IYENGAR'S

# CODYFIGHT ACT AND RUES

Fifth Edition



# T. R. SRINIVASA IYENGAR'S THE COPYRIGHT ACT, 1957

As Amended up-to-date by
The Copyright (Amendment) Acts [(23 of 1983) and (65 of 1984)]

(With Rules & Appendices)

Thoroughly revised by Dr. R. G. Chaturvedi

Advocate

FIFTH EDITION

1985



THE

Law Book Company

(PVT.) LTD.

Sardar Patel Marg—Post Box No. 1-004 Allahabad—211001 (U. P.) India

# © The Law Book Company (Pvt.) Ltd., Allahabad

First Edition	1959
Second Edition	1968
Third Edition	1977
Fourth Edition	1983
Fifth Edition	1985

 Indian
 Rs.
 125.00

 U. S.
 \$ 10.00

 Malaysian
 \$ 50.00

 Pakistani
 Rs.
 200.00

 Nepali
 Rs.
 185.00

# PREFACE TO THE FIFTH EDITION

Copyright is an abstract law. It deals with and regulates traffic in a property originating in thought. The paradigms of this law are conceptual; the principles settled are terse; and the adjudication on such disputes, the evidence and appreciation of points of controversy in probable litigation in this field, are delicate matters.

The fifth edition of this book on the subject is a well-discussed treatise on all that is required in this branch of the knowledge of law.

Like most of Indian statutory law, this law, too, is of English origin, and the book in hand is a comprehensive account on both the English and the Indian law, brought up-to-date and meticulously recast in view of the two major amendments to this law brought about by the Amendment Acts, 23 of 1983 and 65 of 1984. Fresh comments have been appended on the amended and newly inserted provisions, and the existing text has been attuned to the amended law.

All relevant and useful appendices have been placed at the end, followed by a synoptically catalogued index to facilitate search of any relevant point. The Rules framed under the Act are included in the Appendices. The alliance of this branch of law with the law of Trade and Merchandise Marks has also been noticed.

The law in this book concerns all published matter succouring needs in all walks of human life touching its aesthetic and inquisitive instinct, covering the business of books and records and original productions of art, sculpture, music, film, radio, video, fiction, poetry and all that supplies the audio-visual taste of the present civilisation. The book in hand is an endeavour to answer the needs of all concerned with this law, be they professional lawyers, or authors, or producers and publishers.

31st March, 1985

Dr. R. G. Chaturvedi

# PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION

In Miller v. Taylor, [(1769) 4 Burr. 2303, 2335] Willes, J. said: "It is wise in any State to encourage letters, and painful researches of learned men. The easiest and most usual way of doing it is by securing to them the property in their works..." Law of copyright not only secures to the authors the property in their own works, but also protects them from plagiarism.

The words of the Eighth Commandment "Thou shalt not steal" gained more prominence after the invention of printing in the fifteenth century. The growth of the law of copyright has closely followed the development of mechanical means of production, and its relevance and importance has greatly increased with the technological advances creating mass media of dissemination. Even the communist countries like the U.S. S. R. have felt the necessity of securing to the authors the fruits of their mental labour and have laws relating to copyright whereby property in the works of authors are secured to them and protected from piracy.

The law of copyright is a law creating monopoly; but only in a limited sense, i. e., limited to the right of preventing copyright and thus appropriating to oneself the brain-work of what belongs to others. If someone also by his independent skill and application of mind and labour arrives at the same results, then there is no piracy, and no infringement of copyright.

In revising this famous book on the Copyright Act, XIV of 1957, no pains have been spared to bring the book up-to-date, both as to statutory law and case-law. Almost all the State Law Reports have been consulted in revising this popular book besides other Law Reports and latest editions of books of authority, references to which have been made in this edition.

A Table of Cases referred to, arranged alphabetically, may be found at the beginning, and a well-planned Index may be found at the end of this book for easy and quick reference to cases included and to points of interest.

It is hoped that this revised Fourth Edition will be found as useful as the preceding three editions.

High Court, ALLAHABAD: October 15, 1982 YUDHISHTHIRA

# PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

The law of copyright is a branch of the law relating to industrial property. It includes the law relating to patents, trade-marks, industrial designs, etc.

The law of copyright affords maximum protection to authors. It encourages the researches of learned men. It secures to them proprietary rights in their own works.

Copyright is a limited monopoly (closely analogous to patent rights) protecting the fruits of an author's exertion in literary, dramatic, artistic or musical compositions, which are his own property. The monopoly is, however, limited to the right of preventing copying. If an author arrives at the same results by independent means, there is no infringement of the copyright.

