

Table of New and Retitled Sections

CHAPTER 1. COPYRIGHT

- § 1:1.50 A “selfie” taken by a monkey is not copyrightable—*Naruto v. Slater* [New]
- § 1:1.55 AI may not be copyrightable—*Zarya of the Dawn* [New]
- § 1:1.60 The Supreme Court holds that the Georgia Annotated Code cannot be copyrighted—*Ga. v. Public.Resource.Org, Inc.* [New]
- § 1:1.70 The Batmobile is sufficiently distinctive to be protected by copyright [New]
- § 1:1.80 The Ninth Circuit holds that *Stairway to Heaven* does not infringe Spirit’s song, *Taurus*—*Skidmore v. Led Zeppelin* [New]
- § 1:16.50 Registration is not a jurisdictional requirement [New]
- § 1:16.60 The lack of factual or legal knowledge on the part of the copyright holder can excuse an inaccuracy in the registration—*Unicolors v. H&M Hennes & Mauritz* [New]
- § 1:16.70 Statutory standing for associations [New]
- § 1:17.10 Copyright Renewal Act [New]
- § 1:28.10 Access, in general — Additional cases [New]
- § 1:31.50 The Supreme Court holds that stripes and chevrons are copyrightable as being independently aesthetic: *Star Athletica, L.L.C. v. Varsity Brands, Inc.* [New]
- § 1:31.70 The song, “We Shall Overcome,” is in the public domain—*We Shall Overcome Foundation and Butler Films, LLC v. The Richmond Organization, Inc. and Ludlow Music, Inc.* [New]
- § 1:33.10 Karaoke infringement [New]
- § 1:33.20 Does the laches defense apply to new infringements of old works—*Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer* [New]
- § 1:33.30 “New Uses” are contract specific—*HarperCollins Publishers LLC v. Open Road Integrated Media, LLP* [New]
- § 1:33.40 Magic act protected as a “dramatic work”—*Teller v. Dogge* [New]
- § 1:33.50 *Blurred Lines* found to infringe Marvin Gaye’s *Got to Give It Up* [New]
- § 1:33.60 Groovespark is liable for file sharing—*UMG Recording, Inc. v. Escape Media Group, Inc.* [New]
- § 1:35.30 Preemption of the right of publicity and football film footage—*Dryer v. NFL* [New]
- § 1:35.50 The California Resale Royalty Act is preempted by the Copyright Act of 1976, but it is not preempted with respect to the date of its enactment (January 1, 1977) and the beginning of the Copyright Act of 1976 (January 1, 1978) [New]
- § 1:46.30 Fair use—Additional cases—*Clean Flicks of Colorado, LLC v. Soderbergh* [New]

- § 1:46.50 DMCA violation and fair use: *Disney v. VidAngel* [New]
- § 1:46.70 Fair use—*Salinger v. Colting* [New]
- § 1:46.90 Fair Use of “Who’s on first?”—*TCA Television Corp. v. McCollum* [New]
- § 1:50.10 *Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. v. Cablevision Systems Corp.* [New]
- § 1:50.20 Fair Use — Additional cases [New]
- § 1:50.30 *Cambridge University Press v. Becker*—The Georgia State University infringement case [New]
- § 1:50.40 Fair Use: Mass Digitization—*Authors Guild, Inc. v. HathiTrust* [New]
- § 1:50.50 Fair Use: Mass Digitization—*Authors Guild, Inc. v. Google, Inc.* [New]
- § 1:50.55 Copying computer code as “fair use”—*Google LLC v. Oracle America, Inc.* [New]
- § 1:50.60 Fair Use—Appropriation art: *Cariou v. Prince* [New]
- § 1:50.70 Use of a photograph without authorization in an exhibition’s catalogue is a “fair use” : *Marano v. Metropolitan Museum of Art* [New]
- § 1:50.80 Determination of the facts needed to decide fair use, despite the book not being a parody—*Dr. Seuss Enterprises v. ComicMix LLC* [New]
- § 1:50.85 “Derivative works,” “transformative works,” and “fair use” explained—*Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. v. Goldsmith* [New]
- § 1:50.87 Fair use cases after *Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts v. Goldsmith* [New]
- § 1:50.90 The Fair Use defense must be considered prior to sending a takedown notice—*Lenz v. Universal Music* [New]
- § 1:60.10 Supreme Court holds that a copyright must be registered before a lawsuit can be brought—*Fourth Estate Public Benefit Corp. v. Wall-Street.Com, LLC.* [New]
- § 1:62.50 Objective reasonableness is not the only factor to be considered in awarding attorney’s fees—*Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.* [New]
- § 1:62.70 The Supreme Court holds that a court may award only taxable costs to a “prevailing party”—*Oracle v. Rimini Street* [New]
- § 1:62.80 Attorneys’ fees and costs reduced by 90% by the court—*Charles v. Seinfeld* [New]
- § 1:80.30 Compulsory licenses—Ringtones [New]
- § 1:80.70 Public performances—Ringtones [New]
- § 1:82.10 Public performances [New]
- § 1:82.20 Aereo infringes the public performance right [New]
- § 1:83.50 The Supreme Court holds that Sovereign Immunity cannot be abrogated under either Article I or the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution—*Allen v. Cooper* [New]
- § 1:83.60 The Texas Supreme Court rules that copyright infringement is not a taking—*Jim Olive Photography v. University of Houston System* [New]
- § 1:84 The first sale doctrine and the importation right [Retitled]

