	Fore	eword	3
	Ackı	nowledgment	4
	Intro	oduction	5
	Con	tents	7
۱.	Case	es from Australia	19
	1.1	WEA International & Anor. v. Hanimex Corporation Ltd.	19
		Tape manufacturer is not liable for authorizing infringement by advertising the sale of blank tapes to make recordings from purchased tapes.	
	1.2	Australian Tape Manufacturers Assoc. Ltd. & Ors. v. The Commonwealth of Australia	21
		Selling blank tapes was not an authorization to infringe copyright as the vendor has no control over the ultimate use of the tapes.	
	1.3	Schott Musik International GmbH & Ors. v. Colossal Records of Australia Pty. Ltd. & Ors.	23
		A techno dance remix from a musical work was not an adaptation so lacking in integrity or quality that it debased the copyright owner's moral rights in the original work.	
	1.4	Telstra Corporation Ltd. v. Australasian Performing Right Association Ltd.	25
		Providing pre-recorded music to telephone subscribers breached the diffusion and public broadcasting rights though the transmission was to individuals in private circumstances.	
	1.5	Phonographic Performance Co. of Australia Ltd. v. Federation of Australian Commercial Television Stations	27
		Broadcasting a film amounted to broadcasting the aggregate of sounds	

that make up the sound track, for which the sound recording owner

retained copyright.

	Australasian Performing Right Association Ltd. v. Metro on George Pty. Ltd.	
	Music venue proprietor was liable for authorizing the unlicensed public performance of works on its premises, though it had disclaimed responsibility in its promoters' contracts.	
1.7	Universal Music Australia Pty. Ltd. & Ors. v. Sharman License Holdings Ltd. & Ors.	
	Sharman, developers of Kazaa P2P software, were liable for authorizing infringement, as they had the power to control (and curtail) their users' infringing activities.	
1.8	Cooper & Ors. v. Universal Music Australia Pty. Ltd. & Ors.	,
	By setting up hyperlinks on his website to unlicensed MP3 files, Cooper was liable for authorizing his users to copy and communicate these recordings.	
Case 2.1	es from China (including Hong Kong SAR) Dalian Audio-Video Publishing House v. Audio-Video Art Service Agency	3
	of Haidian District of Beijing	
		_3
	In a pre-Copyright Law decision, defendant was liable for unlicensed replication and sale of cassette tapes of songs without the permission of the master tape owner.	
2.2	and sale of cassette tapes of songs without the permission of the master	
2.2	and sale of cassette tapes of songs without the permission of the master tape owner. Music Copyright Society of China v. Netease Com.,	
2.2	and sale of cassette tapes of songs without the permission of the master tape owner. Music Copyright Society of China v. Netease Com., Inc. & Mobile Communications Corporation Netease was liable for unlicensed download of a musical work as a mobile ring tone, but mobile operator MCC was not liable as it merely provided a	3

2.4	Go East Entertainment Co. Ltd. (H.K.) v. Beijing Century Technology Co., Ltd. (ChinaMP3.com)	44
	Website operator liable to the music rightholder for breaching its obligation of care and caution by selecting, organizing and finalizing hyperlinks to unlicensed album downloads.	
2.5	Beijing Feitong Music Co. Ltd. v. Heilongjiang Radio Station	48
	Radio station was not liable for online streaming of rightholder's album for promotional purposes as the music could not be downloaded and this was within the parties' promotion contract.	
2.6	Zhejiang FanYa Co. Ltd. (5fad.com) v. Beijing Yahoo! China & Alibaba Information Technology Co. Ltd.	50
	Alibaba search engine not liable to rightholder under the safe harbour defences for providing links to download songs for free as it was not served with take-down notices.	
2.7	Shanghai Push Sound Music & Entertainment Co., Ltd. v. Beijing FashioNow Co. Ltd.	53
	Developer/operator of P2P client software/network held jointly liable with its users for intentionally assisting users in the unlicensed sharing of music files.	
2.8	Shanghai Push Sound Music & Entertainment Co., Ltd. v. Beijing Baidu Technology Co. Ltd.	56
	Baidu search engine was liable to rightholder for profiting (through web advertisements) from the provision of information location results to unlicensed music files.	
2.9	EMI Group Hong Kong Limited v. Beijing Baidu Network Technology Co. Ltd. EMI	58
	Baidu search engine was not liable to rightholder under the safe harbour defences for linking to third party unlicensed music files as it was not served with take-down notices.	
2.10	Go East Entertainment Co. Ltd. (H.K.) v. Beijing Alibaba Technology Co., Ltd.	62
	Alibaba search engine was liable in damages to rightholder for failing to take down all links to rightholder's recordings after being served with take-down notices.	

