



INDIAN JOURNAL OF
LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 3 OF 2024

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION



INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN – 2583-2344

(Free and Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/>

Journal's Editorial Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/>

Volume 4 and Issue 3 of 2024 (Access Full Issue on – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-4-and-issue-3-of-2024/>)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education (Established by I.L.E. Educational Trust)

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 – info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in



© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserve with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer <https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/>



NAVIGATING MEDIA FREEDOM AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE DIGITAL ERA

AUTHOR – ISHA DEVESHWAR & MADHUR TIWARI, STUDENT AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL, NOIDA

BEST CITATION – ISHA DEVESHWAR & MADHUR TIWARI, NAVIGATING MEDIA FREEDOM AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE DIGITAL ERA, INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR), 4 (3) OF 2024, PG. 326-332, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

In the digital era, the interplay between media freedom and intellectual property rights presents a complex legal and ethical challenge. While media organizations rely on the freedom of expression to report news and create content, intellectual property laws protect creators' rights to control the use and distribution of their work. As digital platforms proliferate, the ease of sharing and replicating content has heightened the tension between these two areas. This project explores the evolving legal landscape that governs media freedom and intellectual property, particularly in the context of copyright infringement, content licensing, and fair use. It also examines the ethical implications for media organizations when balancing public interest with respect for creators' rights.

The analysis covers significant case studies that highlight the conflict between the right to report and the need to protect intellectual property, such as the use of copyrighted images, video content, and music in media production. Additionally, the role of digital platforms like YouTube, social media, and streaming services in facilitating content sharing is examined, as they often serve as battlegrounds for intellectual property disputes. This project emphasizes the importance of finding a balance that upholds both the principles of free expression and the protection of intellectual property in the rapidly evolving digital age.

Keywords: Media freedom, intellectual property, digital era, copyright, legal ethics

Introduction

The digital age has revolutionized the media landscape, offering unprecedented access to content and information. Alongside this transformation, new challenges have emerged, particularly concerning the intersection of media freedom and intellectual property (IP) rights. Media organizations, while benefiting from the expanded reach and accessibility provided by digital platforms, face increasing legal and ethical dilemmas when using copyrighted materials. The ease of content reproduction and dissemination online has intensified the struggle to balance media freedom—the right to report, critique, and disseminate information—with the protection of creators' intellectual property rights, such as

copyright, trademarks, and patents⁵⁸⁸. Historically, media freedom has been regarded as a cornerstone of democracy, allowing for the free exchange of information, ideas, and opinions. Intellectual property laws, on the other hand, were established to incentivize creativity and innovation by granting creators exclusive rights over their work. However, the digital era has blurred the lines between these two principles. As media outlets increasingly rely on online platforms, they must navigate complex legal frameworks governing the use of third-party content. Copyright infringement claims have become more common, often pitting the media's right to inform the public against the rights of creators to control and profit from their work. Furthermore, digital platforms such as

⁵⁸⁸ U.S. Constitution, Amendment I.

YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook complicate the issue. These platforms not only serve as conduits for media distribution but also enable users to share and remix copyrighted content, often without clear consent or compensation.⁵⁸⁹ The ethical dimension of this issue is equally significant. Media organizations have a responsibility to ensure that their reporting respects the intellectual property rights of creators, but they also have a duty to inform the public. Striking the right balance is difficult, especially in situations where public interest may justify the use of copyrighted material under doctrines like fair use or fair dealing. This project will explore these tensions, focusing on how legal frameworks and ethical considerations are evolving in response to the challenges posed by the digital era.

Copyright challenges in the digital era

The rapid proliferation of digital media has brought about significant challenges regarding copyright enforcement and compliance. Copyright law, designed to protect the rights of creators by granting them exclusive control over the use and distribution of their work, is facing unprecedented strain in the digital environment. As digital content becomes more accessible and easily replicable, media organizations must navigate a landscape where copyright infringement is more likely to occur, often unintentionally. One of the foremost challenges is the ease with which digital content can be copied, shared, and distributed across platforms without the creator's consent. This issue is particularly prevalent on social media and video-sharing platforms such as YouTube and Facebook, where user-generated content often incorporates copyrighted material. In many instances, copyrighted music, videos, and images are used without proper licensing or attribution, raising concerns about the enforcement of copyright laws in a digital space. Platforms themselves face legal pressures to ensure compliance with copyright law, often relying on algorithms and automatic

content recognition systems to identify potential infringements. However, these systems are not foolproof, and legitimate fair use of content may be incorrectly flagged as infringement. Another challenge lies in the media's reliance on copyrighted content in their reporting. Journalists and media organizations often use copyrighted materials such as images, videos, and music in their publications. While doctrines like "fair use" in the United States or "fair dealing" in other jurisdictions provide some leeway, determining whether a particular use qualifies as fair can be subjective and often requires judicial intervention. This legal uncertainty complicates the media's ability to use copyrighted content freely, as they must constantly assess the risk of litigation from rights holders who may argue that their work has been used without permission or proper licensing. Furthermore, the global nature of digital media presents jurisdictional challenges.⁵⁹⁰ Copyright laws vary significantly across countries, and digital content is often accessible worldwide, leading to conflicts over which country's copyright laws apply in a given case. This issue is particularly problematic for media organizations with global reach, as they must comply with the laws of multiple jurisdictions, increasing the complexity of copyright management.⁵⁹¹

