



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

DIGITAL DISRUPTION AND COPYRIGHT GOVERNANCE: EVALUATING INDIA'S LEGAL FRAMEWORK

AUTHORED BY - ROHIT RANJANI

6th Semester, LL. B, Amity University, Lucknow

Abstract

The term "intellectual property" refers to works of art that are the result of human intelligence and creativity and that provide their creator the right to profit and recognition. Copyright is a type of intellectual property that restricts the reproduction of works while encouraging creativity and innovation. Furthermore, it grants intellectual property rights to people, companies, and organizations—such as broadcasters or entertainers—who display their work in the public sphere. However, in the quickly changing digital landscape, the current legislative structure for copyright protection seems insufficient. Thanks to developments in networking and multimedia technologies, there are now more chances for those who create digital material. However, the simplicity with which a piece of digital property can be replicated exactly encourages misuse, unlawful distribution, plagiarism, and misappropriation—all of which result in copyright infringement. Additionally, Internet pirates frequently violate the legal rights of copyright owners by transferring digital content that is protected by copyright illegally using popular peer-to-peer software. The report looks at a number of difficulties that the Indian copyright legal system will face in the future. It also looks at concepts like "fair use" and privacy, which are commonly used in digital settings to strike a balance between user rights and copyright holders' exclusive rights. The study ends with a comparative analysis of new digital developments and their effects on legal frameworks and society in order to address the concerns brought up by the substantive decisions. By assessing how efficient copyright governance supports justice in the digital era and fortifies legal institutions, the study advances SDG 16. By emphasizing the significance of intellectual property protection in promoting innovation and the expansion of India's digital economy, it further promotes SDG 9.

Keywords: *Copyright infringement, fair use, piracy, Internet Service Providers, author, and moral right.*

Introduction

Thanks to the efforts of numerous national and international stakeholders, the field of intellectual property has expanded. In the 1970s, developing nations advocated for the recognition of intellectual property rights as an economic concern within international trade negotiations under the framework of the World Trade Organization (WTO). From Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPs) to Indian laws and legislation since 2005, India has taken additional steps to safeguard its economy, culture, and legacy.

According to the Indian Copyright Act 1957², creators of "*literary work, dramatic, musical, artistic works, cinematographic films, and sound recordings*" have legal protection for copyright. "*There can be no liberty unless there is economic liberty.*"³ For art to be produced, evaluated, and sold, the artist must have freedom and protection over their work. There are statutory gaps within the copyright system that fail to adequately address emerging and unforeseen forms of creation.

According to R Anthony Reese, "*the gatekeepers for copyrightability are the articulations of copyrightable subject matter and of the conditions for protection.*"⁴ The number of creations that are protected by copyright will increase with the size of the gate. In line with the advancement of technology, there are on-going issues in the copyright legal system pertaining to the protection and extent of copyright owners' rights and interests as well as those of society at large.

The framework of copyright law that is currently widespread in Indian laws is examined in this study, including statutes that regulate and overlap copyrighted works, designs, expressions, counterfeit items, etc. It further examines contemporary forms of copyright infringement and emerging trends in copyrightability. It further highlights the emerging challenges and weaknesses in the copyright system from the perspectives of both the author and the alleged infringer. The article concludes with suggestions and cutting-edge methods for extensive preservation coverage under the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) umbrella.

Laws for Protection of Copyright: Indian & International Approach

—If a creative person steals your idea, he's killing his creative ability, if he steals your art, he's killing his art, if he makes it available to the world, it won't create the impact you could have created, because it wasn't from the right source— Michael Bassey Johnson

Intellectual property arises from an individual's creative process, involving the application of skill, labour, and intellect to produce an intangible work. Self-created property rights, or intellectual property rights, have been acknowledged since antiquity. Copyright is a right against society as well as a personal one. The law recognizes copyright as a negative right that protects the author of the work from unapproved duplication or exploitation. Copyright law exists to protect the creativity and hard work of authors, artists, musicians, filmmakers, software developers, and other creators. It gives them legal control over how their work is used, copied, shared, or commercially exploited.