2.11	Shanghai Xinchuan Online Co. Ltd. v. Tudou.com Co. Ltd. ("The Crazy Stone case")	65
	Tudou.com video sharing website did not qualify for safe harbour protection as it knew of uploads of infringing works and was negligent in overseeing and monitoring them.	
2.12	Shanghai Push Sound Music & Entertainment Co., Ltd. v. Beijing Yobo Century Technology Co. Ltd.	68
	Yobo.com website was liable to rightholder for being making and hosting unlicensed uploads of rightholder's music on its website and profiting from its infringing activities.	0
2.13	HKSAR v. Lau Ying Wai	70
	Defendant was not liable for supplying an unlicensed ringtone as the court accepted his defence of innocent infringement.	
2.14	HKSAR v. Lam Shuen Shuen & Anor.	72
	When sentencing for the offence of selling infringing copies of copyright works, a distinction is made between a casual employee (light sentence) and the owner (heavy sentence).	
2.15	HKSAR v. Ng Ping Kwan	74
	Defendant was acquitted of charge of possessing pirated music CDs for sale as prosecution had failed to prove copyright ownership in the pirated CDs.	
2.16	Cinepoly Records Co. Ltd. & Ors v. Hong Kong Broadband Network Ltd. & Ors (No. 1)	76
	ISPs were legally permitted, pursuant to a discovery order, to disclose the identities of their subscribers alleged to have infringed copyright online.	
2.17	Cinepoly Records Co. Ltd. & Ors v. Hong Kong	
	Broadband Network Ltd. & Ors (No. 2)	79
	ISPs were legally permitted to disclose the identities of their subscribers alleged to have infringed copyright as these identities are exempted from protection as personal data.	

Case	es from India	81
3.1	Indian Performing Right Society Ltd. v. Eastern Indian Motion Pictures Association & Ors.	81
	Copyright in a cinematograph film (with the sound track) did not derogate from a composer or lyricist's separate rights to perform the music otherwise than as a film.	
3.2	Gramophone Co. of India Ltd. v. Mars Recording Pvt. Ltd. & Anor.	84
	Dispute as to whether an applicant can secure a statutory licence to make a "version recording" without first securing the copyright owner's consent was transferred to the lower court.	
3.3	Super Cassettes Industries v. People Infocom & Anor.	87
	In granting an interim injunction, a court has to consider the plaintiff's prima facie case, the balance of convenience and the interests of justice.	
3.4	Radio Today Broadcasting Ltd. v. Indian Performing Rights Society	89
	Radio station has to pay royalties to the Indian Performing Rights Society in addition to royalties to the Phonograhic Performance Limited for broadcasting songs on radio.	
3.5	Indian Performing Right Society Ltd. v. Debashis Patnaik & Ors.	91
	Unlicensed playing musical works in hotels was a breach of the rightholder's rights of public performance in or communication to the public of literary/musical works.	
3.6	Lahari Recording Company Limited v. Master Audio Video Manufacturing Co. (P) Ltd.	93
	Notwithstanding ongoing dealings in unlicensed cassettes by third parties, no permanent injunction was granted against manufacturer which had ceased cassette manufacture.	
3.7	Super Cassette Industries v. Nirulas Corner House (P) Ltd.	95
	The unlicensed playing of audio works through TV channels in defendant's hotel rooms amounted to an infringing broadcast and a communication to the public.	

3.

3.8

		Indian Copyright Board can order a grant of a compulsory licence for the public communication of a sound recording if the copyright owner's grounds of refusal were unreasonable.	
	3.9	Phonographic Performance Ltd. v. Hotel Gold Regency & Ors.	101
		As a collecting society, PPL only had the right to administer the owners' copyright; in the absence of the owners or exclusive licences, it could not sue or seek civil remedies.	
4.	Case	es from Japan	103
	4.1	One Rainy Night in Tokyo	103
		If the defendant created a work that was identical to an existing work but did not draw from it, the newly created work was not a reproduction of the existing work.	
	4.2	Club Cat's Eye/Singing at a Karaoke Lounge	105
		The singing by the business' customers amounted to a public performance of the copyright music by the business for which a separate licence was required.	
	4.3	Supply of Karaoke Equipment for Business Use ("Video Mates" Case)	107
		Karaoke equipment lessor had breached its duty of care to the rightholders by failing to verify with the lessee that it had concluded a copyright licensing agreement.	
	4.4	File Rogue	110
		Defendant provider of file sharing service was contributorily liable by enabling its users to reproduce and transmit, without permission, the rightholders' music works.	
	4.5	Simultaneous Broadcast Satellite Retransmission	114
		The wire diffusion organizations' simultaneous broadcast satellite broadcast was a different method of public transmission by "broadcasting" and was not authorised under their existing licence contract.	

