

## Publisher's Note

An Update has Arrived in Your Library for:

<b>Please circulate this notice to anyone in your office who may be interested in this publication.</b> <i>Distribution List</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

### **FOX ON CANADIAN LAW OF COPYRIGHT AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS, 4<sup>th</sup> EDITION**

**John S. McKeown**

**Release No. 1, February 2026**

This comprehensive statement of Canadian law and practice has been the bedrock of Canadian copyright research and argument for more than half a century.

### **What's New in This Update**

This release features updates to Appendix F (Quantum Table: Copyright Infringement) and Appendix WP (Words and Phrases Judicially Defined).

---

**Thomson Reuters®**

**Customer Support**

1-416-609-3800 (Toronto & International)

1-800-387-5164 (Toll Free Canada & U.S.)

E-mail [CustomerSupport.LegalTaxCanada@TR.com](mailto:CustomerSupport.LegalTaxCanada@TR.com)

This publisher's note may be scanned electronically and photocopied for the purpose of circulating copies within your organization.

## Highlights

**Appendix F (Quantum Table: Copyright Infringement)**—The following cases have been added to this appendix—

- *Industrial Custom Equipment & Construction Limited et. al. v. Industrial Commercial Equipment Manufacturing Ltd. et. al.*, 2025 MBKB 121 (CanLII) (Man. K.B.).
- *Archimed Studio inc. c. Man*, 2025 QCCQ 4737 (CanLII) (Court of Quebec).
- *Archimed Studio inc. c. Cogir*, 2025 QCCQ 2673 (CanLII).
- *Bachand v. Mural*, 2025 QCCQ (CanLII) (Court of Quebec).
- *Yelda Haber Ve Görsel Yayincilik A.S. v. GLWiZ Inc.*, 2025 CarswellNat 2690, 2025 CarswellNat 2691, 2025 CF 1107, 2025 FC 1107 (F.C.).

**Appendix WP (Words and Phrases Judicially Defined)**—This appendix has been updated to December 15, 2025 in this release. The following is an excerpt from this appendix—

### **WP:38.5 FREE**

#### **Federal**

At the hearing, counsel for Mr. Zanin repeatedly attempted to convince the Court that the terms “FREE or \$0” apparently referred to two different realities and concepts, and that “FREE” could somehow be disconnected from a notion of price. I find this argument to be entirely without merit. It is untethered to any evidence or legal precedents, it offends common sense . . .

*Zanin v. Ooma Inc.* (2025), 2025 CF 51, 2025 CarswellNat 4773, 211 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 2025 CarswellNat 184, 2025 FC 51 (F.C.) at para. 57 Gascon J.