

Intellectual Property (LAWW3030) (M33139)

[View Online](#)

-
1.

Bently L, Sherman B, Gangjee D, Johnson P. Intellectual Property Law. 5th ed. Oxford University Press; 2018.
 2.

Torremans P, Holyoak J. Holyoak and Torremans Intellectual Property Law. 8th ed. Oxford University Press; 2016.
 3.

Green v Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand [1989] 2 All ER 1056.
<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjloYCNZyJn3WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>
 4.

Creation Records v News Group Newspapers [1997] EMLR 444.
<https://www.justcite.com/Document/e7jsrUrxA0LxsKjloXajN4edlIOuDYL2CKL2y0L2BULezlOdm9baa>
 5.

Norowzian v Arks Ltd (No2) [2000] FSR 363.
<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjloYCdXyZm5WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>
 - 6.

Lucasfilm Ltd & Ors v Ainsworth & Anor [2011] UKSC 39 (27 July 2011).
[https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/format.cgi?doc=/uk/cases/UKSC/2011/39.html&query=\(.2011.\)+AND+\(UKSC\)+AND+\(39\)](https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/format.cgi?doc=/uk/cases/UKSC/2011/39.html&query=(.2011.)+AND+(UKSC)+AND+(39))

7.

C-393/09 Bezpečnostní softwarová asociace - Svaz softwarové ochrany v Ministerstvo kultury [2011] ECDR 3. <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-393/09>

8.

Copyright and Its Categories of Original Works. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 2010;30(2):229-254. doi:10.1093/ojls/gqq009

9.

Bently L, Sherman B. Intellectual Property Law. 5th ed. Oxford University Press; 2018.

10.

Torremans P, Holyoak J. Holyoak and Torremans Intellectual Property Law. 8th ed. Oxford University Press; 2016.

11.

Designers Guild Ltd v Russell Williams (Textiles) Ltd [2000] 1 WLR 2416.
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&suppsrguid=ia744cc630000014d9f733755dc297a23&docguid=I98667580E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&hitguid=I98664E70E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=196&crumb-action=append&context=80&resolvein=true>

12.

Sawkins v Hyperion Records Ltd [2005] EWCA Civ 565 [2005] 3 All ER 636.
<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjloZKZm0WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF/sawkins-v-hyperion-records-ltd>

13.

C-5/08 Infopaq International A/S v Danske Dagblades Forening [2009] ECDR 16.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo2Cto5GtmWWIikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>

14.

C-604/10 Football Dataco Ltd v Yahoo! UK Ltd [2012] 2 CMLR 24.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo4edm1Gto5WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF/football-dataco-ltd-v-yahoo-uk-ltd-c60410>

15.

The idea/expression dichotomy and the games that people play. European Intellectual Property Review. Published online 1995.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=ia744c0970000014d9f774bbc6d6f5f645&docguid=IB8E874F0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&hitguid=IB8E874F0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=1&crumb-action=append&context=89&resolvein=true>

16.

Patrick Masiyakurima. The futility of the idea/expression dichotomy in UK copyright law. International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=IC163EEB08C7F11DDA308CE7DDE22A835>

17.

Derclaye E. Wonderful or worrisome? The impact of the ECJ ruling in Infopaq on UK copyright law. European Intellectual Property Review. 2010;32(5).

<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IB72704A030AC11DF9C83BB18AACF6BDB/View/FullText.html?transitionType=Default&contextData=%28sc.Default%29>

18.

University of London Press v University Tutorial Press [1916] 2 Ch 601.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/f7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo2GJmYiZnSils1jxAZrWAjrxAV5wsKjloW0ha>

19.

Ladbroke (Football) Ltd v William Hill (Football) Ltd [1964] 1 WLR 273.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/f7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo2udo0ytoSils1jxAZrwAJrxAV5wsKjloW0ha>

20.

Copyright in photographs. European Intellectual Property Review. Published online 2000.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=ia744cc630000014da017fb0120102e0c&docguid=IB799ADD0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&hitguid=IB799ADD0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=3&crumb-action=append&context=9&resolvein=true>

21.