Entertainment Network (India) Ltd. v. Super Cassette Industries Ltd.

97

4.6	Simultaneous Communication Satellite Broadcast Retransmission	117
	The wire diffusion organizations' simultaneous communications satellite retransmission was a different method of public transmission "broadcasting" and was not authorised under their existing licence contract.	
	and was not authorised under their existing licence contract.	
4.7	Rokuga Net	119
	Service provider was liable for providing a for-profit service for the unlicensed recording and transmission of free-to-air broadcasts to users.	
4.8	Rebroadcasting TV Programs	121
	Licence between composer and broadcaster for use of background music was a comprehensive licence to broadcaster that includes use of music for rebroadcasting.	
4.9	Live Performance & Singing at Nightclub	123
	Representative director as operator of nightclub was liable for band's unlicensed live performance of musical compositions on its premises.	
4.10	Producer of Documentary Film	125
	In making all arrangements for the concert, the musical group's management company was deemed assignee of copyright in the concert recording produced by the director.	
Case	s from Malaysia	128
5.1	Dunia Muzik WEA Sdn. Bhd. & Anor v. Koh Tay Eng	128
	The unlicensed reproduction and sale of cassette tapes was an infringement of the rightholders' copyright in the musical works and sound recordings.	
5.2	Rock Records (M) Sdn. Bhd. v. Audio One Entertainment Sdn. Bhd.	130
	The unlicensed making of a karaoke VCD from sound recordings was an infringement of the rightholder's right in the sound recordings.	

5.

6.	Case	es from New Zealand	133
	6.1	Australian Performing Right Association Ltd. v. Koolman & Anor	133
		Club proprietor was liable for permitting and impliedly authorizing the unlicensed performance of rightholder's music on its premises by the band and club patrons.	
	6.2	J Albert & Sons Pty. Ltd. & Ors. v. Fletcher Construction Co. Ltd.	135
		Importer of licensed sound recordings for diffusion services was liable for failing to licence the rights to use the rightholders' copyright in the musical works in the recordings.	
	6.3	Phonographic Performances (NZ) Ltd. v. Lion Breweries Ltd.	138
		Hotel was not liable for causing a public performance of music to be heard on its premises as it had not received payment in respect of the performance.	
	6.4	Police v. Vile	140
		Based on sentencing guidelines for the offence of selling infringing items, the accused was imprisoned for conducting a large and extensive commercial infringement operation.	
7.	Case	es from Republic of Korea	142
	7.1	Lee Mi-bae Songs	142
		Disc manufacturing agreement between composer/song writer and manufacturer was a non-exclusive copyright licence that includes distribution of the master tape on new media.	
	7.2	Windy Sound	145
		The digitization of an analogue recording of a music disc did not produce a derivative work as any changes to the original work were not to the extent of creating a new work.	
	7.3	Bugs Music	148
		Online streaming of music files would bring about reproductions of the music files and if unlicensed, was an infringement of the rightholder's rights	

	7.4	Baby V.O.X.	151
		Agreement between composer/song writer and producer gave producer a licence to produce and sell albums with the writer's and composer's musical works.	
	7.5	Soribada	153
		P2P service provider was liable for assisting in copyright infringement as they knew of infringing uses of the service and facilitated such uses by developing and distributing P2P software.	
	7.6	Sonata of Temptation	156
		Music video adapted without licence from video game was an infringement of the reproduction, transmission and broadcast rights and the right of integrity in the video game.	
3.	Case	es from Singapore	158
	8.1	The Performing Right Society Ltd. & Anor. v. United Artists Singapore Theatres Pte. Ltd.	158
		The screening of films amounted to a public performance of the musical works in the sound tracks for which a separate licence from the musical works' authors is needed.	
	8.2	Odex Pte. Ltd. v. Pacific Internet Ltd.	161
		A video distributor as mere licensee has no standing to apply for a discovery order against an ISP to disclose the identities of its subscribers alleged to be infringing copyright by P2P file sharing.	
9.	Case	es from Thailand	164
	9.1	Saeksan Tape & Record Registered Partnership v. Rose Video Co. Ltd & Ors.	164
		"Sale of copyright" agreement by singer-composer's estate did not operate as a copyright assignment and estate could contract with others to adapt the musical compositions.	

