
Index – Volume 22

Account of profits for patent infringement, 20–24

- apportionment, 22–23
- deduction, 21–22
- discretion to award, 23–24
- making the election, 27
- type of profit, 22

Acohs Pty Ltd v Ucorp Pty Ltd

- copyright in databases, 39–40

Advanced Building Systems Pty Ltd v Ramset Fasteners (Aust) Pty Ltd

- damages for patent infringement, 13–16

Anheuser-Busch Inc v Budejovicky Budvar (1984)

- determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 124–125

Anterior skill and effort

- in databases, 89–91

Approval — see Authorisation

Artistic craftsmanship

- fashion design protection and, 199

Australian Consumer Law (ACL)

- unfair contract terms, in parental liability for internet use, 169–171

Authorisation

- under copyright law, and “the nature of any relationship,” 172–196
 - early cases, 175–179
 - illustrative examples, 193–195
 - modern cases, 179–182
 - transitional cases, 179
- as meaning granting or purporting to grant a right, 189–190
- parental liability for internet use, 162–169
- reasonable steps and the relationship, 191–193

Authorise

- use of word, 173

Authorised users

- trademarks, 7

Authorship

- copyright in computer-generated work
 - evolution of, 30–33
 - need for legislative change, 29–45
 - proposed amendments, 44
- copyright in databases, 89
- proposed amendments, 44

Book reviews

- Australian Trade Mark Law*, by Burrell and Handler, 46–47

Breach of contract

- parental liability for internet use, 169–171

Bundling

competition law and, 63

Cadbury–Schweppes Pty Ltd v Pub Squash Co Ltd [1980]

determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 123–124

Causation

originality of databases and, 94

Children

parental liability for internet copyright infringement by, 161–171

Clothing — *see* **Fashion design protection**

Collaborative publications — *see* **Databases**

Commerce Act 1986 (NZ)

IP licensing safe harbours and, 54–56

Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth) (formerly Trade Practices Act 1974)

IP licensing safe harbours and, 54–55

Competition law

relationship with intellectual property law, 52–65

tests for tying practices, 63

typical IP licensing provisions and, 61–65

Complex compilations — *see* **Databases**

Composition

musicological and legal perspectives on music borrowing, 137–156

Computer-generated work

copyright in

need for legislative change, 29–45

United Kingdom, 33–34

United States, 34–35

evolution of authorship, 30–33

Contracts

parental liability for internet use in, 169–171

Convention on Tobacco Control

cigarette plain packaging and, 80–82

Copyright

boundaries of copyright in dramatic works, 106–118

copyright subsistence criteria and musical works, 147–149

direction of skill and effort, 91–96

duration

fashion design protection, 205

proposed new subsection, 44

fashion design — *see* **Fashion design protection**

music as subject matter protectable under, 145–147

originality and, 96–100

fashion design protection, 204–205

firework displays, 116–117

proposed new subsection, 44

proposed reforms, 100–101

Copyright Act 1968 (Cth)

- anti-overlap provisions, impact on fashion design, 199, 206
- authorisation of copyright infringement under, and “the nature of any relationship,” 172–196
- copyright in computer-generated work
 - need for legislative change, 29–45
- copyright in computer-generated work, need for legislative change, 100–101
- firework displays, 106–118
- ownership of and rights in, 149
- parental liability for internet use, 163, 166–167, 169–170
- proposed amendments, 42–44
- s 10, authorship
 - proposed amendments, 44
- s 32(5), originality
 - proposed new subsection, 44
- s 32(6), duration
 - proposed new subsection, 44

Copyright Act 1976 (US)

- Innovative Design Protection and Piracy Prevention Act amendment, 197–210

Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 (UK)

- copyright in computer-generated work, 33–34

Copyright infringement

- authorisation under copyright law and “the nature of any relationship,” 172–196
 - consequences of relationship factor, 195
- graduated response schemes and parental liability, 161–171
- IceTV v Nine Network Australia* and need for legislative change, 29–45
- music borrowing, 150–153
- “substantially identical” test for fashion designs, 204–205

Copyright Law Review Committee (CLRC)