The law of copyright secures, to the producer of an original work, certain benefits, derived by the exercise of his brain, skill and labour, or talent or genius. The copyright given to him is not in derogation of the right of any other person, but is merely the right to prevent other persons from copying and appropriating that which is the true production and the true property of the original author or composer.

Effort has been made in this work to expound the law of the copyright, as contained in the Copyright Act, XIV of 1957. Pains have been taken to deal exhaustively, in appropriate places and under appropriate headings, the entire law relating to copyright.

Care has been taken to bring the work up-to-date, both as to statutory law and case-law. Wherever necessary, obsolete matter has been removed. New passages have been added and some old ones re-written to make the work abreast of the law. In case of doubt or ambiguity over the interpretation of any section of the Act, it will be profitable to look to the relevant English provisions of U. K. Copyright Act, 1911 on which our Copyright Act of 1914 was based for ascertaining the true meaning. However, the U.K. Copyright Act of 1911 is repealed by U. K. Copyright Act, 1956. 1st July, 1977

J. P. SINGHAL

# PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

Copyright, as a right of property, had occupied the thoughts of man for several centuries. From the days of Shakespeare authors and others have sought to protect their works from plagiarism. It is said that pirated editions of Dickens and Trollope were on sale in New York and Boston within days of the arrival of steam-packets carrying stolen proofs. The importance of copyright was stressed by Trollope in these words: "Take away from English authors their copyrights and you would very soon take away from England her authors". The moral basis of the protection afforded in most civilized countries against plagiarism can be stated in the words of the Eighth Commandment: "Thou shalt not steal". Such protection became important after the invention of printing which, in England, occurred about the end of the fifteenth century. It is only just that every man should be entitled to the fruits of his labour. Science and learning are in their nature publici juris and the creation of the mind is merely a contribution to the common stock of knowledge and enjoyment of mankind in which the public have a right. It is felt in Communist countries that the fruits of men's minds should be available to the whole world and they have, therefore, remained outside international agreements relating to copyright. The growth of the law of copyright has closely followed the development of the mechanical means of production; it is noteworthy that in England the printing licences were the earliest form of copyright.

The importance of the law of copyright has greatly increased with technological advances creating modern mass media of dissemination. It is of paramount interest to all those who are concerned in literature, drama, music and art. It has been said that "the law of copyright, despite its wide impact on so many members of the community, has come to be regarded by lawyers as well as others as an arcane branch of the law to be comprehended only by the expert." There is, therefore, need for a lucid, analytical and critical exposition of the law embodied in the Copyright Act, 1957 (14 of 1957) and the second edition now laid before the public endeavours to satisfy this need.

The second edition has been completely re-written in order to make the commentary workmanlike and entirely to the point. The section-wise treatment carries under each section synopsis headings. Authorities, Indian and Foreign, have been enlisted in the discussion and wherever necessary, quotations have been made from leading judgments to illuminate the principles. If authorities were not clear or divergent or were lacking, the correct line to be taken has been indicated with cogent reasons for so doing. The mysteries of the law have been unveiled so as to make the law understood by the lawyer as well as the layman. A well-planned and thorough Index at the end is designed to be a help to the busy reader to obtain quickly the reference on any point he is interested in. It is hoped that the work will prove useful to all those grappling with any question arising under the Copyright Act, 1957 (14 of 1957).

Independence Day, 1968

J. P. SINGHAL

# PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

"THOU shalt not steal", so runs the Eighth Commandment. This is the moral basis of the protective provisions of the Law of Copyright; the principle is that no man shall steal what belongs to another. The law does not permit one man to make a profit and to appropriate to himself that which has been produced by the labour, skill and capital of another.

Two masters of English Literature, Charles Dickens in England and Mark Twain in America, suffered much unhappiness from their works being pirated. Milton spoke of a book as being the precious life-blood of a master-spirit. Not every work in the world bears the stamp of genius. The art that conceals art is the hall-mark of the supreme artist whose works are acclaimed by the common consent of mankind as products of genius and who is not of an age but for all time. Michael Angelo counselled that an artist should "take infinite pains to make something that looks effortless." The pecuniary rewards which come to the author of a first-rate work tempt lesser and unscrupulous men effortlessly to copy the artist's work and reap rewards to which they are not entitled and which by right belong to the original author. The fruit of man's brains can with the utmost propriety be called his property. It is this incorporeal right that the Law of Copyright confers on the producers of original works and what is more important, protects.