Three rights are granted to the author of the work: —usus, abusus, and fructus⁵,|| The latter two relate to the author's ability to "freely authorize others by contract to exploit his works by assigning or licensing his rights (abusus) to them," subject to payment of compensation (i.e., fructus).

Indian jurisprudence has historically reflected a cultural respect for knowledge dissemination, as seen in ancient philosophical traditions. Ancient Indian philosophical traditions emphasized the ethical dissemination of knowledge through concepts such as *Vidya Daan*, or the dissemination and exchange of knowledge, was a crucial virtue⁶. The Bhagavad Gita holds that the production of intellectual property, along with its destruction and transmission, is the highest virtue. According to the Gita, creating property is vital, but it's also your responsibility to avoid feeling or wanting to own it⁷.

The Copyright Act gives the author the commercial right to make translations of the work and to reproduce, issue copies, perform, or disseminate cinematographic film or sound recording, as well as any adaptations of the work to the public. The idea of protecting creative work through copyright law may appear modern, but its philosophical foundation can be traced back to ancient Indian wisdom, particularly the Bhagavad Gita and the concept of *Vidya Daan* (the gift of knowledge). Indian and international copyright frameworks attempt to balance two equally important values—respect for the creator's effort and the free flow of knowledge for societal welfare, both of which find deep resonance in Indian philosophy. Additionally, Sections 479 to 489 of the Indian Penal Code address offences relating to counterfeiting and fraudulent marks. Additionally, the Design Act of 2000⁸, protects additional provisions related to the protection of designs that incorporate color, shape, size of products, etc., also known as special copyright. In India, there are both civil and criminal regulations pertaining to

copyright protection.

For example, Section 63⁹ of the Copyright Act stipulates that any behaviour that results in copyright infringement is illegal and carries a maximum sentence of three years in jail. Additionally, there is a lot of disagreement on the aforementioned part because some high courts believe that the aforementioned offense is not subject to bail, while others believe it is.

However, because different high courts have different judgments, it is unclear what this offense entails. It is important to remember that Section 63 makes piracy illegal in addition to infringement. Copyright infringement caused India's economy 496.3 million US dollars in lost commerce, according to a 2007 research by the International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA)¹⁰.

Copyright Infringement

With rapid technological advancement, copyright infringement refers to the unapproved use of works that are protected by copyright laws. The author created the work, which is protected and comes with a remedy in the event that copyright is violated. The following are some of the infringement mechanisms that have existed for a few decades worldwide:

1. Reproduction, distribution, and public communication without the owner's or author's authorization are among the mechanisms of infringement that have been in place for a few decades worldwide.
2. Importing, renting, or selling copies of a work protected by copyright without the owner's or author's permission.
3. Producing an unauthorized derivative work, often associated with digital piracy, by illegally downloading or streaming a copyrighted work without the owner's or author's permission. This includes content that is accessible online.
4. Publicly performing a work protected by copyright without the owner's or author's permission.

The *Berne Convention*¹¹ Adopted in 1886, established minimum international rules for copyright protection for innovative and creative works, including music, movies, paintings, and novels. It acknowledged the right to be shielded against unapproved intellectual property adaptation. More than 170 nations have ratified the Convention, which is run by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and safeguards the copyright-holding artists' rights.

It is commonly known that the form, expression, and content of an article or work are protected by copyright in both Indian and American legal systems, but not the concept behind the work¹².

Copyright Infringement: Section 51 of the Act

According to Section 51¹³ of the Copyright Act 1957¹⁴, which defines what constitutes copyright infringement, the common ways in which copyright is violated exactly correspond with the author's vested and other adjacent rights. According to Section 51, there is a violation of the copyright available to the rightful owner when someone, without a license granted by the owner or the Registrar of Copyrights as allowed by the Act, does something that confers the act upon him or for financial gain and disseminates the work to the public.