Balancing innovation and access in the digital media

The digital age has redefined the dynamics of intellectual property (IP) rights, particularly in the media and creative industries. With the vast proliferation of digital platforms and global access to content, a central issue that has emerged is how to balance the need for protecting innovation through IP laws while ensuring broad access to information and cultural works. On one side, IP protections incentivize creators and innovators by safeguarding their rights and offering economic benefits. On the other side, overly restrictive

⁵⁹⁰ Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 512 (1998).

⁵⁹¹ Laidlaw, E. (2020) *Internet Regulation and Online Content: Principles and Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁵⁸⁹ Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101–1332.

protections can limit access, stifle creativity, and hinder media organizations from disseminating information. Striking the right balance between innovation and access is a pressing challenge in the digital era, and legal, ethical, and technological frameworks are evolving to address it. In the digital age, where content can be easily duplicated and shared across platforms, protecting IP is more important than ever.⁵⁹² Without strong protections, creators may lose control over their work, making it difficult to monetize and reducing the incentive to innovate. This is particularly true for industries that rely on licensing models, such as software and entertainment, where piracy can significantly impact revenues. At the same time, the rise of digital platforms has created new opportunities for innovation. Content creators can now reach global audiences with unprecedented ease, allowing for greater distribution and potential profit. However, the very platforms that enable innovation also present risks for creators, as they struggle to control how their content is shared and used. This has led to a rise in copyright infringement claims and a need for more robust digital IP enforcement mechanisms, such as those outlined in the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA).

While IP rights are crucial for fostering innovation, they also raise significant concerns regarding access to information and media freedom. In a media landscape where rapid dissemination of news and information is critical, overly restrictive IP protections can inhibit the ability of journalists, researchers, and media organizations to use and share content freely. For example, the use of copyrighted images, videos, or music in news reporting often leads to conflicts over whether such usage constitutes "fair use" or "fair dealing." Balancing innovation and access in the digital era is a complex task that requires careful consideration of both the rights of creators and the needs of the public. While intellectual

property rights are essential for encouraging innovation, overly stringent protections can hinder access to information, stifling creativity and limiting media freedom. Through mechanisms such as fair use, open-access licensing, and digital rights management, the legal and technological landscape is evolving to ensure that both innovation and access are preserved in the digital age.

Celebrity and image rights in the digital era

Celebrity image rights, a subset of intellectual property rights, have gained increasing attention in the digital age, particularly as media and social platforms make the widespread dissemination of celebrity images and likenesses more accessible than ever before. At the heart of the issue lies the tension between the media's freedom to report and share public figures' images and the celebrities' right to control the commercial use of their likenesses.⁵⁹³ This tension has raised significant legal questions about the extent to which celebrity image rights should be protected and how such protections intersect with freedom of expression and intellectual property law. Image rights refer to the control a person has over the commercial use of their likeness, which includes their name, image, voice, and other aspects of their identity. Celebrities, in particular, derive a significant portion of their income from licensing their image for advertising, endorsements, and merchandise. When unauthorized use of their image occurs, especially for commercial gain, it can result in lost revenue and the dilution of their personal brand. In many jurisdictions, the right of publicity grants individuals the right to control the commercial use of their identity. However, this right is not recognized globally and varies significantly from country to country.

In the United States, the right of publicity is governed by state law, with notable cases such as *Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co.* demonstrating the balance between media

⁵⁹² *Cariou v. Prince*, 714 F.3d 694 (2d Cir. 2013)

⁵⁹³ *Fraleigh v. Facebook, Inc.*, 830 F. Supp. 2d 785 (N.D. Cal. 2011).

freedom and image rights. In this case, the Supreme Court ruled that broadcasting a human cannonball performer's entire act without permission violated his right of publicity, underscoring the commercial value of image rights. However, the ruling also acknowledged that media organizations have a degree of freedom to report on matters of public interest, even when they involve celebrities. The rise of social media platforms like Instagram, Facebook, and TikTok has amplified the challenges surrounding celebrity image rights. Celebrities increasingly use these platforms to build and maintain their personal brands, often sharing curated images that reflect their desired public persona. At the same time, the media and general public frequently repost, share, and remix these images without permission, blurring the line between personal use and commercial exploitation⁵⁹⁴. Balancing media freedom and celebrity image rights requires a nuanced legal framework that takes into account the commercial value of a celebrity's image, the public's right to information, and the protection of individual privacy. As the digital era continues to evolve, this balance will remain a crucial area of debate in both the media and intellectual property law.

