



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

Copyright 2019

5th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into copyright law

Published by Global Legal Group, in association with Bird & Bird LLP

With contributions from:

Acapo AS	LexOrbis
Advance Partners	Liad Whatstein & Co.
Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune	Løje, Arnesen & Meedom
ARENAIRE	LPS L@w
Bereskin & Parr LLP	MinterEllison
Bird & Bird LLP	Paradigma – Law & Strategy
Daniel Legal & IP Strategy	Patent & Law Firm YUS, LLC
De Beer Attorneys Inc.	PÉREZ CORREA & ASOCIADOS, S.C.
Deep & Far Attorneys-at-Law	S. P. A. Ajibade & Co.
Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu, P.C.	Seow & Associates
Grupo Gispert	SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan
Güzeldere & Balkan Law Firm	Synch Advokat AB
Hamdan AlShamsi Lawyers & Legal Consultants	Wenger Plattner
JIPYONG LLC	ZY Partners
Klinkert Rechtsanwälte PartGmbB	



global legal group

Contributing Editor

Phil Sherrell, Bird & Bird LLP

Sales Director

Florjan Osmani

Account Director

Oliver Smith

Sales Support Manager

Toni Hayward

Sub Editor

Amy Norton

Senior Editors

Suzie Levy
Caroline Collingwood

CEO

Dror Levy

Group Consulting Editor

Alan Falach

Publisher

Rory Smith

Published by

Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glggroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design

F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source

iStockphoto

Printed by

Stephens & George
Print Group
October 2018

Copyright © 2018
Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-912509-37-9
ISSN 2056-4333

Strategic Partners



General Chapter:

1	Brexit and Copyright: More Questions than Answers? – Phil Sherrell & Will Smith, Bird & Bird LLP	1
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

2	Australia	MinterEllison: John Fairbairn & Katherine Giles	7
3	Brazil	Daniel Legal & IP Strategy: Antonio Curvello & Hannah Vitória M. Fernandes	14
4	Canada	Bereskin & Parr LLP: Jill Jarvis-Tonus	20
5	China	ZY Partners: Zhou Qiang & Fu Mingyang	26
6	Denmark	Løje, Arnesen & Meedom: Tanya Meedom & Susie P. Arnesen	33
7	France	ARENAIRE: Pierre Massot & Mythili Thaya	39
8	Germany	Klinkert Rechtsanwälte PartGmbH: Piet Bubenzer & Dr. David Jahn	44
9	India	LexOrbis: Dheeraj Kapoor & Aprajita Nigam	50
10	Israel	Liad Whatstein & Co.: Liad Whatstein & Uri Fruchtman	57
11	Italy	Paradigma – Law & Strategy: Massimo Donna & Francesco Tripaldi	63
12	Japan	Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune: Masayuki Yamanouchi & Yuri Fukui	68
13	Korea	JIPYONG LLC: Seung Soo Choi & Seungmin Jasmine Jung	74
14	Malaysia	Seow & Associates: Cheong Shih Wen & Joel Prashant	79
15	Mexico	PÉREZ CORREA & ASOCIADOS, S.C.: Israel Pérez Correa & Hugo H. Zapata	87
16	Nigeria	S. P. A. Ajibade & Co.: John C. Onyido & Yetunde Okojie	93
17	Norway	Acapo AS: Magnus Thomassen & Espen Clausen	99
18	Philippines	SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan: Enrique T. Manuel & Vida M. Panganiban-Alindogan	103
19	Russia	Patent & Law Firm YUS, LLC: Maria Lovtsova & Nikolay Medvedev	111
20	Senegal	LPS L@w: Léon Patrice Sarr & Bocar Balde	117
21	South Africa	De Beer Attorneys Inc.: Jacques Stemmet & Abduraouph Kamaar	122
22	Spain	Grupo Gispert: Sönke Lund & Eric Jordi	128
23	Sweden	Synch Advokat AB: My Byström & Sara Sparring	134
24	Switzerland	Wenger Plattner: Melanie Müller & Yannick Hostettler	139
25	Taiwan	Deep & Far Attorneys-at-Law: Yu-Li Tsai & Lu-Fa Tsai	144
26	Turkey	Güzeldere & Balkan Law Firm: Altuğ Güzeldere & Erdem Balkan	150
27	Ukraine	Advance Partners: Oleg Zhukhevych & Elena Biloshuk	160
28	United Arab Emirates	Hamdan AlShamsi Lawyers & Legal Consultants: Hamdan AlShamsi & Omar Kamel	166
29	United Kingdom	Bird & Bird LLP: Rebecca O'Kelly-Gillard & Phil Sherrell	170
30	USA	Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu, P.C.: David Donahue & Jason D. Jones	176