- copyright in computer-generated work, 35–36

Countenancing — see Authorisation**Damages for patent infringement, 10–20**

- additional damages, 24–25
- damages “at large,” 20
- licence fees, 17
- lost profits, 11–17
- making the election, 27
- reasonable royalty, 17–20

Databases

- anterior skill and effort, 89–91
- authorship, 89
- copyright in computer-generated work, need for legislative change, 29–45
- direction of skill and effort, 91–96
- originality and, 87–88, 96–100
 - proposed reforms, 100–101

Deceptive conduct — see Misleading or deceptive conduct**Design patents**

- fashion design protection in the United States, 202–203

Design protection — *see* **Fashion design protection**

Designs Act 2003 (Cth)

fashion design protection under, 199–200

proposed one year grace period for fashion design, 198, 206–207

Digital Agenda Act

authorisation of copyright infringement and, 175

Digital material — *see* **Computer-generated work**

Directories — *see* **Databases**

Downstream products

price restrictions on, 62

Dramatic works

copyright in firework displays, 106–118

form in, 112–116

historical factors, 110–112, 114–115

human performers in, 109–110, 116–117

E & J Gallo Winery v Lion Nathan Australia Pty Ltd

uncertainties regarding, 4–9

Enforcement

as misuse of market power, 55–56

Essential facilities doctrine, 57–58

IP and, 60–61

Fair use

expansion of to include use of information, 101

Fashion design protection

creation of trends through copying, 198, 204, 207, 209

current state in Australia, 199–200

current state in the US, 200–203

denying frivolous lawsuits, 205

overcoming lack of protection, 203–207

reduced duration for fashion design copyright, 205

US “fashion Bill” as a model for, 197–210

FCTC (Framework Convention on Tobacco Control)

cigarette plain packaging and, 80–82

Firework displays

copyright in, 106–118

Formalist perspective of copyright law

copyright in firework displays, 106–118

Garment designs — *see* **Fashion design protection**

Good faith

use of trademarks in, 7

Goodwill

determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 119–136

Graduated response schemes

parental liability for internet use, 161–171

Household internet connections — *see* **Parental liability for internet use**

IceTV v Nine Network Australia

- copyright in computer-generated work
 - need for legislative change, 29–45
 - shortcomings in law highlighted by, 36–39
- facts and findings in, 88–89
- immediate effects of and alternatives to, 100–101

iiNet internet service

- authorisation of primary infringements, 181–182, 192, 196

Indicia — *see* **Reputation-based claims**

Indifference — *see* **Authorisation**

Infringement — *see* **Copyright infringement; Patent infringement and invalidity disputes**

Infringement notices — *see* **Graduated response schemes**

Innovation

- competition law scrutiny and, 54

Innovative Design Protection and Piracy Prevention Act

- fashion design protection, 197–210

Intellectual property

- rationale, 53

Intellectual property law

- relationship with competition law, 52–65

Internet service providers (ISPs)

- graduated response schemes for internet copyright infringement, 161–171
- parental liability for internet use in contract and, 169–171

Joint tortfeasors

- authorisation of copyright infringement, 173, 176, 193, 195

Larrikin case

- copyright infringement through music borrowing, 150–153

Liability of parents — *see* **Parental liability for internet use**

Licensing

- refusals to license, 56–60

Mapping services — *see* **Computer-generated work**

Market power, 55–61 — *see also* **Refusals to license**

- essential facilities doctrine, 60–61
- IP enforcement as misuse of, 55–56
- refusals to license, 56–60

Misleading or deceptive conduct

- determining “relevant date” for claims of, 119–136
- passing off compared with, 131–134

Misuse of market power — *see* **Market power**

Monetary remedies

damages or an account of profits for infringement, 10–28

Monopoly

IP-competition law relationship and, 53

Moorhouse – see University of New South Wales v Moorhouse (1975)

Multilateral licensing provisions

competition law and IP licensing provisions, 64–65

Music borrowing

conscious vs subconscious borrowing, 141–143
copyright infringement, 150–153
doctrine of sustainability, 154–155
limited stock of musical building blocks, 143–145
musicological and legal perspectives on, 137–156
reproduction, adaptation or something else, 149–150
sampling distinguished from, 139–141
as subject matter protectable under copyright law, 145–147