Broadcasting rights to sport

Broadcasting rights to sports events are a critical area of intellectual property (IP) that has evolved dramatically in the digital era. These rights, which grant broadcasters exclusive access to film, record, and distribute live sports events, have become immensely valuable, particularly with the rise of online streaming platforms. As a result, media companies, sports organizations, and digital platforms vie for control over these rights, which are crucial for generating revenue through advertising, sponsorship, and subscription services. However, the rapid technological advances in broadcasting and content distribution raise

important legal and ethical questions regarding the balance between protecting IP and ensuring access to sporting events for the public. The commercial significance of broadcasting rights is evident in the vast sums of money paid by networks and streaming services to secure exclusive access to major sporting events such as the Olympics, FIFA World Cup, and the NFL. For example, the National Football League (NFL) recently signed multi-billion-dollar deals with multiple networks and streaming services to broadcast its games, underlining the increasing value of these rights. This exclusive access gives broadcasters the power to control not only who can view the event but also how and where it can be consumed, which has led to the proliferation of pay-per-view models and subscription-based streaming services. However, the rise of digital media has also brought challenges to the enforcement of broadcasting rights. Online piracy has become a major issue, with unauthorized streams of live sports events available on illegal websites, social media platforms, and even through unofficial apps. This practice not only undermines the value of legitimate broadcasting deals but also raises legal questions about how to protect the rights of broadcasters in a world where content can be shared instantaneously across borders. The issue of jurisdiction also complicates enforcement efforts, as content can be illegally streamed from one country and consumed in another, making it difficult for rights holders to control unauthorized access. At the same time, there is an ongoing debate about whether broadcasting rights should be so heavily restricted, particularly for major events of national and global importance. Critics argue that exclusive broadcasting deals limit public access to sports, especially for viewers who cannot afford expensive subscription services. The European Union, for instance, has introduced regulations that require certain events of significant public interest, such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup, to be broadcast on free-to-air television. This

⁵⁹⁴Strowel, A., 2006. Digital Rights Management (DRM): Overview of Issues and Policy Choices. *Journal of Digital Law & Policy*, 4(2), pp.145-167.

balance between maximizing commercial revenue and ensuring public access to important cultural events remains a contentious issue.

Copyright and Journalism: Ethical and Legal Dilemmas

Copyright laws play a critical role in shaping the practice of journalism, particularly when it comes to investigative reporting. Investigative journalism often involves the use of copyrighted materials, such as documents, images, and audio-visual content, to expose matters of public interest. However, copyright restrictions can pose significant challenges, as they may limit journalists' ability to reproduce or share these materials without permission. This creates an ethical and legal dilemma: how to balance intellectual property rights with the media's essential role in informing the public about issues that affect society. Copyright law grants creators exclusive rights over the use of their work, including the right to control reproduction and distribution.¹ While this protection is vital for encouraging creativity and innovation, it can conflict with the media's responsibility to disseminate information. Investigative journalists often rely on copyrighted materials to support their findings, but seeking permission to use such content is not always practical, especially when reporting on controversial or sensitive issues. In some cases, copyright owners may refuse permission if they have a vested interest in preventing the public from accessing the information. The fair use doctrine, recognized in many jurisdictions, provides some relief by allowing journalists to use copyrighted material without permission for purposes like criticism, commentary, and news reporting⁵⁹⁵. However, determining whether a particular use qualifies as fair use is subjective and often requires a legal interpretation based on factors such as the purpose of the use, the nature of the copyrighted work, and the amount of material used. This uncertainty can leave

journalists vulnerable to litigation, which may discourage the use of crucial evidence or delay the publication of important stories. In addition to legal challenges, copyright issues also raise ethical concerns. Journalists must balance their obligation to inform the public with respect for intellectual property rights. Using copyrighted material without permission or attribution may be seen as unethical, even if the intent is to serve the public interest. However, when the information pertains to significant matters like government corruption or corporate malfeasance, the public's right to know may outweigh the copyright holder's proprietary rights. Ultimately, the tension between copyright law and journalism reflects a broader debate about the balance between protecting creators' rights and ensuring public access to information. Striking a balance between intellectual property and the public's right to know is crucial in safeguarding both creativity and democratic accountability in the digital age.