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice.

Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication.

This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

United Kingdom

Rebecca O'Kelly-Gillard



Bird & Bird LLP

Phil Sherrell



1 Copyright Subsistence

1.1 What are the requirements for copyright to subsist in a work?

For copyright to subsist:

- literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works must comply with the criterion of originality, i.e. the work must originate from its author and must not be copied from another work. This does not mean that the work must be the expression of original or inventive thought; the originality required relates to the expression of the thought and is not a subjective test regarding the 'artistic' originality or novelty. The standard of originality is low and depends on the author having created the work through his own skill, judgment and individual effort, and not having copied from other works;
- the work must be fixed, i.e. recorded in writing or in some other material form; and
- the work must meet UK qualification requirements, either through the nationality of its author or through its place of first publication.

1.2 On the presumption that copyright can arise in literary, artistic and musical works, are there any other works in which copyright can subsist and are there any works which are excluded from copyright protection?

Copyright can also subsist in the following works: dramatic (e.g. plays, dance); typographical arrangements of published editions (e.g. magazines, periodicals); sound recordings (which may be recordings of other copyright works, e.g. musical and literary); films; and broadcasts.

Computer programs are protected as literary works. However, copyright protects the expression of an idea, not the idea itself; therefore, certain forms may not carry copyright protection, e.g. the functionality, programming language and interfaces (such as data file formats) of computer programs are not protected by copyright to the extent that they are not contained in the software's source code (which is the written expression in which copyright can subsist).

1.3 Is there a system for registration of copyright and if so what is the effect of registration?

No, copyright subsists automatically.

1.4 What is the duration of copyright protection? Does this vary depending on the type of work?

In general, the terms of protection in the UK are as follows:

- Copyright in a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work lasts for the life of the author plus 70 years from the end of the calendar year in which the author dies.
- Copyright in computer-generated literary, dramatic, musical or artistic works lasts 50 years from the end of the calendar year in which the work was made.
- Copyright in a film expires 70 years after the end of the calendar year in which the death occurs of the last to survive of the principal director, the authors of the screenplay and dialogue, and the composer of any music specifically created for the film.
- Copyright in a sound recording expires 50 years from the end of the calendar year in which the recording is made; or if, during that period, the recording is published, 70 years from the end of the calendar year in which it was first published; or if, during that period, the recording is not published but is played or communicated in public, 70 years from the end of the calendar year in which it was first so made available.
- Copyright in a broadcast expires 50 years from the end of the calendar year in which the broadcast was made.
- Copyright in the typographical arrangement of a published edition expires at the end of the period of 25 years from the end of the calendar year in which the edition was first published.

1.5 Is there any overlap between copyright and other intellectual property rights such as design rights and database rights?

Some works are also covered by other intellectual property rights in addition to copyright: e.g. 3-D and other designs can be protected by design rights; a database may be protected by the *sui generis* database right (this is intended to protect and reward investment in the creation and arrangement of databases); and a logo can also potentially be protected by a trade mark.