Photographing paintings in the public domain: a response to Garnett. European Intellectual Property Review. Published online 2001.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&src=ri&docguid=IB7886FC0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&hitguid=IB7886FC0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&srguid=i0ad629030000014d9f591f4f101e575a&spos=1&epos=1&td=3&refer=%2Fmaf%2Fwluk%2Fapp%2Fdocument%3Fdocguid%3DICFAADD40E71211DA915EF37CAC72F838%26td%3D3%26spos%3D1%26suppsrguid%3Di0ad629030000014d9f591f4f101e575a%26refer%3D%252Fmaf%252Fwluk%252Fapp%252Fdocument%253Ftd%253D3%2526spos%253D1%2526rank%253D1%2526epos%253D1%2526hitguid%253DIB7886FC0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028%2526docguid%253DIB7886FC0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028%2526resolvein%253Dtrue%2526srguid%253Di0ad629030000014d9f591f4f101e575a%2526crumb-action%253Dappend%2526context%253D5%26epos%3D1%26src%3Dri%26hitguid%3DIB7886FC0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028%26crumb-action%3Dappend%26context%3D16&crumb-action=append&context=32>

22.

The compatibility of the skill and labour originality standard with the Berne Convention and the TRIPs Agreement. European Intellectual Property Review. Published online 2004.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=ia744c09a0000014d9f6fb5dac7d18af6&docguid=IB744D711E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&hitguid=IB744D711E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=1&crumb-action=append&context=57&resolvein=true>

23.

An Intentional View of the Copyright Work. Modern Law Review. 2008;71(4):535-558.

doi:10.1111/j.1468-2230.2008.00705.x

24.

Rahmatian A. Originality in UK Copyright Law: The Old "Skill and Labour" Doctrine Under Pressure. IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law. 2013;44(1):4-34. doi:10.1007/s40319-012-0003-4

25.

Derclaye E. Assessing the impact and reception of the Court of Justice of the European Union case law on UK copyright law: what does the future hold? *Revue Internationale du Droit d'auteur*. 2014;240:5-117. <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/3613/>

26.

Bently L, Sherman B. *Intellectual Property Law*. 5th ed. Oxford University Press; 2018.

27.

Torremans P, Holyoak J. *Holyoak and Torremans Intellectual Property Law*. 8th ed. Oxford University Press; 2016.

28.

Francis Day & Hunter v Bron [1963] Ch 587.
<https://www.justcite.com/Document/f7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo2udo4iJmSiIs1jxAZrwAJrxAV5wsKjloW0ha>

29.

Designers Guild Ltd v Russell Williams (Textiles) Ltd [2000] 1 WLR 2416.
<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo4mdn0WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>

30.

Norowzian v Arks Ltd (No2) [2000] FSR 363.
<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjloYCdoXyZm5WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>

31.

Newspaper Licensing Agency Ltd v Marks and Spencer Plc [2003] 1 AC 551.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo3aJn4WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>

32.

Baigent v Random House Group Ltd [2006] EWHC 719 (Ch).

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&suppsrguid=i0ad629030000014d9f7c65405ffdddf4&docguid=I6D9771B0E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&hitguid=I6D972391E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=52&crumb-action=append&context=107&resolvein=true>

33.

C-5/08 Infopaq International A/S v Danske Dagblades Forening [2009] ECDR 16.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo2Cto5GtmWWlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>

34.

The hedgehog and the fox, a substantial part of the law of copyright? European Intellectual Property Review. Published online 2001.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=ia744c0970000014d9f807c4558b0afb3&docguid=IB78F4D90E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&hitguid=IB78F4D90E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028&rank=2&spos=2&epos=2&td=2&crumb-action=append&context=125&resolvein=true>

35.

Test of infringement: what is it now? European intellectual property review. Published online 2014.

36.

'Joy' for the claimant: can a film also be protected as a dramatic work? Intellectual Property Quarterly. Published online 2000.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=ia744c09a0000014d87a4ec45c7cffa7a&docguid=I7FA49810E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&hitguid=I7FA49810E45411>

DA92358E85EE602D8A&rank=2&spos=2&epos=2&td=34&crumb-action=append&context=70&resolvein=true

37.

Joy: a reply. Intellectual Property Quarterly. Published online 2001.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=ia744c0970000014d87a6fd800a3bb51f&docguid=I7FA50D40E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&hitguid=I7FA50D40E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=51&crumb-action=append&context=79&resolvein=true>

38.

British film copyright and the incorrect implementation of the E.C. Copyright Directives. Entertainment Law Review. Published online 1998.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=i0ad69f8e0000014d87aca10f05dbc7f7&docguid=I81502530E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&hitguid=I81502530E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=1&crumb-action=append&context=107&resolvein=true>

39.