Furthermore, *copyright is considered to be violated if the violating copies are distributed, sold, rented, or exhibited in public through trade or imports into India*¹⁵. The clause also gives the copyright owner the authority to file a lawsuit against the infringer and pursue remedies like an injunction (a court order to stop or prevent the infringing activity), damages (compensation for monetary losses incurred due to the copyright infringement), and an account of profits (amount directed to the infringer to pay in account with any profits earned on the basis of infringement).

With rapid technological advancement, a few ways of infringement are:

Fair Use as a Tool for Infringement

There has been a recent trend of growing fair use in copyright, especially with regard to the *Google Book*¹⁶s initiative, where large-scale digitization of books was considered permissible under the doctrine of fair use in the United States, even if the copyright owner had not given their agreement. The fair use or fair dealing exemption, which permits some activities to be carried out without the copyright owner's consent, is one of the most well-known exceptions to copyright law.

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Description of acts</i>	<i>Relevant clauses of section (52)(1) of the Act</i>
1.	Fair scholarly use	(a), (p)
2.	Educational uses	(g), (h), (i)
3.	Media reporting uses	(b), (m), (n)
4.	Uses of state produced materials	(c), (d), (e), (g), (r)
5.	Making of records of literary, dramatic, or musical works	(i)
6.	Performance of such works	(f), (k), (l)
7.	Use by public libraries	(o)
8.	Use of engraving, etc.	(s), (t), (x)
9.	Cinematograph films—uses by makers, and exhibitors	(u), (y)
10.	Uses relating to artistic works	(v), (w)

17

Table No. 1: The acts protected from copyright infringement under the ambit of Section 52 the Copyright Act 1957 (Fair Use)

In India, "Section 52 of the Copyright Act 1957" recognizes the fair dealing theory. This concept relates to specific actions outlined in the statute, for which there is no liability even though the actions fall inside the purview of copyright infringement.¹⁸ In India, "fair use/fair dealing" is exemplified by Section 52 sub-section (1) (a), which permits the use of copyrighted works for various purposes, including research and private study with regard to the academic framework, without a license. However, publishers argued that the exception disproportionately affected their commercial rights, such as *Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, etc.*¹⁹ in the historic case of multinational publishers suing Delhi University.

In this instance, Suggested readings were compiled and reproduced by photocopy shops in the form of course packs for students²⁰. Nonetheless, Indian courts have upheld copyright holders' rights while engaging in the idea-expression dispute and debating the test of originality in order to validate and safeguard the interests of justice.²¹

Piracy²²

The term "piracy" refers to the use of an expression that has been appropriated from another person's idea and turned into intellectual property as a duplicate or clone of the original creator. According to "*The Study on Copyright Piracy in India*," which was carried out by the "National Productivity Council"²³, copyright piracy occurs in India in a number of growing kinds of

intellectual property, including performers, sound recordings, computer software, literary works, and cinematographic works. Online intermediaries and e-commerce platforms may inadvertently facilitate the circulation of pirated goods if adequate compliance mechanisms are not enforced, either knowingly or inadvertently facilitating infringement. The financial losses resulting from piracy are substantial and economically significant. The intellectual property protection regime is once again challenged by technological advancements, such as 3D printers with shapes and patterns that are easily accessible and can be used to produce stolen goods.²⁴

The trend of digital piracy does not yet have a reliable defense mechanism, despite the fact that the piracy of counterfeit goods supplied in the market is common and distinguishable. Because copies are necessary for data transmission over electronic networks, it is possible to create exact copies of copyrighted artwork and virtually altered interpretations of the original, which signifies the essence of the creative experience. However, copies or reproductions tend to ride on the reputation and commercial values traditionally assigned to originals, resulting in copyright infringement.²⁵