1.6 Are there any restrictions on the protection for copyright works which are made by an industrial process?

No. Until recently in the UK, where articles embodying a copyright work were made with the copyright owner's consent by means of an

industrial process, and had been marketed, the work could be copied without infringing copyright in the work 25 years after those articles were first marketed. A work is regarded as made by an industrial process if it is one of more than 50 articles made as copies of a work (this can include miniature replicas of a work). New legislation in 2016 repealed this provision in the UK with effect from 28 July 2016 so that all artistic works, whether or not made by an industrial process, now benefit from copyright protection for the life of the author plus 70 years. In addition, the transitional period ended on 28 January 2017, after which date any work created in reliance on the old section, and which does not fall within an exception to copyright law, must be destroyed or authorised by the rightsholder.

2 Ownership

2.1 Who is the first owner of copyright in each of the works protected (other than where questions 2.2 or 2.3 apply)?

The author, i.e. the person who creates the work, is usually the first owner of copyright in that work. The presumption is that the author will be:

- the person who creates a work for literary, dramatic, musical or artistic works;
- the producer of a sound recording;
- the producer and the principal director of a film;
- the publisher of a published edition;
- the person making a broadcast or effecting a retransmission of a broadcast;
- the publisher of a typographical arrangement; and
- the person making the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work for computer-generated works.

However, this may be amended by agreement. For example, it is possible for someone who would ordinarily be deemed to be the copyright owner to assign the benefit of future copyright, even prior to that work having been created.

2.2 Where a work is commissioned, how is ownership of the copyright determined between the author and the commissioner?

Copyright will belong to the author of the work (i.e. the person commissioned), unless there is an agreement to the contrary assigning the copyright and which is signed by the commissioned party, e.g. in a services contract. However, where a work has been commissioned and there is no express assignment of the copyright to the commissioner or licence to the commissioner to use the work, the courts have often been willing to imply a contractual term that copyright should be licensed to the commissioner for the use that was envisaged when the work was commissioned. Occasionally, the court will even assign the copyright to the commissioner. The extent of any implied licence will depend on the facts of any given case, but generally the licence will only be that necessary to meet the needs of the commissioner.

2.3 Where a work is created by an employee, how is ownership of the copyright determined between the employee and the employer?

If a work is produced as part of an employee's employment, the first owner will automatically be the company that employs the individual who created the work, unless the employee and employer

agree otherwise in writing. No further formalities are required and the employee has no rights to subsequent compensation.

2.4 Is there a concept of joint ownership and, if so, what rules apply to dealings with a jointly owned work?

Yes. A work will be of joint authorship if it is produced by the collaboration of two or more authors in which the contribution of each author is not distinct from that of the other author or authors. If the contribution is distinct then separate copyrights will subsist in each author's respective parts of the work.

A joint author will have individual rights that they can assign independently of the other author or authors. However, a joint owner cannot grant a licence which is binding on the other co-owners, nor can a joint owner grant an exclusive licence.

3 Exploitation

3.1 Are there any formalities which apply to the transfer/assignment of ownership?

Copyright is transmissible by assignment, by testamentary disposition or by operation of law, as personal or movable property.

The only formal requirements for an assignment of copyright are that it is in writing and signed by or on behalf of the assignor. The terms of the assignment (and how they are expressed) are entirely at the discretion of the contracting parties.

An assignment or other transfer of copyright may be partial, that is, limited so as to apply to one or more, but not all, of the acts the copyright owner has the exclusive right to do; and can be in relation to part or the whole of the period for which the copyright is to subsist.

3.2 Are there any formalities required for a copyright licence?

Unlike an assignment, a licence of copyright need not be in writing nor comply with particular formalities and may, therefore, be oral or implied. However, in order to obtain the statutory rights of an exclusive licensee, e.g. the right to sue third party infringers, an exclusive licence must be recorded in writing signed by or on behalf of the licensor. If an exclusive licence is not in writing, the licensee will only have a contractual right to use the copyright, not to enforce it.

3.3 Are there any laws which limit the licence terms parties may agree (other than as addressed in questions 3.4 to 3.6)?

Please see the answers to questions 2.4 and 4.2.