Questions of copyright began to agitate the minds of authors of books as soon as printing was introduced. Copyright first applied to "books" and was, in course of time, extended to works other than "books". The first English Act relating to copyright was passed in 1709 (8 Anne, c. 21); it conferred on an author the exclusive privilege of printing, re-printing and publishing his own original work. The Law of Copyright today operates on a much wider field than it did more than two centuries ago. Modern mass media based upon technological advances in Science have made possible the dissemination of the spoken or printed word on a scale and at a speed undreamt of till recently. Burgeoning international trade in literary, musical and artistic works since the last war led to Universal Copyright Convention of 1952 and has caused deep concern to the owners of copyright in countries other than the country of origin. The Law of Copyright, essentially, rests upon the statutory principle, subject to certain restrictions in the interests of the public, that the producer of any original work, be it literary, dramatic, musical or artistic, should be entitled to certain benefits derived from the creation of his brain, skill and labour. The right has been extended to cinematograph films and records.

Copyright in England as in India is statutory. The Parliaments in both countries, sensitive to the need for gearing up the law to changing and expanding requirements of society, have put recently on the statute book the Copyright Act of 1956 in England and the Copyright Act, 1957 (XIV of 1957) in India.

More than two centuries ago, the first Copyright Act in England was passed in 1709 (8 Anne. c. 21). Fourteen Acts of Parliament were passed between the years 1855 and 1875 and several more were added between the years 1875 and 1910. The succession of Acts threw the law into a state of

C-ii

confusion which the Act of 1911 sought to end. It was this English Act of 1911 which was the basis of the Indian Act of 1914. The scheme of the Copyright Act, 1957 (XIV of 1957) in India is derived from the report of the Copyright Committee in 1952 which formed the basis of the latest English Copyright Act of 1956.

The changed status of India as a Sovereign Democratic Republic required that we should have an independent, self-contained law on the subject of copyright. The new Act is the product of a heightened awareness of the rights of producers of original work and has benefited by the experience gained in the working of the existing law for more than four decades. The lay-out of the Act shows a re-arrangement of the main principles of the law as it stood. The Act incorporates many new features such as the establishment of a Copyright Office under the control of the Registrar of Copyrights acting under the superintendence and direction of the Central Government, the setting up of a Copyright Board, the enlargement of the definition of copyright, provisions relating to the issue of a general or special licence for public performances by means of a radio receiving set of a mechanical contrivance, separate copyright in a cinematograph film apart from that in its component parts, story, music, etc., to name only a few. The Act comes to grips with new problems in the Law of Copyright created by technological advances since 1911 in the field of means of communication, such as broadcasting, microfilming, photolithography, movie cinemas and talkies. Besides, provision has been made for discharging our international responsibilities and obligations in the realm of copyright.

In matters of copyright, the Legislature has always kept the interest of the public before it. The Copyright Act, 1957 (XIV of 1957)., affirms and protects the right of the creative artist to the fruit of his labours but it also recognises that artists are members of society and their property is the property of the whole nation. The creative genius of the artist requires for its unfoldment the stimulus of public appreciation and obtains those material rewards which public appreciation implies. It is undeniably just that he should have a copyright in his work but public interest demands that the enjoyment and exercise of this right should be limited to a term which the statute has prescribed. The Law of Copyright is concerned with a triangle of forces, the three sides being the artist, the public, and the publisher or the disseminator and the Indian Act keeps the three forces in order thereby maintaining an equilibrium of competing and conflicting forces, on the whole satisfactory to the three sides.

The Commentary on the Copyright Act, 1957 (XIV of 1957), now laid before the public, endeavours exhaustively and critically to expound the law as contained in the Act. The discussion is under appropriate headings and pains have been taken to deal with every question of law likely to arise under the Act. Authoritative and luminous decisions, which Bacon called the anchors of law, whether Indian or foreign, have been pressed into service to illustrate established principles. The best legal literature on the subject has been drawn upon wherever necessary. The case-law has been brought-up-to date. The Commentary, therefore, constitutes a complete Manual on the important Law of Copyright as contained in the Indian Act and it is conceived that those who seek a clear answer to any question in this branch of the law will find it in this work.

In conclusion, the Author ventures to hope that the fruit of his labour will commend itself to the Bench, the Bar and the public whose discerning appreciation will be his best reward.

