



International Journal of Law, Policy and Social Review

www.lawjournals.net

Online ISSN: 2664-6838, Print ISSN: 2664-682X

Received: 16-09-2021, Accepted: 01-10-2021, Published: 18-10-2021

Volume 3, Issue 4, 2021, Page No. 26-31

Emerging trends in digital copy right law

Ankita Singh¹, Janmejay Singh^{2*}

¹ BA, LLB, School of Legal Studies, Babu Banarasi Das University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

² Assistant Professor of Law, BBD University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract

The copyright law in past records is known to be the heritage of technology. It has experienced organized changes keeping in view the nature, scope, and purview of technology involved to protect the public interest of originality, novelty, and creativity. Its main thrust is to afford sufficient encouragements to authors and creators of different copyright works, on the one hand, and make such works available to the public on the other hand. While the silhouette of copyright law have always been pinched by the burgeoning in the technological world, the unfolding of digital technologies towards the ceasing decades of the twentieth century as defining paradigms of new age communication embossed a whole new set of challenges to copyright regimes. Primary rights of reproduction distribution feigned tangible physical copies only of a work. The modern technologies convoyed in non- material and sharing. The paramount intention of the copyright law is to strike out an equilibrium between rights of the copyright holders and the general public. With the dawn of the Digital Environment, the access, utilization, replication or transformation of the indigenous work has become really facile. The copyright law had to regulate itself between the need to honour the creator and the desirability of making such works public. With the ubiquity of the Internet as an irreplaceable and completely new medium of global human communication all over the world, contracted into a digital universal village, the security of copyright works has become a graver alarm for lawyers, as well as, the other stakeholders. The Internet together with "Peer to Peer" computer setups makes it conceivable for a gradually larger number of individuals to take part in collective information production, thereby weaken the efforts to provide incentives to original authors of intellectual property. The Internet assists the approximately-rapid, exclusive quality reproduction of and worldwide, lightening- speed broadcasting of copyrighted works. The problems and paradoxes underlying the digital dilemma, by nature, are linked with the clash between the concept of "information wants to be free" and the demands for tougher copyrighted control of information in the digital environment. In contradiction of the above background, this essay shall scrutinize and critically evaluate emerging issues concerning copyright protection in a digital environment.

Keywords: copyright law, digital world, TRIPS agreement, WIPO treaties, technological circumvention, digital rights management

Introduction

In the foregoing few years the velitation on copyright has taken on colossal proportions and it has emanate as the authoritative allegory of the information era, with the swedge for control over information fabricating new colloquy of disquietude and antagonism. It would not be an embellishment to say that copyright has become a media event, and sporadically does a day go by without some anecdote of copyright violation or infringement^[1]. Law is a reaction to social challenges. Law while countering, replies such challenges and in the course develops itself. Copyright is the best example one reaches when researching upon the connection between law and technology. On the one hand, it is considered that technology was the ancestor of copyright and copyright based industries; on the other hand, every new technology developed has posed a probable risk to the copyright-based industries. The industry subsequently has put all new invention to its benefit in terms of producing newer forms of utilisation of art, spreading markets and aggregate profits. Digital technology is the up-to-date one in the field at the international scale. The digital Age being the hallmark of the existing era is a

witness to yet another era open out by the Internet and this linking is, in numerous ways, a crucial moment in the long and variable history of copyright. The digital technology is a notable impact on copyright works and its formation, distribution, and protection. Digitization has made it much easier to operate, replicate, and allocate protected works. Digital content can be joint, changed, diversified, and operated easily. By enabling the creating of faultless copies of copyrighted works for slight cost, digital technology intimidates to weaken the distribution systems and rise illegal use of copyright works. The Internet skill reveals that outdated actors in the communications process (information producer, provider, publisher, intermediary user) take on fresh roles in the digital networked environment. The Internet is designed as an 'open platform model' as opposite to the 'broadcasting model' of most existing media. On the Internet writers may easily broadcast their works without the interference of traditional publishers: authors are becoming 'publishers'. Besides, digital technology empowers users to actively search and operate information accessible on the network: operators are

becoming 'authors'. Moreover, traditional intercessors, such as university libraries, may take on new roles as information providers: intercessors are becoming publishers as well. This conjunction of roles may ultimately affect the prevailing system of rights allocation in copyright and neighbouring rights legislation. Thus, in a way, the Internet has twisted the attractively arranged, inflexibly accordingly characterized and justified a picture of copy-related and non-copy related rights under the Berne Convention. Digital communicating transmissions produce a certain mix form of making accessible to an unknown number of individuals and let them consume the content at any time as they wish.