3.4 Which types of copyright work have collective licensing bodies (please name the relevant bodies)?

There are numerous collecting societies in existence in the UK, including:

- the Performing Rights Society (PRS), which administers the public performance rights (including in relation to broadcasts, streaming services, and non-theatrical performances) of authors, composers and music publishers in musical works;
- the Mechanical-Copyright Protection Society (MCPS), which administers the reproduction rights (e.g. in relation

- to CDs, digital downloads and musical toys) of songwriters, composers and music publishers (PRS and MCPS operate jointly as PRS for Music);
- Phonographic Performance Ltd (PPL), which administers the public performance rights of producers in sound recordings;
 - NLA Media Access (formerly the Newspaper Licensing Agency), which administers the reproduction rights of newspaper and some magazine publishers in articles;
 - the Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA), which administers the reproduction rights of authors and publishers in literary and artistic works;
 - the Authors' Licensing and Collecting Society (ALCS), which administers various rights of authors in literary and dramatic works; and
 - the Design and Artists Copyright Society (DACS) and the Artists' Collecting Society (ACS), which administer rights in artistic works (including resale rights).

3.5 Where there are collective licensing bodies, how are they regulated?

Collecting societies are regulated by the Collective Management of Copyright (EU Directive) Regulations 2016. They are also subject to the supervision of the Copyright Tribunal in relation to licensing terms.

3.6 On what grounds can licence terms offered by a collective licensing body be challenged?

A reference in respect of the terms of a *proposed* licensing scheme may be made to the Copyright Tribunal by an organisation claiming to be representative of persons who claim that they require licences under the proposed scheme. A licensee may also refer to the Copyright Tribunal the terms on which a licensing body proposes to grant a licence to it. A reference to the Copyright Tribunal in respect of the terms of an *existing* licence scheme may be brought by a person claiming that he requires a licence under it, or an organisation claiming to be representative of such persons.

The primary grounds of challenge which the Copyright Tribunal can consider are that the terms are unreasonable or discriminate unfairly between licensees.

In addition, a person can make an application to the Copyright Tribunal where an operator of a scheme has unreasonably refused to grant a licence under that scheme.

In addition to copyright claims, the Collective Management of Copyright (EU Directive) Regulations 2016 require copyright licensing bodies to make available alternative dispute resolution procedures in relation to any breach of the Regulations, except in relation to tariffs.

4 Owners' Rights

4.1 What acts involving a copyright work are capable of being restricted by the rights holder?

Copyright holders have the exclusive right to do or authorise the following:

- copying the work;
- issuing copies of the work to the public;
- renting or lending the work to the public;
- performing, showing or playing the work in public;
- communicating the work to the public; and
- adapting the work.

The copyright owner can restrict these acts in relation to the whole or any substantial part of the work.

The courts have shown that they are willing to find intermediary service providers (ISPs) liable for primary copyright infringement where they have infringed the exclusive right of copyright owners to authorise any of the above acts, most notably where ISPs have authorised the copying of works or making them available to the public.

The courts have also shown a willingness to use common law principles to protect the rights of copyright owners. For example:

- parties have been found to infringe copyright where they act in a common design with each other to induce others to do any of the above infringing acts; and
- recent case law has also found that where website operators or service providers provide the key means by which copyright can be infringed, and they know or intend for their service to be used for that purpose, they can be held to be joint tortfeasors with those who actually perform the infringing act.

4.2 Are there any ancillary rights related to copyright, such as moral rights, and if so what do they protect, and can they be waived or assigned?

There are a number of ancillary rights associated with the creation of copyright works, the most common of which are:

- Moral rights: the author or director of a copyright work usually has moral rights in relation to the work. These are the rights to: i) be identified as the work's author or director; ii) object to derogatory treatment of the work; iii) privacy in respect of certain photographs and films; and iv) not have the work's authorship wrongly attributed. These rights may be waived by the author or director but not assigned. The first three rights have the same duration as copyright, but the right to object to false attribution lasts for the author's or director's lifetime plus 20 years.
- Performers' rights: performers have various rights in their performances, as well as in the recordings or broadcasts of their performances.
- Publication right: the publication right grants rights equivalent to copyright to a person who publishes for the first time a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work, or a film in which copyright has expired.