# **Table of Cases**

A

Abraham v. Sadanandan, 237 Administrator-General v. Prem Lal, 5 Admiralty Commissioners v. S. S. Susquehanna, 314 Agarwala Publishing House v. Board of High School and Intermediate Education, 28, 33 Ahibaran Singh v. State, 360 Albert v. Hoffnung & Co. Ltd., 32 Albert v. Strange, 110 Altman v. New Haven Union Co., 127 Amar Nath v. M. C. Mohan, 137, 146 Amber Size Co. v. Menzel, 112 American Code v. Bensigner, 304 American Trotting Register Assn. Gocher, 304 A. M. G. Dutch Paint Colour and Varnish Works (Pvt.) Ltd v India Trading House, Delhi, 17, 245, 250 Anderson v. Lielber Code Co., 51 Andrew Re, 383 Annesley, In re, 90
Anton Piller, K. C v. Manufacturing Process
Ltd., 300, 301
Arthur John Mellor v. Australian Board Casting Commission, 37 Articles 143, Constitution of India, In re. Arustein v. Edward, etc. Music Corporation, 83 Arya Pratinidhi Sabha v. Arvind Niketan, 123, 124 Ash v. Dickie, 313, 315, 340 Ashby v. White, 311 Asia Publishing House v. John Wiley, 7 Aspinwall Manufacturing Co. v. Gill, 160 A. Sundarsan v. Thirulok Chandar, A. C., Attorney-General v. Butterworth & Co. (Australia) Ltd., 28 Attorney-General v. De. Keysers Royal Hotel, 376, 383 Attygalle v. King, 359 Austin v. Columbia Gramophone Co. Ltd., 84, 213, 243

Bachman v. Belasco, 236
Bigge v. Miller, 82, 213
Bailey v. Taylor, 323
Baker v. Hutton, 250
Baker v. Libbie, 66
Banco De Portugual v. Waterlow & Sons
Ltd., 335
Banker v Coldwell, 21
Bank of England v. Vagliano, 6

Barnard v. White, 74 Baschet v London Illustrated Standard Co., Basket v. Cambridge University, 28 Bauman v. Fussell, 213 Beal, Ex Parte, 105, 223 Beharilal v. Jogarnath Prasad, 314 Belford v. Charles Scribner, 309, 328, 340 Bengal Immunity Co. v. State of Bihar, 346 Benham & Hart v. Hirst Bros & Co. Ltd., 344 Benton v. Bandype, 300 Beullac. Ltee v. Simard, 85 Bhatia Co-operative Housing Society v. D. C. Patel, 348 Bhupendra M. Patel v. State of Gujarat, 361 Bird v. Cocking & Sons Ltd., 314 Birendra Bahadur Pandey v. Gramophone Co. of India Ltd., 250 Birn Bros Ltd. v. Keen & Co. Ltd., 309, 338, 340 Bishop v. Viviana & Co., 80 Bishop Hareford v. Griffin, 61 Bivabani v. State of Madras, 360 Black v. Ehrich, 72 Black v. Murray A. & Son, 52, 56, 68, 67 Black A. C. Ltd. v. Claude Stacey, Ltd., 19, 20, 124 Blacklock (H) & Co. Ltd. v. Arthur Pearson, (C) Ltd, 57, 67, 68 Blackwell v. Harpar, 85 Blackwood & Son Ltd. v. Parsuraman, 5, 72, 105, 256, 268 Blair v Alan S Tomkins, 246 Blake v. Warren, 91 Blestein v. Donaldson Litho Co., 75 Bloom and Hamlin v. Nixon, 241, 266, 267 Blume v. Spear, 241 Board of Governors, etc. v. Walt Disney Productions, 135, 140 Bobbs-Merrill Co. v. Straus, 3, 96 Bobrecker v. Denebeim, 25 Bocock v. Enfield Rolling Mills Ltd., 314 Bolbes v. Outing Co., 24 Botton v. London Exhibitions Ltd., 222 B. O. Morris Ltd. v F. Gilman B. S. T. Ltd., 223 Boneham & Hart v. Hirst Bros. & Co. Ltd., Boosey v. Empire Music Co., 240, 304 Boosey v Fairelie, 54 Borthwick v. Evening Post, 71, 303, 305 Boucas v. Cooke, 128, 222 Boueicault v. Hart, 220 Boworth v. Wilkes, 268 Bracken v. Rosenthal, 252