Plagiarism of digital content that is erroneous and fraudulently offered online is therefore included in the scope of cyberspace. Digital plagiarism is the act of passing off an idea as one's own. Plagiarism is defined by *Merriam-Webster* as "to steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own."²⁶

Counterfeit Products

The Act of 1957 gives copyright holders the ability to stop infringing copies from being "imported" into India by requesting that the registrar of copyright, who has the necessary authority to conduct inquiries and searches, declare such copies to be forbidden imports²⁷. The idea of counterfeiting denotes an overlapping infringement of copyright, trademark, and design; also, the sale of products bearing such markings is deemed to be unlawful and a violation of intellectual property rights. Furthermore, the National Productivity Council reflects the reality of the gaps in the implementation of the laws pertaining to counterfeiting goods, despite the fact that these laws have been covered by Indian legislation.

The Copyright Act's flaws Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Artificial intelligence's (or "AI") expanding capabilities have led to a vast expansion of internet users' access to technology. The emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has introduced

complex questions regarding authorship and ownership, particularly in cases where creative works are autonomously generated by machine-learning systems. Generally speaking, and according to current law, copyrighted materials were written by human authors; nevertheless, in the present period, and eligibility for copyright protection under existing legal frameworks. Due to the lack of prevailing legislation and court decisions, this legal gap is not established in the framework of Indian law.

Providers of Internet Services

The 1957 Copyright Act does not align with international standards in a number of ways. According to Sections 13²⁸ and 67²⁹ of the Copyrights Act (1957), sound recordings, digital photos, literary works, and other literary works cannot be duplicated without the owners' permission. It does not, however, hold Internet service providers (ISP) responsible for violations. These days, copyright holders' works are uploaded on the internet via ISPs. It is unclear how copyright regulations relate to online violations or breaches. However, Section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 only provides limited safe-harbour protection to intermediaries. Nonetheless, this was covered by local laws in our modern jurisdictions. According to Section 512(c)³⁰ of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 1998, which was passed in the USA, ISPs are liable and must abide by take-down orders and notices from the authorities or risk civil and criminal penalties. The plaintiffs in *BMG Rights Mgmt. (US) LLC v. Cox Commcn., Inc.*³¹ sought damages from the defendant, an ISP, and the court granted \$25 million in damages. The court's argument against the aforementioned judgment was that ISPs have to abide by copyright takedown requests and would be liable for users' copyright violations if they implemented a program to ban repeat offenders. There is no specific process or redressal mechanism³² in the Indian legal system to address this issue. The parties who feel wronged must go through arduous legal proceedings. ISPs are required by Rule 3³³ of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, which were issued in accordance with the Information Technology Act, 2000, to advise their users not to post or distribute any content that they do not own, but their liability is restricted to this.

Animal as the owner of a copyright

Animals are not regarded as copyright proprietors under the present legal system. Animals are not covered by copyright laws, which are intended to safeguard the rights of authors of original

works, including software, music, literature, and artwork. Animals cannot legally possess the rights to any work they may have produced because they are not allowed to own property, including copyrights. In most jurisdictions, copyright law is based on human authorship, meaning that only human creators and subsequently their estates can hold copyright, whereas animals are excluded from such legal recognition.

Nonetheless, there have been cases where "related rights" or "neighbouring rights" provisions—which prohibit the commercial exploitation of a work without the creator's permission—have safeguarded works made by animals. In these situations, the animal may be represented in the management of the earnings from the commercial use of the work. *Judicial precedents in comparative jurisdictions have clarified that copyright protection requires human authorship, thereby excluding works created autonomously by animals.*

Section 63 of the Act's criminality

There has also been ongoing discussion and misunderstanding on the criminality of "Section 63 of the Copyright Act, 1957" with regard to piracy and infringement. This has resulted from the Hon'ble High Courts' inconsistent rulings in several circumstances. For example, on December 19, 2006, the Andhra Pradesh High Court ruled in *Amarnath Vyas v. State of Andhra Pradesh*³⁴ that copyright infringement is a non-cognizable and bailable offense. On May 29, 2007, the Kerala High Court ruled in *Suresh Kumar S/o Kumaran v. The Sub Inspector of Police*³⁵ that the crime is cognizable and does not require bail.