4.3 Are there circumstances in which a copyright owner is unable to restrain subsequent dealings in works which have been put on the market with his consent?

The doctrine of exhaustion of rights provides that once copies of a copyright work are issued to the public in one EEA Member State with the owner's consent, the owner cannot object to their circulation anywhere else within the EEA. The courts have held that the principle does not apply to subsequent/back-up copies of digital works. In those cases it appears that the copyright owner's rights would only be exhausted in relation to the original digital version placed on the market.

5 Copyright Enforcement

5.1 Are there any statutory enforcement agencies and, if so, are they used by rights holders as an alternative to civil actions?

HMRC is the UK customs authority responsible for national policy governing IP rights enforcement at the UK external border. In certain

circumstances, HMRC (and Border Force, the law enforcement command within the Home Office responsible for carrying out the frontier interventions that implement this policy) are empowered to detain goods that may infringe intellectual property rights such as copyright. There are two regimes in existence, one governed by European Regulations and the other by purely domestic legislation. The two regimes, which are mutually exclusive, are as follows:

- Regulation (EU) No 608/2013 (in force in the UK since 1 January 2014), which regulates pirated goods infringing copyright; and
- Section 111 of CDPA 1988, which permits the owner of copyright in certain types of works to lodge a notice with HMRC stating their ownership of copyright in a work and requesting infringing copies to be treated as prohibited goods.

Trading Standards officers in the UK are also under a statutory duty to enforce copyright and have the powers, among others, to make test purchases of infringing goods, to enter premises and to inspect and seize goods and documents which infringe.

The City of London Police and the UK Intellectual Property Office have also set up the Police Intellectual Property Crime Unit (PIPCU) to tackle serious and organised intellectual property crime (counterfeit and piracy) affecting physical and digital goods (with the exception of pharmaceutical goods). PIPCU's focus is on offences committed online. PIPCU is an independent, national enforcement unit designed to protect and enforce existing rights.

5.2 Other than the copyright owner, can anyone else bring a claim for infringement of the copyright in a work?

Yes, an exclusive licensee has the same rights and remedies, in respect of matters that occur after the exclusive licence was granted, as if the licence had been an assignment. This statutory position can be modified by contract.

A non-exclusive licensee can also bring a claim for infringement, although only in limited circumstances; specifically, if the infringement is directly connected to an act which the licensee had been licensed to carry out under the licence, and the licence is in writing, signed by the copyright owner, and expressly grants the non-exclusive licensee a right of action.

5.3 Can an action be brought against 'secondary' infringers as well as primary infringers and, if so, on what basis can someone be liable for secondary infringement?

Yes, a person will be liable for secondary infringement of copyright if they do or authorise any of the following:

- import an infringing copy;
- possess or deal with an infringing copy;
- provide means for making infringing copies;
- permit the use of premises for an infringing performance; and
- provide apparatus for an infringing performance.

To be liable for secondary acts of infringement, the secondary infringer must have some actual or imputed knowledge of the primary infringement of the copyright work.

5.4 Are there any general or specific exceptions which can be relied upon as a defence to a claim of infringement?

A number of provisions of the CDPA permit various activities which would otherwise be infringements of copyright in literary, dramatic or musical works.

The most common exceptions relate to:

- temporary copies technically required to enable a lawful use;
- fair dealing, including the use of copyright works for the purpose of:
 - news reporting;
 - parody, caricature or pastiche; and
 - quotation;
- incidental inclusion;
- educational use;
- use in libraries,
- archives and public administration;
- works permanently situated in public places;
- the making of digital copies by various institutions;
- text and data mining;
- making copies accessible to disabled people;
- further exceptions for the purpose of research or private study;
- public interest; and
- copying for the visually impaired.

There is currently no private copying exception under UK law.