Bradbury Agnew & Co. v. Day, 252

Bradbury v. Hotten, 68, 270, 272 Brady v. Daly, 217 Braithwaite Burn & Co v. Trustees of the Port of Madras. 86 Bramwell v. Halcomb, 269, 272, 309 Brightley v. Littleton, 268
Britain v. Kennedy, 254, 255
Britain Publishing Co (London) Ltd. v.
Trade and Commercial Press, Ltd., 71 British Actor's Film Co. v Glover, 89, 130, 134, 136, 137, 141, 142, 157, 159, 222
British Broadcasting Co. v. Wireless League Gezette Publishing Co., 56, 58, 98 British Oxygen Co. Ltd. v. Liquid Air, Ltd., 64, 65 Brooke v. Chitty, 139 Bromel v. Meyer, 69 Brown v. State of Mary Land, 281 Brunsden v. Humphrey, 309 Buck v. Crescent Garden Operating Co., Buck v. Jewell-La-Salla Realty Co, 220 Burke v Spicer's Dress Designs, 17 Burrow Giles v. Sarony, 249 Buskirk v. King, 300 Butterworth v. Robinson, 61 Byrne v Statist Co., 123, 325

(

Cable v. Marks, 76 Cagieux v. Beauchemin, 226 Caird v. Sime, 64, 104 Caley & Sons Ltd. v. Garret & Sons Ltd., 51 Callagham v. Myers, 308, 309, 340 Cambridge University Press v University Tutorial Press Ltd., 22, 229, 272 Carter v. Ford, 23 Cary v. Faden, 72, 269 Cary v. Kersley, 226 Cary v. Longman, 61, 72 Cate v. Devon etc. Newspaper Co., 56 Caxton Publishing Co. Ltd v. Sutherland Publishing Co. Ltd., 315, 324, 336, 338, C. B. S. (U. K.) Ltd. v. Charmdale Records Distributors Ltd., 255 Central India Spinning & Weaving & Manufacturing Co. Ltd. v. Municipal Committee, Wardha, 281 Cescinsk v. George Routledge & Sons Ltd., 290 Chabot v. Davies, 86, 342 Chaplin v. Hicks, 313 Chappel v. Davidson, 71 Chappell v Purday, 111 Chappell v. Sheard, 71 Chappel & Co. v. Fields, 230, 234 Chappell & Co. Ltd. v. Redwood Music Ltd, 121 Chatterton v. Cave, 270 Cherian P. Joseph v. K. Prabhakaran Nair. 95, 104, 358, 360, 361

Chicago Record Herald v. Tribune Association, 18 Chidambare v. Renga, 131 Chilton v. Progress Printing and Publishing Co, 76, 77, 110. 111 Clapham v. St. Pancras, 125 Clarke v. Brajendra Kishore Roy Chow-dhury, 265 Clarke Irwin & Co. Ltd. v. C. Cole Co. Ltd., 283 Clement v. Maddick, 71 Colburn v. Simms, 323, 328 Collis v. Cater, 57, 91 Commissioner of Income-tax v. Teja Singh, 346 Con Planc v. Kolynos, 128 Constantine v. Imperial London Ltd., 311 Cooper v. James, 83, 84 Cooper v. Whittingham, 327 Copper v Stephens, 133, 138, 160, 222 Corelli v Gray, 4, 216, 240 Corns v. Griffiths, 71 Corn Products Co. Ltd. Vennotscharp, 344 Ltd. v. Naamlooze Cox v. Land and Water Journal Co., 56, Cravens v. Credit Men's Association, 294, Cummins v. Bond, 18, 19, 120 Carwood v. Affiliated Distributors Inc.,

#### D

Daily Calendar Supplying Bureau v. United Concern, 102, 247 D'Almaine v. Boosey, 213, 224, 239, 240, Dalmia Biscuit (Pvt.) Ltd. v. Tez Biscuit Factory, 101 Daly v. Palmer, 78, 231, 233, 214, 236, 239 Daly v. Webster, 217 Dam v. Kirkela Shelle Co., 217, 231, 302, 303, 308, 309, 316, 340 Davidson v. Annesley, 90 Davis v. Benjamin, 60 Davis Ex parte, 376, 384 De Bekker v. Stokes, 160 Deb Narain v. Ram Sadhan, 131 Deeks v. Wells, 94, 100, 110, 111 Deifeld v. Dodge Pub Co., 228 Delfe v. Delomotee, 323 De Mille Co. v. Casey, 220 Dennis v. London Passenger Transport Board, 311 Dennison v. Ashdown, 222 Deonandan v. State of Bihar, 359 De Parto Statutory Co v. Giuham Statutory Co., 302 De Silva v. Soosai Pillai, 372 De Vitre v. Betts, 323, 324 Devonport v. Century Production, 128

