* [1991] FCA 332, 21 IPR 481 (Fed. Ct. of Australia), 109n35, 110, 110n43, 112, 126n132, 129n142, 220n70, 249n111

United States

- 16 Casa Duse v Merkin* 791 F3d 247 (2d Cir, 2015), 64n282, 66, 66n294, 190–191, 191n215
- Aalmuhammed v Lee* 202 F3d 1227 (9th Cir, 2000), 5n23, 34n111, 45n175, 64n280, 64n282, 65, 65n290, 187–191, 198, 199, 199n265, 262n189
- Bridgeman Art Library v Corel* 36 F Supp 2d 191 (SDNY, 1999), 117n80

Table of Cases

xix

- Carter v Bailey* 64 Me 458 (SC of Maine, 1874), 34n111, 262n184, 262n188, 263n190
Childress v Taylor 945 F2d 500 (US CA 2nd Cir, 1991), 32–33n104, 33n109, 38n138, 64n282
Chou v University of Chicago 254 F3d 1347 (Fed Cir, 2001), 143n77, 150n105
Erickson v Trinity Theatre 13 F3d 1061 (7th Cir, 1994), 38n138, 64n282
Feist Publications Inc v Rural Telephone Service (1991) 499 US 340 (USSC), 144n80
Gaiman v McFarlane 360 F3d 644 (7th Cir, 2004), 38n138, 65n292
Garcia v Google 743 F3d 1258 (9th Cir, 2014), 786 F3d 733 (9th Cir, 2015), 5n23, 117n82, 189–191, 189n198, 191n214, 192n220, 198
Jacobsen v Katzer 535 F 3d 1373 (US CA Fed Cir, 2008), 91–92
Johnson v Schmitz 119 FSupp 2d 90 (D Conn, 2000), 143n77, 150n105
Nichols v Universal Pictures 45 F2d 119 (2nd Cir, 1930), 172n83
Pullman-Standard v Swint (1982) 456 US 273 (USSC), 53n229
Thomson v Larson 147 F3d 195 (2d Cir, 1998), 33n110, 34n111, 38n138, 65
Weissmann v Freeman 684 FSupp 1248 (SDNY, 1988), 868 F2d 1313 (2nd Cir, 1989), 151–153, 154n126, 155, 155n127, 209, 222n86

Other Jurisdictions

- Carlos RL v Javier AA and Maria Cruz DA* [2002] ECDR 23 (Madrid CA 12th Section, Spain), 149n101
 Case II CSK 527/10, 22 June 2010 (Polish SC), 255n141
Elisha Qimron v Hershel Shanks [1993] 7 EIPR D-157 (Israeli SC), 81n54
Fabrikant c. Swamy (2011) QCCS 1385 (Superior Court of Quebec, Canada), 151n107
Heptulla v Orient Longman [1989] 1 FSR 598 (Indian High Court), 40n151, 41n158, 50n205, 157n135
Land Transport Safety Authority of New Zealand v Glogau [1999] 1 NZLR 261 (Wellington CA, New Zealand), 34n114
Neudorf (Darryl) v Nettwerk Productions [2000] RPC 935 (British Columbia SC, Canada), 32–33n104

Table of Statutes

UK

Copyright Act 1911, 100, 170, 170n71, 185
 Copyright Act 1956, 27, 30, 30n92, 30–31n94, 100–101n1, 170, 170n73, 170n75, 171n80, 180n143, 183n167
 Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988, 2n11, 9, 13, 14, 15–19, 24n47, 25n57, 26, 26n70, 27–29, 42, 44, 48, 49n197, 49n202, 51, 51n216, 52, 54, 55, 61n261, 62, 63n276, 70, 73, 78, 84, 84n68, 85n70, 86, 86n76, 89, 92, 96, 100, 100–101n1, 148, 159, 160, 164, 169, 170, 172n87, 173, 173n93, 175, 175n109, 179, 181, 185n176, 186, 197, 204n12, 207n20, 208, 211, 217, 218, 221, 223, 228, 238n43, 240, 247, 248, 251, 254, 257–259, 259n167, 266, 267n214, 268n221, 269, 271, 272n231
 Dramatic Copyright Act 1833, 41n159, 170n71, 185n178
 Fine Arts Copyright Act 1862, 170n71
 Interpretation Act 1978, 259n167
 Law of Property Act 1925, 264n202, 265n203, 265n204
 Patents Act 1977, 259n165, 267n214
 Trustee Act 1925, 264n202, 265n205
 Trustee Act 2000, 265n205
 Trusts of Land and Trustees Appointment Act 1997, 265n205

Europe

92/100/EEC Rental and Related Rights Directive 1992, 19n15, 27n76, 176n113
 93/98/EEC Term Directive 1993, 19n15, 23n38, 27n76, 170n76, 176n113, 179n141
 96/9/EC Database Directive 1996, 19n15, 23n38, 25n57, 84, 84n66, 85n70
 2001/29/EC Information Society Directive 2001, 22, 24n50
 2009/24/EC Computer Programs Directive 2009, 19n15

Australia

Competition and Consumer Amendment (Exploitation of Indigenous Culture) Bill 2017 (Cth), 123
 Copyright Amendment (Indigenous Communal Moral Rights) Bill (Draft) 2003 (Cth), 108n30, 123, 123n110
 Copyright Act 1968 (Cth), 100, 111n51, 113, 117n83, 119
 Native Title Act 1993 (Cth), 112n57, 113n62
 Resale Royalty Right for Visual Artists Act 2009 (Cth), 123n109
 Trade Marks Act 1995 (Cth), 124n117

Other Jurisdictions

Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights 1994, 18n13
 Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works of 9 September 1886, 18, 18n11, 18n12, 23, 26n70, 28n81, 181, 272
 Copyright Act 1976 (US) (United States Code, Title 17), 28n82, 30n93, 33, 63n276, 65n283, 88n91, 189n199, 190n206, 262n185, 263n192
 Pacific Model Law (Model for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture 2002), 127n139