5.5 Are interim or permanent injunctions available?

Yes, both interim and permanent injunctions are available, as are "site-blocking injunctions" (orders against ISPs to prevent access to websites held to infringe copyright).

5.6 On what basis are damages or an account of profits calculated?

Damages are calculated so as to put the claimant in the position it would have been in if the infringing act had not occurred. This is often based on what would have been a reasonable licence fee had the copyright owner entered into an arm's length licence with the party found to infringe the copyright. An account of profits is calculated so as to make the defendant forfeit to the copyright owner the profits made as a result of the infringing act. A successful claimant must elect one of the two remedies. In the event that the infringement has been particularly flagrant, the copyright owner will be able to claim punitive damages in addition to the basic amount.

5.7 What are the typical costs of infringement proceedings and how long do they take?

The traditional forum for IP litigation at first instance in the UK is the High Court. Costs can vary from £250,000–£1 million per side (depending on the complexity of the claims at issue) to take an action to trial, and the winner can usually expect to recover about two thirds of its actual costs from the loser. The typical time for a case to be heard at the High Court is about 12–15 months, and with an appeal within a further 12–18 months.

Infringement proceedings can also be brought in the Intellectual Property and Enterprise Court ("IPEC") in which court procedures are simplified to make the cost of actions significantly lower: recent experience has shown that typical costs are of the order of £75,000–£200,000 per side, although costs recovery by the winner is limited to a maximum of £50,000. The typical time for a case to be heard is 8–12 months in the IPEC.

5.8 Is there a right of appeal from a first instance judgment and if so what are the grounds on which an appeal may be brought?

Yes, the appeal court will allow an appeal where the decision of the lower court was one of the below:

- Wrong (which is presumed to mean: an error of law; an error of fact; or an error in the exercise of the court's discretion).
- Unjust, because of a serious procedural or other irregularity in the proceedings in the lower court.

5.9 What is the period in which an action must be commenced?

The limitation period for bringing a copyright infringement claim in the UK is six years from the date when the cause of action arose.

6 Criminal Offences

6.1 Are there any criminal offences relating to copyright infringement?

There are various criminal offences in respect of copyright infringement, including:

- making an infringing article for sale or hire;
- importing an infringing article into the UK other than for private and domestic use;
- possessing an infringing article in the course of business with a view to committing any act infringing copyright;
- selling, letting for hire, offering/exposing for sale or hire, exhibiting in public, or distributing an infringing article in the course of business;
- distributing an infringing article not in the course of business but to such an extent as to prejudice the copyright owner; for example, a large number of infringing copies are given away for free, therefore affecting the copyright owner's revenue;
- making/possessing an article specifically designed for making copies of a copyright work;
- communicating a work to the public in the course of a business or in such a way as to prejudicially affect the copyright owner;
- causing an infringing public performance of a literary, dramatic or musical work;
- causing an infringing public showing of a sound recording or film; and
- circumventing technological measures, removing or altering electronic rights management information, or dealing in devices meant for that purpose.

6.2 What is the threshold for criminal liability and what are the potential sanctions?

Infringements carried out with knowledge and intent for a commercial purpose can attract criminal liability; there is no

criminal liability where a protected work is copied but not made available for commercial sale or hire.

Criminal remedies apply in parallel with civil remedies, and offences carry varying levels of possible punishment including fines and/or imprisonment with, in certain cases, a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years. Criminal sanctions for online copyright infringement have recently been brought in line with those for physical infringement (i.e. to increase the sanction from a maximum two-year imprisonment to a maximum of 10 years' imprisonment).

7 Current Developments

7.1 Have there been, or are there anticipated, any significant legislative changes or case law developments?

The text of the new European Copyright Directive continues to be negotiated, particularly with regard to the issues of a new press publishers' right and the proposal set out in Article 13 regarding the so-called "value gap". In light of the ongoing delays in relation to the Directive's approval, it is becoming increasingly unlikely that the date by which the Directive will need to be implemented will happen before the date the UK will leave the European Union. If the Directive is not required to be implemented prior to Brexit, it will be for UK legislature to determine what elements, if any, of the Copyright Directive will be transposed into English law.