Musical works

copyright subsistence criteria and musical works, 147–149

Names, reputation subsisting in — see Reputation-based claims

No-challenge clauses

competition law and IP licensing provisions, 64

Non-price restrictions

competition law and, 62

Norman Kark Publications v Odhams Press Ltd [1962]

determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 123

Novelty

fashion design protection, 204–205

Package licensing

competition law and, 63

Parallel importation

non-use applications regarding trademarks, 6–7

Parental liability for internet use

contract law, 169–171
graduated response schemes, 161–171
tort law, 162–169

Passing off

compared with misleading or deceptive conduct, 131–134, 136
determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 119–136

Patent infringement and invalidity disputes

account of profits for, 20–24
damages for, 10–20
defences, 25–27
 ‘innocent’ infringement, 25
 s 115 good faith defence, 26
 s 115 reasonable skill and knowledge defence, 26–27
making the election, 27

Patents

infringement and invalidity disputes — *see* **Patent infringement and invalidity disputes**
US design patents for fashion, 202–203

Pay-for-delay

competition law and IP licensing provisions, 64

Pearce v Paul Kingston Pty Ltd

damages for patent infringement, 19

Plain packaging

alternatives, 82–85
compatibility with TRIPS, 73–85
development, 67–68
effect on consumers, 70–73
effect on trademarks, 69–70
Tobacco Plain Packaging Bill 2011 (Cth), 68–69

Playcorp Group of Companies Pty Ltd v Peter Bodum A/S (2010)

determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 129–131

Power to prevent

authorisation under copyright law and “the nature of any relationship,” 172–196

Primary infringers

authorisation under copyright law and “the nature of any relationship,” 172–196

Pub Squash rule

determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 119–136

Publishers

copyright in computer-generated work, need for legislative change, 29–45

Reciprocal licensing provisions

competition law and IP licensing provisions, 64–65

Refusals to license

market power issues, 56–60

Relationships

authorisation under copyright law and “the nature of any relationship,” 172–196
consequences of relationship factor, 195
reasonable steps to prevent infringement, 191–193

“Relevant date”

determining for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 119–136

Reputation-based claims

determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 119–136

Resale price maintenance

competition law and, 62

Research and development

future restrictions on, 64

“Reverse payment” settlements

competition law and IP licensing provisions, 64

Royalties

competition law and, 61–62

Safe harbours

IP licensing and, 54–55

Sampling — *see also* **Music borrowing**

music borrowing distinguished from, 139–141

Sanctioning — *see* **Authorisation**

Skill and effort

originality of databases and, 94–96

Software — *see* **Computer-generated work**

Substantiality test

applied to musical works, 137–156

Sui generis regimes

database protection, 100

fashion design protection, 198, 207

Sustainability doctrine

music borrowing and, 154–155

Taco Co of Australia Inc v Taco Bell Pty Ltd (1982)

determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 126–128

Telstra Corp Ltd v Phone Directories Co Pty Ltd

copyright in databases, 40–42

facts and findings in, 89

immediate effects of and alternatives to, 100–101

Thai World Import & Export Co Ltd v Shuey Shing Pty Ltd (1989)

determining “relevant date” for claims of misleading or deceptive conduct, 128–129

“Three strike” policy — *see* **Graduated response schemes**

Tobacco — *see* **Plain packaging**

Tort

parental liability for internet use, 162–169

Trademarks

Australian Trade Mark Law, book review, 46–47

E & J Gallo Winery v Lion Nathan Australia Pty Ltd, 4–9

non-use applications, 4–9

plain packaging and, 69–70

and trade dress, for fashion designs, 197–198, 208

TRIPS and, 73–85

TRIPS

plain packaging compatibility with, 73–85

Tying arrangements

competition law and, 63

Unilin Beeher BV v Huili Building Materials Pty Ltd and Others (No 2)

account of profits for patent infringement, 21–22

University of New South Wales v Moorhouse (1975)

authorisation under copyright law and “the nature of any relationship,” 172–196

as authority for ‘sanction, approve, countenance,’ 187–189

modern cases relying on, 184–187

Unregistered design regime

fashion design protection, 198, 207

Vertical price fixing

competition law and, 62

Vicarious liability — *see* **Parental liability for internet use**