Dhankappan v. Vidyarambhan Press and Book Depot, 119 Dharam Dutt v. Ram Lal, 142, 331, 337 Dhermalinga v. Balasubramania, 350 Dhian Singh v. Union of India, 338 Dial Singh v. Gurdwara Sri Akal Takht, 13 Dickens, In re, 96, 109, 133 Dicks v. Yates, 68, 69, 70 Diwan Singh v. Emperor, 354 Dodsley v. Kinnersley, 52 Donmar Production Ltd. v. Bart, 298 Donoghue v. Allied News Papers, Ltd., 17, 18, 19, 119, 120 Dorling v Honnor Marine Ltd., 105 Dorsey v Old Surety Life Insurance Co., 72, 94 Doya Narain v. Secretary of State, 372 Drabble Ltd. v. Hycolite Mfg. Co., 222 Draper v. Trist, 71 Duck v. Bates, 217, 218, 219 Duke of Leeds v. Amherst, 129 Duke of Queensbury v Shebbeare, 112 Dun v. Lumberman's Credit Assn., 302 Dymow v. Bolton, 230, 232

Eastern India Motion Pictures v. Performing Right Society, 118, 178 Edison v. Lubin, 88 Edmonds v. Stern, 84 Educational Co. of Ireland Ltd. v. Fallon Bros, Ltd., 56, 141 Education Book Depot v. Rabindra Nath Tagore, 274 Edward Thomson Co. v. American Law Book Co., 73 Etchel v. Marcin, 3, 95, 96, 231, 232 Elizabeth v. Pavement Co., 340 Emerson v. Davies, 22, 236, 249 Entertaining Enterprises, Madras v. State of Tamil Nadu, 25, 179, 290
Ernest Turner Electrical Instruments Ltd. v. Performing Right Society Ltd., 214, 220 Errabhadrarao v. B N Serma, 47 Evans v. Hulton & Co. Ltd., 18 Everest Pictures Circuit, Salem v. S. Karuppannan, 350 Exchange Telegraph Co. v. Central News, 111 Exchange Telegraph Co. v. Gregory & Co., 56, 111, 315, 335

Falcon v. Famous Players Film Co. Ltd., 89, 130, 221 Falk v. Donaldson, 24, 245 Falk v. Howell & Co., 251, Falk Ltd. v. J cobwitz, 345 Fenning Film Service Ltd. v. Wolverhampton Walsall & District Cinemas Ltd., 335 Ferris v. Frohman, 220, 221 Ferris v. Hexamer, 249 Fleischer Studios Inc. v. Ralph. Freundlich Inc., 252 Folsom v. Marsh, 65, 66, 67, 265, 266, 269, Football League Ltd. v. Littlewoods Pools Ltd., 57 Fores v. Johnes, 74 Fortune Films v. Dev Anand, 89 Francis D'Almaine v. Boosey, 213 Francis Day and Hunter, Ltd. v. Bron, 103, 213, 242 Francis Day and Hunter v. Feldman & Co., Francis Day and Hunter, Ltd. v. Twentieth Century Fox Corporation Ltd., 68, 70, 221 Frankel v. Irwin, 217, 229, 231, 232 Fraser v. Evans, 96 Frederick Emerson v. C. Davies, 48 Fred Fisher Inc. v. Dillingham, 23, 238, 244 Fuller v. Beins, 79

Fuller v. Blackpool Winter Gardens & Pavilion Co., 82 G G. A. Cramp and Son, Ltd. v. Frank Smythson, Ltd, 22, 48, 57 Gale v. Leckie, 74, 139 Gama Prasad v. Nabahash Goswami, 87, 124, 217 Gambert v. Ball, 105 Ganesh Prasad v. Bechu Singh, 131 Ganga Vishnu v. Moreshvar, 323, 324, 339 Gani Lal v. Emperor, 360 Gee v. Pritchard, 64, 66, 74 G G. Harrap & Co. v. Harbans Lal, 224 Ghafoor Bakhsh v. Jawala Prasad Singhal, 61, 63, 302 Ghampney v. Haag, 247 Ghurey v. State, 365 Gibbon v. Pease, 86 Gill v. Apollo Pub, 309 Gilmore v. Anderson, 295 Glaxo Operations U. K. Ltd. Middlesex (England) v. Samrat Pharmaceuticals, Kanpur, 17, 119, 187, 257, 330, 332 Glyn v. Sexton Feature Film Co., 313 Glyn v. Western Feature Film Co., 513 241 Good Eating Inc. v. Best Places to Eat Gopaldas v. Jagannath Prasad, 19, 226, 337 Gopi Mohan v. Pratap Chunder, 372 Goswami v. Govardhanlal, 372 Govindan v Gopala Krishna, 21, 59, 61, 72, 224, 227 Govindarajulu v. Secretary of State, 371