There has also been a recent development in blocking injunction case law in England. The Supreme Court decision in *Cartier International v BT & Another* [2018] UKSC 28 found that rightsholders (in that case, trade mark owners), not ISPs, must bear the cost of the implementation of blocking injunctions that they request ISPs to impose. This may have a consequential effect on blocking injunctions sought by copyright owners if the same reasoning is applied to them. A possible effect, if this approach is taken, is that the cost a copyright owner may have to bear for the implementation of a blocking injunction could be disproportionate to the value of the injunction.

7.2 Are there any particularly noteworthy issues around the application and enforcement of copyright in relation to digital content (for example, when a work is deemed to be made available to the public online, hyperlinking, etc.)?

European case law continues to evolve in this regard, most recently with the CJEU decision in *Renckhoff C-161/17* in which the CJEU found that the publication on a website without the authorisation of the copyright holder of a work, which was previously communicated on another website with the holder's consent, should be treated as making such a work available to a new public, and thereby an unauthorised communication of that work to the public. It will be interesting to see whether the CJEU's current line of reasoning (which continues to favour copyright owners) will be followed by the English courts after the UK leaves the EU.

**Rebecca O'Kelly-Gillard**

Bird & Bird LLP
12 New Fetter Lane
London, EC4A 1JP
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 7415 6000
Email: rebecca.okelly@twobirds.com
URL: www.twobirds.com

Rebecca is a senior associate in Bird & Bird's Intellectual Property department. She was admitted to the New York Bar in 2005, qualified as an Irish solicitor in 2007 and was admitted to the roll of solicitors of England and Wales in October 2012.

Rebecca has represented major ISPs in litigation brought by the recorded music industry relating to peer-2-peer music downloading and the blocking of Pirate Bay websites. Rebecca has also worked extensively with customs authorities in relation to counterfeit goods on behalf of numerous global media, clothing, automotive, and food & drink organisations. As a result of this work, Rebecca was invited to be the Irish liaison between rightsholders and international customs authorities in the initial phase of the World Customs Organisations' innovative Interface Public-Members Tool project. More recently, Rebecca has acted in numerous actions involving copyright infringement relating to broadcasting sports events in pubs around the UK and in relation to infringing activity online.

**Phil Sherrell**

Bird & Bird LLP
12 New Fetter Lane
London, EC4A 1JP
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 7415 6000
Email: phil.sherrell@twobirds.com
URL: www.twobirds.com

Phil is a partner at Bird & Bird specialising in IP/media litigation, and heads the firm's Media, Entertainment & Sports sector. He has a particular focus on copyright work.

Phil has handled several Copyright Tribunal cases in relation to the licensing of music and newspaper content, including representing the media monitoring industry in the well-known Meltwater dispute. He also advises a wide range of clients on other copyright law related issues, including content owners and licensees in the music, publishing, broadcast and advertising industries.

Phil is ranked as a leading individual for Media & Entertainment in the most recent *The Legal 500* UK guide.

Bird & Bird

Over the last century we've been lucky enough to have played a part in protecting some of the world's most ground-breaking inventions and forward-thinking brands, and we're pretty confident we're one of the most ambitious, energetic, dedicated groups of intellectual property professionals you're likely to meet.

We thrive on helping clients with creative and cost-effective ways to improve or protect their intellectual property position internationally, and our future-facing copyright team are digital experts: tech-savvy; regulation-aware; and a step ahead of current trends.

We continue to top the rankings in the legal market and this first-class reputation allows us to attract world-leading IP advisors and litigators, and by working with us you will be able to draw upon their formidable experience in this field.

Not only do we have the range and depth of expertise, but with more than 300 specialist lawyers across 28 offices, we have numbers in force.

Other titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Anti-Money Laundering
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Cybersecurity
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Fintech
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Investor-State Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Investment Funds
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks
- Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms



59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk