

Australian Intellectual Property Journal

Volume 29, Number 4

June 2019

EDITORIAL – *General Editor: David Lindsay* 181

ARTICLES

Music in Campaigns: Does the Moral Right of Integrity Protect Musicians from Political (Mis)Appropriation? – *Jessica Turley*

Music regularly features in political campaigns and rallies, often without the express consent of songwriters and performers. This political appropriation of music can threaten the integrity of songwriters and performers through false implications of endorsement or association. Australian copyright law protects songwriters from the political appropriation of music – within prescribed limitations – through the moral right of integrity of authorship. However, it fails to provide sufficient protection for recording artists, who receive the lesser moral right of integrity of performership. This article explores the different treatment of these two rights in Australia and abroad, and it concludes that the lack of protection of recording artists deserves rectification. In the absence of other effective protection, this article calls for legislative intervention to better protect performers against the political appropriation of music. 183

The Impact of Interlocutory Injunctions on the Biosimilars Industry: Re-adjusting the Balance of Convenience with Public Interest – *Bryanna Workman*

This article considers the granting of interlocutory injunctions in the context of patents for biologic medicines. Bringing these life-saving products to market can be very expensive because of the need to show they are safe and effective. Biosimilars are reproductions of original biologic medicines that can often be sold at a lower price, allowing greater access to medicines. Interlocutory injunctions play an important role in regulating the balance between enforcing patent rights and allowing access to cheaper forms of medicine before final judgment. The article outlines the principles for granting interlocutory injunctions and how these principles may need to be adjusted to take account of the unique challenges faced by the biologic and biosimilar industries. The article discusses *F Hoffman-La Roche AG v Sandoz Pty Ltd*, the first Australian case to consider an interlocutory injunction against a biosimilar, highlighting lessons for future respondents in such proceedings and possibilities for reform. 198

Patenting Bioprinted Structures in a Clime of Moral Uncertainty: Time to Amend the Patents Act? – *Olumayowa O. Adesanya*

The role of morality in Australia’s patent regime has remained largely uncertain owing in part to a general reluctance to engage with the “general inconvenience” proviso. The prevailing view is that matters of morality and indeed ethics are within the exclusive purview of the legislature. Unfortunately, despite repeated attempts at law reform, the situation remains largely unchanged. Drawing from the words of the Australian Law Reform Commission in its 2004 *Genes and Ingenuity Report*, it appears there has been no compelling case for amending the *Patents Act 1990* (Cth) to allow expressly for the

exclusion of particular subject matter from patentability on social or ethical grounds. More than a decade on, the question is whether this statement holds true. Accordingly, this article evaluates the current ethical exclusions in Australia’s patent regime in light of the dilemma posed by patenting bioprinted structures and considers whether this presents a compelling enough case for the amendment of the *Patents Act 1990*. 222

VOLUME 29 – 2018–2019

Table of Authors 241
Index 243