TABLE OF NEW AND RETITLED SECTIONS

- § 1:84.10 The first sale doctrine — Additional cases *[New]*
- § 1:84.20 The first sale doctrine does not apply to digital music—
Capitol Records, LLC v. ReDIGI Inc. [New]
- § 1:84.30 There is no public performance right in New York—*Flo & Eddie, Inc. v. Sirius XM Radio, Inc. [New]*
- § 1:89.50 The Music Modernization Act Summary *[New]*
- § 1:91 Copyright Office Fees (effective March 20, 2020) *[Retitled]*
- § 1:92 Fair Use Index—February 2023 *[New]*

CHAPTER 2. TRADEMARKS AND UNFAIR COMPETITION

- § 2:1.50 Federal Circuit vacates *Blackhorse v. Pro-Football, Inc.* in light of the Supreme Court’s holding in *Matal v. Tam. [New]*
- § 2:1.70 Supreme Court holds that Lanham Act provision governing disparaging marks is unconstitutional: *Matal v. Tam [New]*
- § 2:1.80 The Supreme Court holds that the “scandalous” and “immoral” language in Section 2(a) is also unconstitutional—*Iancu v. Brunetti [New]*
- § 2:1.85 The Federal Circuit holds that Section 2(c) of the Lanham Act, as applied, is unconstitutional *[New]*
- § 2:1.90 The California Racial Mascots Act *[New]*
- § 2:4.50 Primarily geographically deceptively misdescriptive marks *[New]*
- § 2:8.50 Color mark requires use with defined shape, pattern, or design to be distinctive: *Forney Industries, Inc. v. Daco of Missouri, Inc. [New]*
- § 2:9.50 Aesthetic functionality *[New]*
- § 2:10.10 Trade dress and the First Amendment *[New]*
- § 2:10.60 Fed. Circ. says ‘Everybody vs. Racism’ does not function as a source identifier—*In re Go & Associates [New]*
- § 2:11.20 For *Rodgers v. Grimaldi* to apply a mark may not be used as an indicator of source—*Jack Daniel’s Properties v. VIP Products LLC [New]*
- § 2:15.50 Lanham Act claim based on a deceptive label is not precluded by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—*POM Wonderful v. Coca-Cola [New]*
- § 2:16.50 Website operator secondary infringement liability—*H-D U.S.A., LLC v. SunFrog, LLC [New]*
- § 2:18.50 Lanham Act Section 43(a)—The Fourth Circuit holds that a use in U.S. commerce is not necessary to succeed in an unfair competition action—*Belmora LLC v. Bayer Consumer Care AG [New]*
- § 2:19.50 Issue of tacking in a trademark case properly belongs to the jury properly belongs to the jury—*Hana Financial, Inc. v. Hana Bank [New]*
- § 2:33.10 Trademark counterfeiting *[New]*
- § 2:36.10 Nominative fair use *[New]*
- § 2:37.30 Fraud on the Trademark Office *[New]*
- § 2:37.50 Counterfeit merchandise on auction sites *[New]*

- § 2:37.65 Is there “volitional conduct” by an interactive print-on-demand service: *Ohio State University v. Redbubble, Inc.* [New]
- § 2:37.70 A license as a defense to infringement [New]
- § 2:37.80 The Supreme Court holds that willful infringement is not a prerequisite for an award of the defendant’s profits—*Romag Fasteners, Inc. v. Fossil, Inc.* [New]
- § 2:37.90 Lanham Act false advertising standing determined by Supreme Court—*Lexmark v. Static Control Systems* [New]
- § 2:41.50 TM Examination Guide [New]
- § 2:42 Policy on Deceptive Advertisements [New]
- § 2:43 “Google” held not to be generic for internet searching—*Elliott v. Google, Inc.* [New]
- § 2:44.50 International Trademark Classification Changes (as of 8/02/2023, Effective January 1, 2024) [New]
- § 2:45 The Supreme Court holds that combining a generic term with the “.com” domain may create an enforceable trademark—*United States Patent and Trademark Office v. Booking.com B.V.* [New]
- § 2:46 “Gruyere” for cheese is generic in the United States [New]