Digital Technology and Copyright Issues

As digital technology substitute's analog technology, the predicament which copyright law now intimidate will become more parlous. Users of digital systems will be able to record and communicate information of advanced quality in minus time and at elevated speed than is possible with analog systems. As a result, copyright infringements will likely be more frequent, more costly, and more difficult to prevent. With the preferment of Technology and more conspicuously digitization, the comprehensive world has always acknowledged the necessity for a Digital Copyright Law. Therefore, the prevailing Copyright law has grown, as the trend of preserving records in the form of Digital data clearly requires protection a need felt all around the world.

The right of reproduction

Digital technologies have ushered in new-fangled structure of facsimile of work. Ceremonial transmission of a work was substantial copy based which could be on paper or tape as in the case of a book or a tape or film as in the case of a phonogram or a motion picture. Right of reproduction is the most quintessential of the copyrights. It, however, was a predicament to elucidate it even in the pre digital days. The Berne convention had in particular included the rights of reproduction only as late as 1967. After the adoption of the Statute of Anne, the mother of present copyright law, the reproduction right has been at the core of copyright law for more than three hundred years. However accepted as an inspirational right conferred to authors ^[2], the reproduction right per se has not been explicitly restricted by the international instruments for copyright protection ^[3]. Due to the nonexistence of agreement on the right's choice and content, the original text of the Berne Convention did not consist of any provision that specifically secures the reproduction right ^[4].

So far there is no stumbling block in apprehending the right of reproduction in digital medium. The nodus emerges, however, on the issue of transitory or incidental reproduction that takes place in Internet communication. When a presumptive patron of a book goes to a book store, he can riffle through the book paramounting on whether to buy or not. In the case of Internet this skimming can take place only after the digital reproduction of the book in the Random Access Memory of the buyer's computer. Whether such a reproduction should be covered under the gamut of the right of reproduction? The WCT did not finally resolve the issue and seem to have left it to the practices to emerge to govern the norms.

The decentralized nature of Internet makes it possible for any user to broadcast a work boundlessly in the World Wide Web through

an end number of channels, thus giving rise to global piracy. Evaluations of global losses from pirated books, music composition and performing software range into billions of dollars. The Internet in a way presents a difficult condition for copyright owners as the users convert mass disseminators of others copyright material and generate an imbalance between the authors and users ^[5]. The beginning of digital technology, therefore, presents lawmakers with a choice: either expand or adapt existing 'old media conceptions' or redefine the index of restricted acts, taking into account the particularities of the new environment in multiple facets.

The dawn of the Internet makes the circumference of the reproduction right supplementary paradoxical in the new media age. Given that any transferral of inoculate works over the Internet involves the reproductions transitorily stored in the connected computers' RAM, the dubiety of whether right owners should be conceded with the ascendancy over all interim reproductions looms large amidst the dematerialized and decentralized psyche of the Internet.

The Agreed statements attached to the WCT and WPPT make it comprehensible that the Article 9 of the Berne convention shall apply mutatis mutandis for the patronage of the reproduction right in the digital environment. At first glimpse, what is unambiguous under these two agreed statements is that unpermanent digital copies, for example, copies stored in floppy disks or a computer's read only memory (ROM), are protected by the WIPO Treaties 1996. Moreover, members are emancipated to commence contemporary inhibition or peculiarity to the re-delimited reproduction right, subject to the three-step test. Yet the quotidian elucidation of the second sentence of the agreed statements, in particular the term "storage", still remains largely ambivalent and concealed. Does it cover the making of temporary copies? One would acknowledge in pessimistic that "in ordinary usage, 'storage' signifies a much extortionate degree of activity than simple 'temporary' conduct". On the incongruous, the counter argument may simply go that the temporarily stored copy does in fact constitute a form of storage of the work. Without the unswerving remission to the phrase "permanent or temporary", the agreed statements, rather than consummating the proclaimed enthusiastic venture to provide the intelligibility, failed to persuade the expanse to which the reproduction right should be pertained in the digital environment. The vacillation of the treaty language leaves the query as to whether the provisional copies have been overlaid, embryonically debatable.

