

2016 Vol.27 Issue 3  
ISSN: 0959-3799

# Entertainment Law Review

## Table of Contents

### Articles

ANDY PHIPPEN

#### **Young People and Pornography—Legislating Our Way Out of a Social Problem 79**

This article considers the UK government's approach to the prevention of access to online pornography by children. It explores the growing legislative threat to service providers and questions the ideological issue around a lack of evidence when forming policy, arguing that poorly understood social issues such as young peoples' online behaviours cannot be easily legislated away.

TED SHAPIRO

#### **The Proposed Regulation on Portability—Don't leave home without it 83**

On 9 December 2015, the European Commission published its Digital Single Market Strategy and, together with that, a proposed Regulation on Cross-Border Portability of Content Services. The proposed Regulation is intended to enable subscribers to content services to continue to access the services while temporarily abroad in another EU member state. The article explores the language of the proposed Regulation and its potential impact.

MARCUS KEPPEL-PALMER

#### **The Emperor's New Clothes—IPSO's New Version of the Editors' Code of Practice 92**

The new version of the Editors' Code of Conduct was published in December 2015, the first new version of the Code since the formation of IPSO and the first since the Leveson Inquiry on Press Standards criticised the PCC, the effectiveness of the Code and the need for a re-statement of press ethics, professionalism and standards. Those expecting root and branch change will be disappointed in this repudiation of Leveson.

### Comments

EMMA FLETT

#### **Cristal, Anyone? Corks Go "Pop" for Louis Roederer 98**

This article discusses the recent decision of the High Court in the case, *Champagne Louis Roederer v J Garcia Carrion SA* [2015] EWHC 2760 (Ch) (6 October 2015), in which the Court upheld a challenge by the owner of luxury champagne brand CRISTAL, Louis Roederer, to the validity of the trade mark CRISTALINO JAUME SERRA for sparkling wines, on the grounds of likelihood of confusion—giving Louis Roederer reason to celebrate.

DAVID HOOPER

#### **How the Court will Interpret Whether England is the Most Appropriate Place to Bring a Libel Action 102**

This article considers the recent High Court ruling in *Ahuja v Politika Novine* setting aside for failure to give full and frank disclosure an order for service out of the jurisdiction of proceedings for the misuse of private information and libel against a Serbian language newspaper circulating in Serbia in hardcopy but available in this country only on the internet, and examines the burden put on Claimants by s.9 Defamation Act 2013.

EILEEN WEINERT

#### **Press Reporting and Open Justice: John Neville Aidiniantz v Grace Aidiniantz 104**

The Court of Protection has held that naming the parties and publishing the judgment regarding the care of 88 year old Mrs Grace Aidiniantz, founder of the Sherlock Holmes museum, was in the public interest.

HUGH TOMLINSON

#### **Theedom v Nourish Training Ltd—"Serious Harm to Reputation" Once Again Established by Inference 106**

In *Theedom v Nourish Training Ltd* [2015] EWHC 3769 (QB), HH Judge Moloney QC decided, on the trial of a preliminary issue, that the claimant had established "serious harm to reputation" for the purposes of s.1 of the Defamation Act 2013. Once again, the claimant succeeded on a "serious harm" case based almost entirely on inference.

PETER SMITH

#### **Damages for Breach of Privacy: Case Note on Gulati v MGN Ltd 109**

The Court of Appeal has upheld the first instance decision of Mann J on the level of damages payable by the publisher of the *Daily Mirror*, the *Sunday Mirror* and *The People* magazine, and has endorsed the judge's careful analysis of the appropriate level of compensation for obtaining private information through phone hacking and the publication of stories based on it.



JENNIFER AGATE

### **Risk and Diagnosis: Anonymity in the Context of a Convicted Killer Within the Mental Health Regime 110**

This article considers *R. (on the application of C) v Secretary of State for Justice*, in which the Supreme Court considered anonymity in the context of a convicted killer held in a psychiatric hospital.

JESSICA WELCH

### **Foul Play by Football Fan Who Posted Defamatory Comments Online 112**

In a case concerning false and defamatory allegations of a sexual nature and asserting fraud and corruption, the High Court has awarded aggravated damages to the chairman and owner of Blackpool Football Club. The court also awarded relatively nominal damages to the Club itself as a corporate claimant. The defendant's malicious conduct was found to have been exacerbated by the presence of his McKenzie friend, who poured "more fuel on the flames". The judge's examination of the relevant factors is a useful illustration of the courts' approach to the assessment of damages in cases of defamation and malicious falsehood.

INDRE BOARETTO

### **Fair Compensation for Reprographic and Private Copying 115**

The CJEU has ruled on the interpretation of the reprographic and private-copying exceptions under the Copyright Directive, finding that they partially overlap, and confirming that "fair compensation" under both exceptions must be based on the harm caused to the authors. For reprography, however, a distinction must be drawn between copies made by a natural person for private use and those made by a non-natural person (or by a natural person for commercial use), as the harm will not be same in each case. The UK government will need to give effect to these principles if trying to re-introduce a private-copying exception.

JULIANE ALTHOFF

### **Mistress R'eal Appeal—Dominatrix Not Bound by Video on Demand Ruling 118**

Ofcom has upheld an appeal by Melanie Lumb against an ATVOD determination that an adult online "dominatrix" service, "Mistress R'eal", was an on-demand programme service for the purposes of the Communications Act 2003. In this case Ofcom found that, although the principal purpose of the service was the provision of audiovisual material, the form and content of the videos were not "TV like" and the service was not, in all the circumstances, in competition with broadcast television. But Ofcom noted that limited reach or low monetisation does not mean that a service could never compete with broadcast television.

ALEXANDER ROSS

### **Direct Injection—The New Copyright Bypass Operation 121**

Four years after its *Airfield* decision, the CJEU has added to the growing acquis on communication to the public with a decision on direct injection, the process by which a broadcaster feeds its transmissions directly and only into third party communication systems (such as cable networks and mobile services). The Court held that because the signals transmitted by SBS Belgium, a Belgian broadcaster, could not be directly accessed by the public there was no communication to the public by the broadcaster. How this squares with the *Airfield* decision is a question the Belgian courts must now resolve.