Derclaye E. Debunking some of UK copyright law's longstanding myths and misunderstandings. Intellectual Property Quarterly. Published online 2013.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I874421C0677511E28B5E802FB0D6A23E>

40.

Griffiths J. Dematerialization, Pragmatism and the European Copyright Revolution. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 2013;33(4):767-790. doi:10.1093/ojls/gqt017

41.

Bently L, Sherman B. Intellectual Property Law. 5th ed. Oxford University Press; 2018.

42.

Torremans P, Holyoak J. Holyoak and Torremans Intellectual Property Law. 8th ed. Oxford University Press; 2016.

43.

Hubbard v Vosper [1972] 2 QB 84.

<https://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&suppsrguid=i0ad6ada60000015f24a6c3d5f879d8da&docguid=IC4449F60E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&hitguid=IC4447850E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&p;td=1&crumb-action=append&context=29&resolvein=true>

44.

Pro Sieben Media AG v Carlton UK Television Ltd [1999] 1 WLR 605. *605 Pro Sieben Media A.G. v Carlton U.K. Television Ltd. and Another

<https://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&suppsrguid=i0ad6ada60000015f24a9d86df4f20ff0&docguid=I2914BA60E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&hitguid=I29149350E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&p;td=2&crumb-action=append&context=35&resolvein=true>

45.

Hyde Park Residence Ltd v Yelland [2001] Ch 143.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo3qZn4WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>

46.

Newspaper Licensing Agency Ltd v Marks and Spencer Plc [2003] 1 AC 551.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo3aJn4WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>

47.

Ashdown v Telegraph Group Ltd [2002] Ch 149.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjlo2yJnWWlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF>

48.

Preserving judicial freedom of movement - interpreting fair dealing in copyright law. Intellectual Property Quarterly. Published online 2002.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=i0ad629030000014da02>

426b5f04f995a&docguid=I7FB3DA50E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&hitguid=I7FB3DA50E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=3&crumb-action=append&context=28&resolvein=true

49.

Copyright law after Ashdown - time to deal fairly with the public. Intellectual Property Quarterly. Published online 2002.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=i0ad69f8e0000014da025b229c86a28e4&docguid=I7FB44F80E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&hitguid=I7FB44F80E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&rank=2&spos=2&epos=2&td=5&crumb-action=append&context=38&resolvein=true>

50.

Acknowledging the conflict between copyright law and freedom of expression under the Human Rights Act. Entertainment Law Review. Published online 2003.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=i0ad629030000014da02751782ac4c3e2&docguid=I849EDB00E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&hitguid=I849EDB00E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&rank=5&spos=5&epos=5&td=5&crumb-action=append&context=48&resolvein=true>

51.

Griffiths J. Pre-empting conflict - a re-examination of the public interest defence in UK copyright law. Legal Studies. 2014;34(1):76-102. doi:10.1111/lest.12006

52.

Bently L, Sherman B, Gangjee D, Johnson P. Chapter 10, from: Intellectual Property Law. In: Intellectual Property Law. 5th ed. Oxford University Press; 2018.

53.

Holyoak J, Torremans P. Intellectual Property Law. Butterworths; 1995.

54.

Sawkins v Hyperion Records Ltd [2005] EWCA Civ 565 [2005] 3 All ER 636.

<https://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjloZKZm0WlikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6>

atF/sawkins-v-hyperion-records-ltd

55.

Morrison Leahy Music Limited v Lightbond Limited [1995] EMLR 144.

<https://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=i0ad69f8e0000015f24b844b994f7cd73&docguid=I05B5B471E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&hitguid=I05B5B471E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=1&crumb-action=append&context=47&resolvein=true>

56.

Pasterfield v Denham [1999] FSR 168.

<https://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&suppsrguid=i0ad629030000015f24c082df1e63b7f9&docguid=I1A540670E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&hitguid=I1A53B850E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&td=1&crumb-action=append&context=66&resolvein=true>

57.

Gerald Dworkin. Moral rights in English law - the shape of rights to come. European Intellectual Property Review.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=IB9E8F500E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028>

58.

Stina Teilmann. Framing the law: the right of integrity in Britain. European Intellectual Property Review.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I7FA66CD0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

59.

Jane C. Ginsburg. Moral rights in a common law system. Entertainment Law Review.

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=IB13AD1D1E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028>

60.

W.R. Cornish. Moral rights under the 1988 Act. *European Intellectual Property Review*. 1989;11(12).

<https://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?access-method=toc&src=toce∓docguid=I7FB8BC51E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A&crumb-action=append&context=15>