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QUESTION: A speaker at a conference permitted the conference organizers to videotape her presentation. Later she wanted a copy of the presentation to show to a class. Who owns the copyright in the video recording?

ANSWER: The general rule is that the person or entity creating the work owns the copyright. If the speaker simply granted permission to be videotaped, she did not transfer the copyright in her presentation. But since the conference organizers created the videotape, the conference would hold the copyright in the video recording while the presenter would own the rights in the presentation itself, assuming that it was fixed other than by the videotape.

When granting permission to be videotaped, it is important to specify what can be done with that tape while reserving any rights that the presenter may want. For example, it would have been very easy to specify in the written agreement that the speaker reserves the rights to: (1) have a copy of the videotape and (2) use it in her classes (or however else she may want to use the video). The conference might want the right to sell the videotape or to put it in the conference archives.

QUESTION: How does a library obtain public performance rights for films that it acquires?

ANSWER: It is far easier to obtain performance rights at the time the film is acquired rather than afterwards. On the purchase order one can request the public performance rights. The rights may be included in the cost of the video or may require a separate royalty. Some video distributors have been licensed by film producers to provide the public performance right. The library should specify the type of performances that it might offer; for example, just in a non-profit educational institution without any admission charge or as a ticketed performance with an admission fee. One can obtain rights for a single performance or for performances over a period of time.

There are several sources for obtaining public performance rights. Swank Motion Pictures, Inc. (www.swank.com) is a comprehensive licensing agency for films. Movie Licensing USA (www.movielic.com) is a division of Swank that provides licenses for K-12 schools and public libraries. The Motion Picture Licensing Corporation can provide the public performance rights through a variety of types of licenses (www.mplic.com).

Criterion USA (www.criterionusa.com) is a non-theatrical distributor of feature films licensed for public performance in the United States. For classics and foreign language art films, a good source for public performance rights is Kino International (www.kino.com), although some of the films are for theatrical performance only. Another source for foreign films is New Yorker Films (www.newyorkerfilms.com).

QUESTION: A library is sponsoring a book talk by a famous author. In order to advertise the event, the library wants to scan the book jacket from the author's latest book and use it on flyers and posters. Does this infringe copyright?

ANSWER: Yes, reproducing the book jacket without permission is copyright infringement. The publisher holds copyright in the book jacket, and it may have to create and use the artwork on the cover. It is often possible to obtain permission to use a book jacket at no charge for the purpose of advertising the author and even offering his books for sale at the event. The library should contact the publisher to obtain permission to use the book jacket in advertisements for the event.

QUESTION: If a library has a licensed database, may a reference librarian use that database for answering a question from a non-affiliated user? What about supplying that individual with a copy of an article from that database? Does it matter that the database has an email option to forward articles to users?

ANSWER: Certainly, the reference librarian may use the database to answer a reference question for anyone. However, the license agreement controls, and if the license says that articles in the database may be accessed and reproduced only by students, faculty staff of the institution or registered borrowers, then supplying the article to someone who is not covered violates the license agreement. What one can do is answer the question, provide a citation to the article and explain that under the library's license agreement, it cannot provide a copy of the article to someone who is not covered. With the citation, the user might be able to access the article in a local public library with a different type of license agreement or obtain it from a printed source through interlibrary loan.

The email option does not mean that the library may ignore the license agreement. The email option is there so that one may email an article to an authorized user of the database. So, a librarian could forward an article to a student, faculty member in the institution, etc., but not to an outside patron.

QUESTION: If a copyright is held by two or more people, must all of the owners agree to allow someone to post the material on the Web?

ANSWER: No, the general rule is that joint ownership of copyright means that the owners are “tenants in common.” This means that each owner holds an undivided interest in the copyrighted work. One owner may transfer the copyright to another without consulting other owners, license others to use the work, etc. That owner is required to account to the other owner or owners and share the proceeds of any license or transfer on an equal basis. It is possible to own a copyright on a different basis but this requires a different arrangement on page 57.
Cases of Note — Laney Act Preempts State Claims — Ultra Sheen Model Falls Off the Legal Runway

by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel) <strauchb@citadel.edu>


June Toney is a model — print, T.V. and runways — who authorized Johnson Products Corp to use her likeness for “Ultra Sheen Supreme,” a “hair relaxer” product. The term ran from November 1995 to November 2000.

Johnson sold Ultra Sheen to Carson Products which sold it to L’Oreal which sold to Wella Corporation. And in the process they used her photo beyond Nov. 2000.