There is a dispute over the offense's standing with regard to bail because of the previously mentioned precedents.³⁶ The number of piracy cases in India has increased as a result of these dilemmas. India has become well-known for being on the Priority Watch List for years, even though the Indian Copyright Act of 1957 provides protection³⁷. This is mostly because of extremely high rates of piracy and insufficient enforcement methods. In the 2017³⁸ global piracy index, India came in third. Copyright infringement caused India's economy 496.3 million US dollars in lost commerce, according to a 2007 report by the International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA). These funds are said to have been utilized in terrorist crimes against nation-states.³⁹ Giving the police the power to conduct suo-motu raids to prevent piracy makes great sense in this dire situation.⁴⁰ However, legislative clarification is necessary to resolve inconsistencies regarding the cognizable and bailable nature of offences under Section 63.

Traditional Knowledge

There is no mention of the protection of traditional knowledge in the Copyright Act of 1957. There is an urgent need to protect the traditional wisdom of the populace in a nation like India, which has a diverse population and a wide range of cultures. Although Section 31A of the copyright legislation, which protects unpublished Indian works, may be exploited to suggest that it does, it does not protect the folklore or traditional knowledge of indigenous people. Whether Section 31A⁴¹ is sufficient to protect traditional knowledge is the question that arises. Following the debate over the patent for neem plants (50) and the copyright of Bikram Yoga in the United States of America (51), this question has been brought up.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in the well-known case of Bikram Yoga that the yoga position sequence was not considered a copyrightable subject matter under 17 U.S.C. 102(b) and that Choudhury's copyright in a book describing his method did not give him copyright over the pose sequence itself⁴². Because traditional knowledge lacks authorship and a fixed form—that is, a tangible form—it cannot be adequately protected by the copyright legislation.

Conclusion

There is an urgent need for policy adjustment and a conceptual shift in the law if India is to become a copyright and innovation refuge in the future. For example, India has a flourishing and rich traditional knowledge base that may be used in many other industries, such as pharmaceuticals and agriculture. But for some reason, this traditional knowledge is not sufficiently protected by Indian intellectual property rules. Benefit-sharing plans and sui generis systems are two options that can be utilized to stop this abundance of data from being misused. In order to benefit indigenous people as well, any study of Indian traditional knowledge must advance the concept of benefit-sharing. Additionally, the criminal responsibility of copyright needs to be reformed, and it needs to be strengthened through clearer statutory interpretation and effective enforcement mechanisms. It's also concerning that the scope of intermediary liability in India remains limited and requires clearer statutory articulation. Additionally, new and unregulated aspects of copyright, such as the emergence of AI-driven intellectual creations and new licensing mechanisms like "copyleft," require regulation and policy development.⁴³

Recommendations

- Stricter enforcement measures must be implemented, the fines must be raised, and the deterrent effect on those who infringe the Copyright Act must be strengthened. Therefore, it is crucial to clarify the state of the bail jurisprudence underlying copyright infringement under Section 63⁴⁴.
- Legislative action pertaining to the preservation of traditional knowledge must be included in the copyright legislation, together with the creation of unique standards for the unique characteristics of traditional knowledge.
- As piracy, copyright infringement, and counterfeit goods continue to harm the economy, undermining the jurisprudence and goal of the laws safeguarding intellectual property rights, a more stringent approach is urgently needed.
- India must develop its position on the acceptance of unregulated aspects of copyright, such as "copyleft" and AI-generated intellectual property.
- ISPs must be brought clearly within the purview of statutory liability frameworks and their liability must be appropriately determined by the Act.
- The Copyright Act should be amended to ensure accessibility of copyrighted works for visually impaired persons and individuals with disabilities⁴⁵.