Legal protection of rights management information

It is essential that every time a work or an object of related rights is requested and transmitted over the network, the fact of the use is verified together with all the documents required to approve that the settled payment can be transferred to the proper right owner (s). Numerous technologies in this respect are accessible or being developed which will allow the necessary feedback to the right owners. Such statistics may also function in unification with technological measures, as where a watermark assist to recognise a work but may also be a key component for allowing the legal use of a copyrighted work. It can also help to facilitate online certifying. It is important, however, that such data is not removed or misleading because the reimbursement of the right owners would not be paid at all in that case, or it would be diverted. From a practical point of view, this would be as

injurious to the profits of the right owners as a complete violation of rights.

Right holders necessitate Right Management Information to docket their works, and to let users diagnose the works and their nick of use, remarkably in the digital environment where activities progress quickly and often leave few superfluous trail. Rights management information is information that differentiates content secured by copyright or related rights. The Rights Management Information (RMI) of a work ^[6] is just an information that provides acknowledgement of rights associated to that work, either directly or indirectly ^[7]. RMI in this sense is not a modern concept. The palatinate of apportionment of creative works, may be seen as the economic analogue to the right of attribution within moral rights jurisprudence, or even permission of files in UNIX ^[8].

Rights management information is one of the linchpin of systems that synchronize the rights held in digital works. The rise of Rights Management Information (RMI) assists the operative manipulation of works of authorship and offers a numerous of new opportunities for right owners to protect their moral rights in the digital age ^[9]. The RMI's vulnerability to unofficial modification or removal casts a long shadow on the safeguard of the integrity of RMI. It aimed to provide right owners with the necessary protection of RMI attached to their works, the WIPO Treaties 1996 assist contracting parties to offer actual protection contrary to the manipulation of RMI and other relative acts that excessively prejudice right owners' benefits.

Antithetical to the traditionalist and amorphous language handed down in the anti- circumvention rules, the RMI-concomitant provisions in the WIPO Treaties 1996

usher in a set of new minimal standards for the protection of the integrity of RMI. Cardinaly, the treaties make it clear that the illegal acts of fiddling RMI include:

1. The removal or alteration of any electronic rights management information without authority; and
2. The non-permissive distribution, importation for distribution, broadcast or communication to the public of works, knowing that electronic rights management information has been removed or altered without authority ^[10]. Succeeding, the RMI provisions emphatically proffer for a two-layered proficiency requirement. With respect to the elemental layer of the knowledge requirement, persons with veritable knowledge perpetrating the afforested felonious act would be subjected to the retribution. The person liable for subsequent layer information of contents, must have the knowledge or have reasonable grounds to know that his act will "induce, enable, facilitate or conceal an infringement of any right" covered by the WCT and WPPT, or the Berne Convention. This, in fact, prepends an additional yardstick to stimulate whether the antecedent administration of RMI shall be castigated. It will immune those who unwittingly make transfiguration or elimination of RMI, and cause no threat to the legitimate interests of right owners ^[11].

Triennial, the gamut of protectable RMI is unambiguously delineated. Under the WCT, the RMI entitled for protection encompasses the information which "identifies the work, the author of the work, the owner of any right in the work", or deal with "the terms and conditions of use of the work, and any numbers or codes that represent such information". Furthermore,

such information should concurrently be "attached to a copy of a work or appears in correspondence with the communication of a work to the public" ^[12].