Grace v. Morgan, 314 Gramophone Co. of India Ltd. v. Birendra

Bahadur Pandey, 281 Gramophone Co. Ltd. v. Stephen Cawar-

dine & Co, 89

Graves, Ex parte, 85, 87, 127, 128, 225
Green v. Bishop, 268
Green v. Luby, 267
Green v. Minzensheimer, 241, 266
Greental v. Luby, 84
Greening v. Wilkinson, 340
Gross v. Seligman, 248
Griffith v. Tower Publishing Co., 157
Guranditta Mal v. Ram Das, 371
Gurudwara Penja Sahib v. Mohd. Nawaz, 68
Gyies v. Wilcox, 52, 224

#### H

Hales v. T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 254 Hall v. Barrows, 71 Hanfstaengl v. Bainest Co., 212, 223 Hanfstaengl v. Empire Palace Ltd., 223 Hanfstaengl v. W. H. Smith & Sons, 100, 212, 213, 316, 328, 335 Hanfstaengl Art Publishing Co. v. Holloway, Hanson v. Jaccard, 299 Harson v. Jaccard, 299
Harbuns v. Bhairo, 292
Harms v. Stern, 73. 160, 161, 219
Harms Inc. and Chappals Co. v. Martan's
Club, Ltd., 4, 214, 218
Harold Lloyd Corp v. Witwer, 234
Harper Brothers v. Biggs & Sons, 272
Hart v. Fox. 160 Hart v. Fox, 160 Hartford Printing v. Hartford Directory and Publishing, 341 Harwood v. Great Northern Railway Co., Hasmaan Picture (N. V.) v. Osborne, 297 Hass v. Feist, 295, 317 Hatris v. Cocacola Co., 25 Hatton v. Keane, 23, 53 Hawker & Son (London) Ltd. v. Paramount Film Service Ltd, 87, 128, 213, 240, 250, 263, 271, 272, 273, 308 Hayness v. Druggist's Circular, 304 H. Blacklock & Co. Ltd. v. C. Arthur Pearson, Ltd, 58 Heal & Sons Ltd. case, 278 Heap v Hartley, 138, 139, 159 Hedderwick v. Griffin, 67 Hein v. Harris, 84, 239 Herbert v. Fields, 121 Herbert v Shanley & Co, 217 Hill v. Whalen & Martell Inc., 252, 266, 272 Hime v. Dale, 74 Hirseh v. Paramount Picture Inc., 23, 83, Historical Pub. v. James Bros, 294 Hodges v. Welsh, 61 Hogg v. Kirby, 323 Hogg v Scott, 227, 295 Hogg v. Toye & Co., Ltd., 67 Hole v. Bradbury, 139, 324 Holland v. Vivian Van Preductions Ltd, 216

Hollinrake v. Truswell, 76, 85, 94, 110, 111 Holmes v. Hurst, 104, 216, 231 Horton v. Colwyn Bay, 313 Howitt v. Hall, 141, 144, 159 Hubbard v. Vosper, 292 Hubges v. Belasco., 233 Hurst v. Picture Theatres Ltd., 222 Hutchings v. Sheard, 68

#### I

Illustrated Newspaper, Ltd. v. Publicity Services (London) Ltd., 71
Indian General Navigation & Railway Co. v. Eastern Assam Co. Ltd., 318
Sutherland Publishing Co. Ltd. v. Caxton Publishing Co. Ltd., 336
International Film v. Affiliated Distributors, 302
I. P. R. Society v. E. I. M. P. Association, 94, 118, 145
Island Records Ltd., Ex parte, 300
Italian Book Co. Inc. v. Rossi, 84

#### T

Jagdish Prasad v. Parmeshwar Prasad, 50 James & Sons Ltd. v Smee, 357 James Nisbet & Co v. Golf Agency, 19 Janata Picture v. A. V. M. Productions, 105 Jarrold v. Haywood, 68, 269 Jarrold v. Houlston, 56, 61, 76, 91, 94, 96, 98, 226, 267, 305 J. C. Williamson Ltd. v. British Dominion Film Ltd., 88 Jefferys v. Boosey, 3, 5, 111 Jennings v Stephens, 214, 218, 219, 223 Jewell-La-Salla Realty Co. v. Buck, 220 Jivandas Savchand In re, 354

