

# Australian Intellectual Property Journal

Volume 34, Number 3

2024

EDITORIAL – *General Editor: David Lindsay* ..... 109

## ARTICLES

### **Topics of interest: Standing on the Shoulders of Giants (But Perhaps Failing to Acknowledge Them All): Some Thoughts on Plagiarism** – *David Llewelyn*

The words “plagiarism” and “plagiarist” are much used, and not infrequently abused. Words mean different things to different people at different times. Confusion often surrounds the decision whether and when to cite another as the source of a collection of words or an image; confusion that is commonly found in academia, at all levels, from student to faculty (and thence to administrators). What is acceptable or required by way of attribution in one field of study and research is criticised in another. The confusion increases when ideas enter the picture “were they my own or an amalgam of different thoughts encountered over the years and then developed?”. As the law struggles to meet the many challenges posed by generative AI (Artificial Intelligence) systems, it is surely incumbent on lawyers and policymakers as well as those in academia to interrogate from all angles what they mean by authenticity and originality, notions that lie at the heart of what most would view as “plagiarism”. The article offers some personal thoughts on a topic that too often leads to distasteful cant rather than the careful consideration it deserves. .... 110

### **Making a Meme Out of Copyright: Using Memes to Teach Copyright Law** – *Isabella Alexander and Joy Twemlow*

The move to online services during COVID-19, and the emergence of generative AI, are just some of the recent technological developments changing the practice of law. While intellectual property lawyers have always been acutely aware of the transformative potential of new technologies, these changes are increasingly impacting the whole of legal practice. Within this context, it is important to ensure law graduates are equipped with the skills required for this digital future. In this article, we argue that intellectual property (IP) educators are particularly well-placed to develop pedagogical innovations directed towards developing digital-ready graduates. Drawing on a teaching pilot at the University of Technology Sydney, we demonstrate how memes were used to engage critically with copyright assumptions and develop key skills in creativity and collaboration. This case study is just one example of the opportunities that exist in the intersections between IP law and emerging technologies for innovation in skills training. .... 123

**The Australian Best Method Doctrine: UK Roots and Lessons from US Law –  
*Yisheng R Chen***

Best method disclosure in a patent specification is a statutory requirement in Australia. The requirement was interpreted narrowly until 2016 when *Les Laboratoires Servier v Apotex Pty Ltd* was decided. A deep dive into the doctrinal development in the United Kingdom before 1977 and in the United States (US) before 2012 revealed that while the principles of quid pro quo social contract and public uberrima fide duty developed in the United Kingdom formed the common foundation for the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia, the best method doctrine developed under the 1949 *British Act* deviated from its original path and became unsuitable for Australia. In contrast, the US best mode doctrine and the current Australian best method doctrine are fundamentally similar. The US doctrine also offers a well-structured testing regime for assessing disclosure compliance. It is recommended that Australia adopts the US testing regime and amends s 40(2)(aa) of the *Patents Act 1990* (Cth) to reflect the adoption. ....

143