*6th Semester, LL. B, Amity University, Lucknow

² Copyright Act, 1957 (Act 14 of 1957)

³ Margaret Thatcher, Former U.K. President

⁴ Reese, R. A. (2017), what should copyright protect? In R. Giblin & K. weatherall (Eds.). what if we could reimagine copyright? (pp. 111-146). ANU Press

⁵ SILKE VON LEWINSKI, REMUNERATION FOR THE USE OF WORKS, EXCLUSIVITY VS. OTHERS APPROACH at 85 (WALTER DE GRUYTER GMBH 2017). See Also, International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN (Online): 2319-7064 Index Copernicus Value (2016): 79.57 | Impact Factor (2017): 7.296 Volume 7 Issue 4, April 2018 www.ijsr.net Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY An Analytical Study of Copyright Laws in India and England Divya Singh , Chetan Chauhan.

⁶ Ayyar, P. V. J. (1982). South Indian Shrines: Illustrated. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services. See Also, Vrinda Singh & Vishal Singh Thakur, Biopiracy and the Eclipse of Traditional Knowledge in India, 6 *Supreo Amicus* 491 (2018).

⁷ Easwaran, E. (2010). The End of Sorrow: The Bhagavad Gita for Daily Living. The Bhagavad Gita Living Series. California: Nilgiri Press. See Also, Intellectual Property in the Ancient Indian Texts, in Diversity in Intellectual Property: Identities, Interests, and Intersections, 232–246 (Prabha Sridevan).

⁸ Design Act, 2000.s.11.

⁹ Copyright Act, 1957.s.57

¹⁰ International Intellectual Property Alliance, 2007 Special 301 Report India, 12 February 2007, p. 49, 51, 53-54, 117, www.iipa.com/rbc/2007/2007SPEC301INDIA.pdf (21 September 2008).

¹¹ —The Protection of Literary Works under Article 2 of the Berne Convention and its Acceptability in EU Countries, SSRN,

¹² Promod Nair, Copyright Protection for Computer Software, 7 SCC J-31 (2004)

¹³ Copyright Act, 1957 (India) s. 51

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Agrawal, Academic Research and Copyright Issues, 4 Asia Pac. L. & Pol'y Rev. 180 (2018)

¹⁶ Authors Guild v. Google, Inc., 721 F.3d 132 (2d Cir.2015)

¹⁷ Upendra baxi, Copyright Law and Justice in India, 28 J. Indian L. Inst. 497 (1986)

¹⁸ Narayan Prasad & Pravesh Aggarwal. *Facilitating Educational Needs in Digital Era: Adequacy of Fair Dealing Provisions of Indian Copyright Act in Question*, 18 J. WORLD INTELL. PROP. 150, 152 (2015)

¹⁹ University of Delhi v. Rameshwari Photocopy Services, Civil Appeal No. 8252 of 2012, (Supreme Ct. of India) —Rameshwari photocopy services integrated within Delhi University operating from the premises of and on the basis of a license provided by the university. The license mandates the price and nature of services. The future of student's access to educational materials in form of course packs in India, without which Indian higher education would go in same costly format of developed countries

²⁰ Associate Professor, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

²¹ See, DB Modak, Deb and Cooper: Govmdan.; N.T. Raghunathan tv. A I.R., A.I.R. 1971 Bom. 48; J.N. Bagga; RSG. Anand v. Delux Films , A.I.R. 1978 S.C. 1613 at 162

²² See e.g. Kal Raustiala and Christopher Sprigman, 'The Piracy Paradox: Innovation and Intellectual Property in Fashion Design' (2006) 92 Virginia Law Review 1687; Kal Raustiala and Christopher Sprigman, 'The Piracy Paradox Revisited' (2009) 61 Stanford Law Review 1201. But see C Scott Hemphill and Jeannie Suk, 'The Law, Culture, and Economics of Fashion' (2009) 61 Stanford Law Review 1147; C Scott Hemphill and Jeannie Suk, 'Remix and Cultural Production' (2009) 61 Stanford Law Review 1227.