Moreover, the acknowledged statement ^[13] additionally makes intelligible that the rights protected incorporate both exclusive rights and rights of remuneration ascribed in the WCT or Berne Convention. Temporarily, contracting parties are not allowed to reckon on Article 12 "to devise or implement rights management systems that would have the effect of imposing formalities", interdicting the autonomous gesticulation of goods or crippling the enjoyment of rights under the WCT. This agreed statement is appurtenant mutatis mutandis to the RMI provision in the WPPT ^[14].

Copyright enforcement in digital environment

Currently, information and communication technologies have thoroughly changed the way works and services disseminate, and have also changed the way protected works are retrieved and pre-owned. They have made it achievable for information to be promulgated at culminating speed over wired or wireless networks essentially everywhere and have authorized for the opportunity of concomitant access by an incalculable number of individuals. Digitization and expansion of works over webs such as the Internet means that low-cost, high- quality copies can be produce quickly, and these produced copies can also be sent to numerous other people everywhere in the world, irrespective of borders. Moreover, digital works are easily rationalised, or even elaborated, which means that there are various potential threats to the moral rights of authors. The relationship between creators, society and the users of protected works has also changed considerably. Considering these facts, it is not flabbergasted that copyright is one of the rudimentary areas to have inveigled the surveillance of the international community. As a substance of fact, copyright, historically incommensurate to truncated circles of specialists and experts, has gambolled to public opprobrium mainly because of the new information technologies and, most of all, because of the expeditious evolution of the Internet. If, traditionally, one were to synchronize the interrelation of the rights of the classic creative chain: (a) authors and creative artists – (b) producers and distributors, generally referred to as "cultural industries" - and (c) public, now, in the new digital environment, new and powerful actors have appeared. The economic interests of these actors are often contradictory to those of the owners of copyright and therefore they tend to consider 'copyright' a very old- fashioned concept for their businesses.

Universal computer-based communications cut through international borders, creating a new dominion of human activity and damage the practicability and legality of laws based on terrestrial boundaries ^[15]. Digital knowledge has made copyright execution difficult to accomplish. Such a network of national codes may have sufficed in an era when the distribution or performance of works occurred within easily identifiable and discrete geographic boundaries. On the other hand, "instantaneous and simultaneous universal access to copyrighted works over digital systems primarily contests territorial notions in copyright" and confounds traditional choice of law doctrine because it is often hard to conclude where certain acts have happened in order to decide which copyright law to apply. Support for inventiveness as a mechanism for cultural and economic development is ludicrous nowadays without an

unambiguous attentiveness in benevolence of originator and cultural industries. Currently the ideal contraption for revitalizing cultural diversity is the erection, fabrication and worldwide circulation of as many heterogeneity of cultural goods as possible so as to safeguard multiracialism cultural offer. The subsequent grail is, however, to mould a better world for all, where technologies are at the amenity of human beings and where our ingenious diversity is inoculated, appreciated and agnized.

The progress in technology posed new contests to the existing copyright laws, as the law was originally developed in the administration of print media that gradually brought under its protective shelter creative works, paintings, drawings, sculptures, which later stretched to photography and cinema as well. These age-old regulations and their essential notions in copyright law had to be re-examined, so as to make digital social record progress. The technological duplicators or recorders make the digital data simply accessible, which could lead to misuse of the work vis a vis a free movement of information in society, as the instant this digital record is placed in the public domain on the internet the author loses all control. Therefore, as Copyright law per se allowances certain negative rights to its owners to avoid anyone from doing acts relating to his work, as the Copyright law has now been amended to suit the new age digitization.

Copyright Protection: An Emerging Trend

USA was the first nation to bring into operation the provisions of the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT). It legislated the Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998 that conferred protection of technological actions by separating it into two different categories being a measure that stop unlawful access of data and methods that prevent unlicensed copying. Thus it forbids circumvention of technological actions governing access. The second ingredient of the DMCA 1998 was it dealt with the technological measures used by authors to safeguard their copyright. However, this was strictly disapproved by the critics who state that this legislation prohibited scientific research and academic development; although the DMCA had a good impression in updating copyright law for the digital environment, as it was the first legislation of its kind.

