

Intellectual Property (LAWW3030) (M33139)

[View Online](#)

1.

Bently, L., Sherman, B., Gangjee, D. & Johnson, P. Intellectual property law. (Oxford University Press, 2018).

2.

Torremans, P. & Holyoak, J. Holyoak and Torremans intellectual property law. (Oxford University Press, 2016).

3.

Green v Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand [1989] 2 All ER 1056.

4.

Creation Records v News Group Newspapers [1997] EMLR 444.

5.

Norowzian v Arks Ltd (No2) [2000] FSR 363.

6.

Lucasfilm Ltd & Ors v Ainsworth & Anor [2011] UKSC 39 (27 July 2011).

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 **30**, 229–254 (2010).

9.

Bently, L. & Sherman, B. Intellectual property law. (Oxford University Press, 2018).

10.

Torremans, P. & Holyoak, J. Holyoak and Torremans intellectual property law. (Oxford University Press, 2016).

11.

Designers Guild Ltd v Russell Williams (Textiles) Ltd [2000] 1 WLR 2416.

12.

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

13.

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

14.

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

15.

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

16.

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

17.

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

18.

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

19.

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

20.

Copyright in photographs. European Intellectual Property Review (2000).

21.

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

22.

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

23.

An Intentional View of the Copyright Work. *Modern Law Review* **71**, 535–558 (2008).

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* **44**, 4–34 (2013).

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* **240**, 5–117 (2014).

26.

Bently, L. & Sherman, B. *Intellectual property law*. (Oxford University Press, 2018).

27.

Torremans, P. & Holyoak, J. *Holyoak and Torremans intellectual property law*. (Oxford University Press, 2016).

28.

Francis Day & Hunter v Bron [1963] Ch 587.

29.

Designers Guild Ltd v Russell Williams (Textiles) Ltd [2000] 1 WLR 2416.

30.

Norowzian v Arks Ltd (No2) [2000] FSR 363.

31.

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

32.

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

33.

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

34.

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

35.

Test of infringement: what is it now? European intellectual property review (2014).

36.

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

37.

Joy: a reply. Intellectual Property Quarterly (2001).

38.

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

39.

Derclaye, E. Debunking some of UK copyright law's longstanding myths and

misunderstandings. Intellectual Property Quarterly (2013).

40.

Griffiths, J. Dematerialization, Pragmatism and the European Copyright Revolution. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies **33**, 767–790 (2013).

41.

Bently, L. & Sherman, B. Intellectual property law. (Oxford University Press, 2018).

42.

Torremans, P. & Holyoak, J. Holyoak and Torremans intellectual property law. (Oxford University Press, 2016).

43.

Hubbard v Vosper [1972] 2 QB 84.

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.

45.

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

46.

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

47.

Ashdown v Telegraph Group Ltd [2002] Ch 149.

48.

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

49.

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

50.

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

51.

Griffiths, J. Pre-empting conflict - a re-examination of the public interest defence in UK copyright law. Legal Studies **34**, 76-102 (2014).

52.

Bently, L., Sherman, B., Gangjee, D. & Johnson, P. Chapter 10, from: Intellectual Property Law. in Intellectual property law (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.

55.

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

56.

Pasterfield v Denham [1999] FSR 168.

57.

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

58.

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

59.

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

60.

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