²³ STUDY ON COPYRIGHT PIRACY IN INDIA sponsored by Ministry of Human Resource Development Government of India.

²⁴ Deven R. Desai from the Thomas Jefferson School of Law and Gerard N. Magliocca from Indiana University.

²⁵ P. (1999). Electronic art and the law: Intellectual property rights in Cyberspace. Leonardo, 32(3), 191–195.

²⁶ Plagiarize." Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Merriam-Webster Online. 19 April 2010.

²⁷ Verma, S. K. ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS: TRIPS PROCEDURE & INDIA

²⁸ Copyright Act, 1957. s.13.

²⁹ Copyright Act, 1957. s.67.

³⁰ Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 1998.s.512(c). See Also, Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, 1999; Australian legislation Copyright Amendment (Digital Agenda) Act, 2000.

³¹ Nos. 16-1972, 17-135 (4th Cir).

³² Pocket Fm Pvt Ltd v. Mebiglo Labs Private Limited & Ors, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 4077 See Also, Marico Limited v. Abhijeet Bhansali, 2020 SCC Online Bom 60.

³³ Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. Rule 3

³⁴ Amarnath Vyas v State of Andhra Pradesh, 2007 Cri LJ 2025 (A P).

³⁵ Sureshkumar S/o Kumaran v The Sub Inspector of Police, 2007 (3) KLT 363. See Also, Jitendra Prasad Singh v State of Assam, 2003 (26) PTC 486 (Gau).

³⁶ Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.s.438.

³⁷ Desai Rachana, Copyright infringement in the Indian film industry, Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment, Law & Practice (Spring 2005), 259-278.

³⁸ Frost, J. (no date) Global piracy increases throughout 2017, Muso reveals, MUSO.

³⁹ Treverton, Gregory F., Carl F. Matthies, Karla J. Cunningham, Jeremiah Goulka, Greg Ridgeway, and Anny Wong, Film Piracy and Its Connection to Organized Crime and Terrorism. Santa Monica, CA: RAND corporation, 2009. —There is compelling evidence to suggest that revenue generated from piracy of intellectual property is used in funding terrorism activities and other crimes. A report titled —Film Piracy, Organized Crime and Terrorism published by RAND Corporation listed seventeen (17) organized crime units that generate funds through piracy. More alarmingly, one of those units is the D-Company led by Dawood Ibrahim who is wanted for many terrorist attacks in India including the 1993 Mumbai serial blast.

⁴⁰ International Intellectual Property Alliance, 2007 Special 301 Report India, 12 February 2007, p. 49, 51, 53-54, 117

⁴¹ Copyright Act, 1957.s.31A.

⁴² Bikram's Yoga Coll. of India, Ltd. P'ship v. Evolution Yoga, Ltd. Liab. Co. - 803 F.3d 1032 (9th Cir. 2015). See Also, Bikram's Yoga Coll. of India, ltd.. p'ship v. Evolution Yoga, ltd.. Liab. co. - 803 f.3d 1032 (9th cir.2015) community.

⁴³ Friedman, K. (2016, July 13). copyleft. Encyclopedia Britannica.

⁴⁴ Proposed decriminalization of offenses under copyright act' 1957 -FICCI

⁴⁵ Pillai, Priya. (2012). Accessible Copies of Copyright Work for Visually Impaired Persons in India. Creative Education. 03. 1060-1062. 10.4236/ce.2012.326159. See Also, AKSHAT BALDWA & ORS. v. YASH RAJ FILMS, 2023 LiveLaw (Del) 48; Lawrence Liang, Exceptions and Limitations in Indian Copyright Law for Education: An Assessment, The Law and Development Review, Volume 3, Issue 2 2010.