CHAPTER 3. RIGHTS OF PRIVACY & PUBLICITY

- § 3:19.10 California appropriation statute—2007 modifications [New]
- § 3:29.50 Nature of the right—Additional cases [New]
- § 3:29.70 Preemption of the right of publicity and football film footage—*Dryer v. NFL* [New]
- § 3:32 Alabama [New]
- § 3:33 Arizona (for soldiers only) [New]
- § 3:33.50 Arkansas [New]
- § 3:36 Hawaii [New]
- § 3:40 Louisiana [New]
- § 3:41 Massachusetts [New]
- § 3:49 South Dakota [New]
- § 3:50 Tennessee [New]
- § 3:51 Utah [New]
- § 3:55 Privacy rights for California minors in the digital world [New]
- § 3:56 Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act of 2017 [New]
- § 3:57 The Supreme Court holds that cell-site-location-information (“CLSI”) requires a search warrant—*Carpenter v. U.S.* [New]
- § 3:58 California Online Privacy Act [New]
- § 3:59 The effect of the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 [New]
- § 3:60 Texas Social Media Act [New]

CHAPTER 4. DEFAMATION AND RELATED CONSTITUTIONAL HARMS [Retitled]

- § 4:34.50 The distinction between a “publisher” and a “facilitator”—
Daniel v. Armslist [New]
- § 4:37 Community standard for obscenity should be national for the
Internet—*United States v. Kilbride* [New]
- § 4:38 Corporate money can pay for political advertisements [New]
- § 4:39 Depictions of animal cruelty statute held unconstitutional
[New]
- § 4:40 First Amendment protects Chinese Internet site—*Jian
Zhang v. Baidu.com* [New]
- § 4:41 Digital information on a cell phone may not be searched
without a warrant [New]
- § 4:42 Massachusetts statute criminalizing standing within 35 feet
from the entrance of a place where abortions are
performed is violated the First Amendment—*McCullen v.
Coakley* [New]
- § 4:43 Supreme Court holds that a prison policy preventing
inmates from growing beards was unconstitutional—*Holt
v. Hobbs* [New]
- § 4:44 D.C. Circuit refuses to rehear net neutrality challenge [New]
- § 4:45 The CDA does not apply to a failure to warn—*Doe v. Internet
Brands* [New]
- § 4:46 Kneeling during the National Anthem is protected speech—
V.A. v. San Pasqual Valley Unified School District [New]
- § 4:47 The compilation of inaccurate consumer information is suf-
ficient to confer standing—*Robins v. Spokeo, Inc.* [New]
- § 4:48 Is the phrase, “Repeatedly Tried to Extort Money,” capable of
defamatory meaning—*Friedman v. Bloomberg, L.P.* [New]
- § 4:49 California law to remove age information from IMDb is
unconstitutional—*IMDb.com, Inc. v. Becerra* [New]
- § 4:49.50 The Mississippi Court of Appeals just overturned the convic-
tion, and struck down the underlying statute, which
banned posting messages “whether truthful or untruthful”
“for the purpose of causing injury to any person.”—
Edwards v. State [New]
- § 4:50 The Ninth Circuit allows a case to go to trial to determine
whether a device that facilitated automated text messages
violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act—*Marks v.
Crunch San Diego, LLC.* [New]
- § 4:51 The Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act
(“PASPA”) is unconstitutional—*Murphy v. Nat’l Collegiate
Athletic Ass’n* [New]
- § 4:52 Article III standing for nominal damages—*Uzuegbunam v.
Preczewski* [New]
- § 4:53 The First Amendment allows the use of drones to take
photographs—*National Press Photographers Assoc. v.
McCraw.* [New]
- § 4:54 The First Amendment prevents the City of Boston banning
the flying of a Christian flag during a ceremony on city
hall grounds—*Shurtleff v. City of Boston* [New]

- § 4:55 Rapper Cardi B wins a defamation lawsuit - *Almanzar v. Kebe* [New]
- § 4:56 The Supreme Court Will Not Find Big-Tech Companies Liable for Third Party Posts [New]
- § 4:57 Sarah Palin loses a defamation case against The New York Times [New]
- § 4:58 Supreme Court sets standards for whether a social media site is private speech or official speech—*Lindke v. Freed* [New]
- § 4:59 Former President Trump owes Jean Carroll \$88 million total after 2nd verdict [New]
- § 4:60 Rudi Giuliani is found liable for \$146 million in a defamation case relating to the 2020 election [New]

CHAPTER 5. INCITEMENT

- § 5:6 Protests at a funeral are protected by the First Amendment [New]