New Licensing Models

In the digital age, the traditional licensing models for intellectual property (IP) are evolving to address the challenges of content creation, sharing, and distribution. As digital platforms facilitate unprecedented access to media and creative works, new licensing models have emerged to strike a balance between protecting creators' rights and promoting broader access to content. These models, such as open-access licenses and Creative Commons, are increasingly being used by creators, media organizations, and educational institutions to share content while maintaining some control over how it is used. One of the most prominent new licensing models is the Creative Commons (CC) system, which offers a flexible range of licenses that allow creators to grant different levels of permission for the use of their work.⁵⁹⁶ These licenses range from the most permissive (allowing others to use, share, and

⁵⁹⁵ Emily Laidlaw, *Media Law and the Public's Right to Know*, 34 *Oxford J.L. & Media* 2 (2019).

⁵⁹⁶ Creative Commons. *About the Licenses*. Available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

even modify the work without restrictions) to more restrictive licenses that prohibit commercial use or modifications. By offering a spectrum of licenses, Creative Commons provides a practical solution for creators who wish to share their work while retaining certain rights, such as attribution or control over commercial exploitation. This model has gained significant traction in the academic, artistic, and media sectors, where the ability to share content widely without compromising intellectual property rights is particularly valuable. Another notable development is the rise of open-access publishing, particularly in academic and scientific communities. Open-access licenses allow scholarly articles, research papers, and other academic materials to be freely accessed and distributed, removing traditional paywalls associated with journals and publications. This model not only democratizes access to knowledge but also fosters innovation by ensuring that important scientific and academic discoveries are available to a broader audience. Many governments and research institutions now mandate that publicly funded research be published under open-access licenses, reflecting a shift towards transparency and accessibility in the dissemination of knowledge. These new licensing models address the limitations of traditional IP frameworks, which were often seen as too rigid for the fast-paced and collaborative nature of digital content creation. By allowing for greater flexibility and fostering a culture of sharing, they help reconcile the tension between protecting intellectual property and ensuring public access to information. However, challenges remain, particularly regarding enforcement and ensuring that users fully understand the terms of these licenses. As these models continue to evolve, they offer promising solutions for balancing innovation, access, and the protection of creators' rights in the digital era.

Conclusion

The digital age has profoundly transformed the relationship between media freedom and

intellectual property (IP) rights, creating both opportunities and challenges in how content is created, shared, and consumed. Traditional IP frameworks, designed for an analog world, struggle to keep pace with the rapid evolution of digital media, where content can be easily copied and disseminated globally. On one hand, IP laws are vital for protecting creators' rights and incentivizing innovation; on the other hand, media freedom is crucial for ensuring the free flow of information, fostering democratic discourse, and promoting public accountability. This tension is particularly evident in areas like journalism, where investigative reporting often relies on copyrighted material, and fair use doctrines provide limited legal protection for using such content in the public interest. However, fair use is often ambiguous and subject to differing legal interpretations, leaving journalists and media organizations exposed to litigation risks. The rise of celebrity image rights and the right of publicity adds further complexity, as unauthorized use of celebrity images on digital platforms raises legal and ethical issues, exemplified by cases like *Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co.*, which underscore the need to balance commercial interests with media freedom. Meanwhile, new licensing models such as Creative Commons and open-access frameworks offer a more flexible approach, allowing creators to share their work freely while retaining control over its use, particularly beneficial in academic and scientific communities. These models reflect a growing recognition that traditional IP protections must evolve to meet the demands of the digital era. As technology continues to outpace legal frameworks, achieving a harmonious balance between media freedom and IP rights remains a significant challenge. Adopting more flexible licensing practices, refining fair use standards, and fostering international cooperation in IP enforcement are essential to ensuring that both creators' rights and the public's right to access information are protected in the rapidly changing digital media landscape.

References

- Laidlaw, E., Internet Regulation and the Protection of Free Speech (Routledge, 2015).
- Suber, P., Open Access (MIT Press, 2012).
- Fitzgerald, B. & O'Brien, D., Copyright, Digital Content and the Internet in the Asia-Pacific (Sydney University Press, 2008).
- Boyle, J., The Public Domain: Enclosing the Commons of the Mind (Yale University Press, 2008).
- Lessig, L., Free Culture: The Nature and Future of Creativity (Penguin Books, 2004).

Journal Articles:

- Yoo, C., "Copyright and Broadcasting of Sporting Events," Stanford Law Review, vol. 19, 2010, pp. 123-148.
- Laidlaw, E., "Media Law and the Public's Right to Know," Oxford Journal of Law & Media, vol. 34, no. 2, 2019, pp. 198-215.
- Litman, J., "Digital Copyright and the Law of Fair Use," Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, vol. 15, no. 1, 2001, pp. 3-28.
- Ginsburg, J.C., "Fair Use in the Digital Age: Transformation, Inspiration, and Publication," Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts, vol. 24, no. 3, 2001, pp. 41-65.

Cases:

- Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises, 471 U.S. 539 (1985).
- Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc., 510 U.S. 569 (1994).
- Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co., 433 U.S. 562 (1977).
- Cariou v. Prince, 714 F.3d 694 (2d Cir. 2013)