The Digital Economy Act 2010 was passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom adaptable digital media and was announced by Lord Mendelssohn, it received Royal Sanction on 8 April 2010, and came into force on 8 June 2010. Nevertheless, the Open Rights Group, privacy and consumer rights organizations censured the online copyright violation provisions via section 3 to 18 of the Act, because it somewhat had a suggestion of a progressed response scheme, which could ultimately disconnect Internet accounts used for persistent copyright violation. The Group took their apprehensions to the House of Lords and raised concerns about the impact on businesses offering Internet access to their customers, such as libraries and universities.

Developing nations as they move in the digitization age, they face a major challenge as they are always reliant on developed countries, as a basis of information. Developing countries must be permitted to maintain freedoms for educational and research purposes. It is very essential that such works are accessible for the complete growth of the Country. Thus, providing access is important, although what form of access may depend in part upon

the sort of institution and its wish to involve in broad, public broadcasting.

Digital technology has created host of issues which needed an alacritous riposte.

In India a compendious undertaking of explicating copyright law was made latterly by way of a major refurbish of copyright law. It provided for punishment for those who in any way outmanoeuvre a technological measure pertaining for the impetus of shielding any of the rights confabulating by the Copyright Act. However, few exceptions were chisel out to asphalt for legitimate use of copyright material while confronting technology, which can be summate up as under (Section 65A of the Copyright (Amendment) Act 2012). The gamut of the exoneration under this section should be incommodious to owners or operators who are expressly authorized by the owners to accomplish the task and should not be so extensive so as to besmear any operator in general. One of the major revolution made by India through these amendments was compliance with WIPO mandate without formally ratifying the WIPO Treaty.

The 2012 Amendment has pioneered a new Section 53 which provides a meticulous procedure where the owner of the copyright can make an application to the Commissioner of Customs (or any other authorized officer) for seizing of infringing copies of works that are imported into India.

This amendment seems to be in oblique with the Intellectual Property Rights (Imported Goods) Enforcement Rules, 2007. After analysis of the evidence embellished by the owner of the right and on being satisfied, the Commissioner may serve infringing copies of the work as proscribed goods that have been imported into India, excluding goods in transit. When any goods treated as prohibited under the above provision have been impeded, the Customs Officer impeding them shall inform the importer as well as the person who gave notice, of the detention of such goods within forty-eight hours of their detention. The present provision appears to be a succour to the copyright owner to prevent import of infringing copies into India. However, the Customs authorities have limited right to detain the goods till the copyright owner obtains court order. It is very difficult for the copyright holders to convince regarding the unregistered copyright ownership to the authorities and therefore, it is required to issue rules in respect of unregistered copyright for better implementation of the object of this provision.

Further, in the case of the Gramophone Co. of India Ltd. v. B.B. Pandey, (1984 (2) SCC 534. SC)^[16], the Supreme Court of India concluded that the word 'import' in Sections 51 and 53 of the Act means 'bringing into India from outside India' and is not limited to importation for trade only but includes importation for transportation across the country. The moment goods enter India, even if it is on transit it is prone to violation of copyright. However, the Amendment has carved out "good in transit" from the "prohibited goods" for the purpose of this Section.

Need for International Harmonization

Harmonization is a process by which the diversifying laws of divergent sovereign entities are gambolled in order to manifest a conventional set of legal principles they acknowledge to follow. Even though the word harmonization is often used so it emerge synonymous with unification, it has a much rambling insinuation, because it seeks to harmonize various legal systems by

annihilating paramount differences and fabricating minimum requirements; unlike unification, which leads to a unwavering set of agreed rules or replacement of two or more legal systems with one legal system.

Given the borderless nature of the Internet and its capacity of transferring works almost at a lightning speed, copyright security has become more and more difficult^[17]. The difficulties created by latest technological developments cannot be resolved by the decisions of individual countries. With the Internet, copyrighted works continue to be exposed to outside piracy even if secured in the home country. Therefore, it is essential to balance between the easy violation and expensive implementation; it is also essential to address the suspicions involved in the international lawsuit. No doubt, to some level these suspicions are common to all litigations, but in most other situations there is, at least, a larger amount of instance for successful results. The more doubt about the processes of application, relevant laws, or the probable results, the more unwilling copyright owners will try to impose their rights overseas. The issue for a copyright holder is not only the potential loss of incomes due to the violation but also the other costs spent in failed litigation. Implementing judgments would be easy if all the offenders were citizens of the country of the court that pronounced the judgment.