9.2	Public Prosecutor v. Mayuree Tavung	166
	2-year imprisonment and 400,000 Baht fine for possessing for sale pirated CDs, DVDs and MP3s was not too severe but sentence reduced for accused.	
	CD3, DVD3 and IVIF 33 was not too severe but sentence reduced for accused.	
9.3	Public Prosecutor v. Sermsak Kamsamer & Anor.	168
	Charge of infringement by unlicensed sale of sound recordings was dismissed as defence of entrapment (that rightholder's agent had persuaded accused to infringe) was accepted.	
9.4	PGM Record v. Visa Khanthap & Ors.	170
	"Transfer of copyright" agreement by author-composer did not operate as an assignment and author-composer could licence others to produce different versions of the songs.	
9.5	Public Prosecutor v. Pongchai Buapan	172
	Charge of infringement by unlicensed sale of sound recordings was dismissed as defence of "seduction" (that rightholder's agent caused accused to infringe) was accepted.	
9.6	Public Prosecutor v. Payak Meeginda	174
	Charge of selling or letting for hire CDs and VCDs was dismissed for lack of evidence that seized media were infringing copies and that accused was engaged in hiring business.	
9.7	Public Prosecutor v. Nad Jangprai	176
	Charge of unlicensed playing of karaoke songs for restaurant customers on a "no-sticker" computer was dismissed on evidence that accused was licenced to play the songs.	
9.8	Kritsada Paleevong v. Software Supply International Co. Ltd. & Ors.	178
	Agreement with composer licensed producer to use the composer's songs and vested sound recordings copyright in producer which it could assign without composer's permission.	
9.9	Public Prosecutor v. Aumnad Agepet	180
	Charge of unlicensed playing of music against restaurant performer was dismissed on evidence that restaurant was licenced to perform (communicate to the public) the songs.	

Add	itional Cases	182
10.1	Mirabai Films Pvt. Ltd. v. Siti Cable Network & Ors. (India, 2003)	182
	Interim injunction granted against cable TV network operators to restrain them, their distributors and franchisees from unlicensed telecasting of rightholder's film.	
10.2	Network Ten Pty. Ltd. v. TCN Channel Nine (No. 1 and 2) (Australia, 2004)	184
	Copyright in broadcasts did not extend to all visual images discernible; whether a substantial part of a programme had been reproduced depended on the quality and not quantity taken.	
10.3	Visual Disk (Japan, 2005)	187
	Unlicensed digitization of analogue photographs and sale as CDs and website service infringed photographer's copyright, but digitization did not breach his right of integrity.	
10.4	Shanghai People's Procuratorate v. Gu Randi & Ors. (China, 2005)	190
	Accused was convicted of the offence of selling infringing copies of DVDs for gain; the original charge of selling infringing discs without registration and licence was dropped.	
10.5	Stevens v. Kabushiki Kaisha Sony Computer Entertainment (Australia, 2005)	193
	Sony's PlayStation CD-ROM access code and console boot ROM did not constitute a TPM as they did not prevent the duplication of a Sony PlayStation CD-ROM.	
10.6	PlayStation 2 (Republic of Korea, 2006)	196
	Sony's PlayStation access code was a TPM and installing a Mod chip to play a game disk without an access code was an act that incapacitated the TPM.	
10.7	Winny I (Japan, 2004) and Winny II (Japan, 2006)	198
	Developer of Winny P2P software was not liable in accessory liability as being merely aware that the software could be abused did not constitute a crime of aiding.	

10.8	Guangdong Zhongkai Cultural Development Co. v. Beijing Zhongsou Online Co. ("The Promise" Case) (China, 2007)	202
	Operator/developer of website for accessing and "Webpig" software for downloading the unlicensed movie infringed the rightholder's right of network dissemination in the movie.	
10.9	HKSAR v. Chan Nai Ming (China, 2007)	205
	Accused who "seeded" and "made available" three unlicensed movies for download through BitTorrent was liable for the distribution of infringing copies to users.	
10.10) Maneki TV (Japan, 2008)	208
	Defendant who provided a service to allow users to view TV programs via the Internet was not providing a public transmission and was not liable for making the broadcasts transmissible.	
APPI	ENDICES	
Table	e of Cases	212
Table	e of Statutes	218

224

225

Table of International Instruments

Index