Failing she did not allege breach of contract. And this is where those law review brainers in the big defense firms will outsmart and out-civil-proof your in a flurry of motions.

First, defendants moved the case to federal court where the judge held the Lanham claim preempted the state one. Then defendants moved to dismiss Under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Toney didn’t take the pictures and didn’t own the copyright!

Toney dropped her Lanham claim with prejudice and “the case was closed.” She appealed the preemption decision in a desperate bid to get back into state court where she could claim a cause of action under IRPA.

So what’s up with IRPA?

IRPA as you’ve no doubt guessed gives Illinois the “right to control and choose whether and how to use an individual’s identity for commercial purposes.” 765 Ill. Comp. Stat. 1075/10. Anyone wanting to use your identity for commercial purposes must obtain written consent. 765 Ill. Comp. Stat. 1075/30.

But then there’s this preemption thing...

Yes, indeed. The Copyright Act preempts under § 301 if (1) the work is in tangible form, and it falls into the subject matter of copyright under § 102; AND (2) the state rights are the same as the federal ones under § 106.

Curiously, if the work is too minimal in its originality to qualify for federal protection, the states may not protect the right either. See Baltimore Orioles Inc. v. Major League Baseball Players Ass’n, 805 F.2d 663, 676 (7th Cir. 1986).

Which sounds like pretty thorough preemption.

§ 102

“Original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium” are the subject matter of copyright. 17 U.S.C. § 102(a). It’s fixed when “sufficiently permanent ... to be perceived, reproduced, or otherwise communicated for a period of more than transitory duration.” 17 U.S.C. § 101.

So, hair relaxer photos meet the requirement, but ... what about? A hypnotic vision produced by a magician? Smoke signals? Morse code?

And if that isn’t enough, § 101 flat says that photos are “pictoral works” covered by Lanham.

Toney gets creative.

Realizing she was up the creek without authority, Toney’s lawyer got creative, arguing her IRPA claim is directed at Defendants’ use of her “identity” rather than her likeness in the negatives and photo prints. But Toney had not stated this in her complaint, and in her response to Defendants’ motion to dismiss she had stated the claim was limited to use of the likeness. She can’t just raise this on appeal. Bell v. Daggett, 367 F.3d 703, 708 n.1 (7th Cir. 2004) citing Williams v. REP Corp., 302 F.3d 660, 666 (7th Cir. 2002).

And Baltimore Orioles supra held no distinction between publicity rights and art — in this case, players playing a game and photos or broadcast of the same. Melville B. Nimmer & David Nimmer, Nimmer on Copyright § 2.09[F] (1999).

Footnotes 24 in Baltimore Orioles did say the question would not be preempted if a company used a player’s name to advertise a product. But that’s not what’s going on here. The public doesn’t know Toney’s name and it wasn’t used anyhow. It was a photo.

§ 106

For preemption, IRPA’s rights must be the equivalent of any rights under § 106 which has six rights of which four are on point: (1) to reproduce in copies; (2) to prepare derivative works, (3) to distribute copies, (4) to display.

These were all Toney’s rights under IRPA.

And Toney didn’t hold copyright. That belonged Carson Products. Which as you recall was why Toney’s case got dismissed.

The court rounds out by saying she should have brought a breach of contract action which would have avoided the preemption issue.

Ouch!

But of course now she can’t because you’re supposed to plead all theories that are available in the one action.

Adventures in Librarianship — A Passion for Public Television

by Ned Kraft (Ralph J. Bunche Library, U.S. Department of State) <kraftn@state.gov>

Voice over with still shot of town square: WETT 62 — Your Public Television. Bringing high school orchestral concerts, pictures of far away cities, our local poets, and whatever to the greater Farmington area.

Scroll: Two Minutes in the Library.

SA: Hello, I’m Stratford Avon bringing you Two Minutes in the Library.

[Music with montage of happy readers, young and old]

SA: Today we’re going to talk to Helen Baeque, the children’s librarian. Welcome, Helen. And, may I say, that’s a lovely dress you have on. And your shoes look incredibly comfortable.

HB: Well, thank you Mr. Avon.

SA: Tell me Helen... may I call you Helen?

HB: Certainly, Stratford, if I may be so bold.

SA: Indeed you may, Helen. Did I mention your lovely dress and comfy shoes?

HB: You did, Stratty. Thank you.

SA: Well... yes, then... Tell me, Helen, is continued on page 58