In the case of alien offenders, it would also be straightforward if they had belongings inside that country. However, foreign offenders with no belongings in the forum country generate a problem. It can be problematic to have national judgments imposed in the foreign country where the offender lives or has belongings, and it is also difficult, expensive, and time-consuming the need to chase additional copyright litigation abroad. The omnipresent nature of online transfer systems requires the attention of international enforcement, which will to some point need the harmonization of domestic laws regarding execution measures and enable the cross-border safeguard of copyright in the digital age. Clear rules about the implementation of initial orders and monetary judgments will reduce the inconvenience of dealing with the unknowns. Even if the cost of the international lawsuit would only be slightly reduced, the increased certainty and chance of victory would improve the balance between the unfettered violation and expensive execution. With escalating interest in foreign economies, the interest in harmonization will also proliferate to make transactions and access more methodical. However, since many nations endeavour to perpetuate their sovereign status, they have unprecedented national interests and different laws. Thus, harmonization of intellectual property is a lacklustre procedure of careful intercession and severance of affairs of copyright.

Harmonization is a procedure without a explicate start and consummate point. We could say it is proficient when developing and already established countries have a serviceable system, approachable to all interested parties, with an unprejudiced and unbiased organization to disentangle antagonism. Since countries oscillate in their scientific and technological advances as well as in their socio – economic structures, an optimal intellectual property system need to be resilient and transparent as well.

Legal Protection of Technological Measures Under Indian Copyright Law

With the thickening of technological technique of dissipating protected material, right owners have thrived, and are still

developing, technological measures focussed at protecting their material against unaccredited use. The objective of technological protection measures is to inoculate or shield works in digital configuration. It can be unsegregated in software or forge into the hardware. The dawn of Internet lubricates the manufacture and touting of circumvention devices, and the subsequent dissemination of copies of works whose technological protection measures have been circumvented, at a global scale, constituting disquieting challenges for the efficacious protection of copyright owner's interests.

The Indian Copyright Law mostly comprises of the Copyright Act^[18]. To meet with the national and international requirements, the Act has been modified five times, previous to 2012, once each in the years 1983, 1984, 1993, 1994 and 1999 to meet with the national and international requirements. The amendment of 1994 were an answer to the technical changes in the means of communication such as broadcasting and telecasting and the development of new machinery like computer software. Further the Amendments pronounced by the Copyright Amendment Act, 2012 are essential in terms of range as they talk about the challenges posed by the Internet and go beyond these challenges in their range. The most recent Amendment complements the Copyright Act, 1957 with WCT and WPPT. With these amendments, the Indian Copyright Law has developed a progressive piece of legislation and the overall opinion is that, excepting a few aspects, the amended Act is capable of fronting copyright challenges of digital technologies as well as those of Internet.

With the amendment of Copyright Act in the year 2012, a new Section 65A has been inserted which gives protection against technological measures which is used by the copyright holder to guard his rights on his work. Any individual who avoids an effective technological measure applied for the guarding any of the rights, with the aim of overstepping such rights, shall be punishable with imprisonment which may range to two years and he shall also be accountable to fine. Sub-section (2) of Section 65A provides for some exceptions. The bar shall not avoid doing anything for a purpose not specifically prohibited by the Act (thus allowing enjoyment of fair use provisions). However, if any person facilitating escape by another person of a technical measure for such a purpose than it shall maintain a complete record of such other person which includes his name, address and all the relevant records which are necessary to identify him and the purpose for which he has been facilitated.

Conclusion

The growth of copyright has been closely associated with technological progress. Though most of the technologies made copyright protection more problematic, digital computers managed to amend the fundamental concepts behind copyright. These tests to copyright industry have arisen at a time when the share of copyright in national economies is reaching exceptional levels. It becomes critical to regulate the legal system to answer back to the new technological developments in an effective and proper way, keeping in view the speed and pace of these developments. This will maintain a stability between the stakeholders be it uses or creators for the public interest. In order to do so, the emphasis of the anti-circumvention regulation should be to aim at the technologically class persons who have the potential to become circumventors, and the producers and

suppliers of circumvention-enabling devices. In most situations, technologically sophisticated persons, though comparatively small in number, have the technological knowledge of how to avoid technological measures. On the contrary, normal users are by no means have the sufficient technological knowledge regarding the protection by the defeating devices in order to avoid technological measures. It is important to note that the welfare of both developed and developing countries cannot be fulfilled in the digital domain due to the absence of territorial limits. Therefore, it is correct to have one single statute for the whole world being a strong DRM system.

Therefore, all content owners across the world would be cheered to do more trade on the internet which end result leads to more profits because of the wide reach and quality offered by the digital world. This, in turn, would provide good monetary incentives, which would end in a development in the use and formation of useful arts. Therefore, it would work to have strong laws against avoidance of DRM systems in order to restraint piracy to a large amount.

It seems ineluctable that the digital networked environment will eventually postulate more exhaustive transmute to the copyright system not only to indemnify requisite protection to right holders, but also to harbour the constitutional interests of users of protected works. The amalgamation of legislative approach will, it is submitted, be the only efficacious way of trading with the problems propounded for the exercise of copyright and related rights in the imprecise environment moulded by the Internet and other international communication systems.

On account of the indivisible nature of the Internet having dissimilar rules for different nations, based on the progress status of the country, works out to be cumbersome. Therefore, in mutual interests of both developed and developing countries, it would be beneficial for the world as a whole to have a strong legal safety against avoidance of DRM systems thereby inspiring creativity in useful arts, which in turn is valuable for everyone.

References

1. USee generally Peter Jaszi, *International Copyright from Basics to Current Issues*, in *Advanced Seminar on Copyright Law 2001*, 653 PLI/Pat 301 (2001). See, e.g, Martin Wainwright, *Harry Potter and the Wizard Idea to Foil Cinema Pirates*, *The Guardian*, 2004.
2. Goldstein P. *International Copyright: Principles, Law and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
3. Spoor JH. *The Impact of Copyright in Benelux Design Protection Law*. In P. B. Hugenholtz (ed.), *The Future of Copyright in a Digital Environment* Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1996, 54-86.
4. Ricketson S. *The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works: 1886- 1986*. London: Centre for Commercial Law Studies, Queen Mary College, 1987.
5. Gulla RK. *Digital Transformation of Copyright Laws and the Misty Indian Perspective*, *Icfai Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 2007:6(3):1-26
6. The term ‘work’ is being used here to restrict this discussion to RMI in data that may be subject to copyright.
7. For example, “Mark Perry” indicates the authorship of this paper, which may lead to assumptions regarding moral rights or economic rights in the absence of other more detailed indications.

8. Jonathan Weinberg, “Hardware-Based ID, Right Management, and Trusted systems” uses the UNIX example, in N. Elkin Karen & N.W. Netanel, Eds. *The Commodification of Information* New York: Aspen Publishers, 1999, 343-64.
9. Schlachter E. *The Intellectual Property Renaissance in Cyberspace: Why Copyright Law Could Be Unimportant on the Internet*, *Berkeley Technology and Law Journal*, 1997:14:1-25
10. Article 12 of WCT and Article 19 of WPPT
11. Samuelson P. *The US Digital Agenda at WIPO*, *Virginia Journal of International Law*, 1997:37:369-440.
12. Article 19 of WCT
13. Article 12 of the WCT
14. *Agreed Statement concerning Article 19 of the WPPT*
15. Austin, Graeme W. *Domestic Laws and Foreign Rights: Choice of Law in Transnational Copyright Infringement Litigation*, *Columbia - VLA Journal of Law & the Arts*, 1999:23:1-46.
16. (1984 (2) SCC 534. SC).
17. WIPO. *Intellectual Property Reading Material*, WIPO, Geneva, 1998.
18. *The Copyright Act 1957*.