J. N. Bagga v. All India Reporter Ltd., 6, 254, 356, 357, 367

John Cane Ltd. v. Associated Newspaper v. Associated Newspaper Ltd., 325, 340 Johns v. Paull Pioneer Music Corporation, 240 Johnson v. Donaldson, 20 Johnson v. Edge, 344

Johnstone v. Bernard Jones Publication
Ltd., 271, 272 Jollie v. Jaques. 16, 238 Jolsom v. Marsh, 319 Joy Music I td v. Sunday Pictorial Newspapers, 102, 241

#### K

Kalia Perumal, In re, 360
Kali Das v. Karam Chand, 354, 355
Kalinga Tubes Ltd. v. D. Suri, 365
Kamala Pook Depot, Ltd. v Souriendra
Nath, 137, 139
Karll v. Curtis Publishing Co, 96
Kartar Singh v. Ladha Singh, 63, 98, 100, 101, 144, 294, 295, 297

Kay v. Goodwin, 381 Keene v. Kimball, 64 Kelly v. Cinema Houses, Ltd., 82, 83 Kelly v. Hooper, 323 Kelly v. Morris, 56, 226, 227 Kelly's Directories Ltd. v. Gavin & Lloyds, Kenrick v. Danube Collieries, etc. Co., Ltd., 56, 66 Kenrick & Co. v. Lawrence & Co., 85, 120, 124 Khemraj v. Garg & Co., 126, 151 K. Hoshide v. Emperor, 365 Khosla Bros v. Thacker Directories Ltd., Kierson v. Thompson & Sons Ltd., 310 King Features Syndicate Inc. v. Kleeman, Ltd , 250 King Features Syndicate v., Fleischer, 251, King Features Syndicate Inc. v. O. & M. Klechman Ltd., 85, 223, 231, 277 Kirk v. Fleming, 55 K. P. M. Sundaram v. Rattan Prakashan Mandir, 299 Kreymborg v. Durente, 78 Krishna v. Nallaperumal, 6 Krishnamurthy v. Parthasarathy, 348 K. R. V. Sarma v. S Ganesan, 247 Kumari Kanaka v Sundarajan, 184 Kundanlal v. Desraj, 314 Kurtz & Co. v. Spence, 344

#### L

Lachman v. Pyar Chand, 311 Ladbroke (Football) Ltd. v. William Hill (Football) Ltd., 49, 57, 69, 100, 106, 212, 263, 265 Ladd v. Oxnard, 21, 300 Lallubhai v. Laxmishankar, 247 Lamb v Evans, 21, 55, 60, 70, 112 Lancashire and Yorkshire Railways v. Mac Niconn, 338 Landeker & Brown v. Wohff & Co. Ltd., 4, 141, 144 Lauri v. Renad, 120 Lawenfels v. Nathan, 235 Lawrence v. Dana, 264, 266, 269, 302 Lawrence v. Smith, 74 Lawrence & Bullun, Ltd. v. Affalo, 61, 126 Laxman v. Dayabhai, 354 Laxton Publishing Co. Ltd. v. Sutherland Publishing Co. Ltd., 338, 339 Leader v. Purday, 84 Leah v. Two Worlds Publishing Co. Ltd., 129 Lee v. Alston, 323 Lee v. Gibbings, 333 Leicestershire County Council v. Faraday & Partners, Ltd., 86 Leslie v. Young (J) & Sons, 52, 57, 72, 272 Levy v. Rutely, 18, 120, 121, 122, 150 Lewis v. Chapman, 268, 295

Lewis v. Fullarton, 61, 68, 302, 306 Liberaco Ltd. v. Shaw Walker, Ltd., 76 Licensed Victualler's Newspaper v. Bingham, Printing & Publishing Lillard v. Sun Association, 269 London v. Biograph Co., 232 London Printing & Publishing Alliance, Ltd. v Cox, 138, 156 Lord v. Calvin, 39, 90 Louis v. Smellie, 112 Louis De Jonge v. Breaker and Kesler, 303 Low v. Ward, 72 Lowenfels v. Nathan (S. D. N. Y.), 217, 237 Lucas v. Cooke, 141, 223, 224, 250 Lumiere v. Pathe Exchange, 249 Luna Advertising Co. Ltd. v. Burnham & Co., 344

### M

Mabarik Ali v. State of Bombay, 355 Mack v. Petter, 71 Maclin v. Richardson Ambler, 220 Macmillan & Co. v. Suresh Chunder Deb, 20, 49, 59, 226, 229 Macmillan & Co. Ltd. v. Cooper, 14, 21, 47, 49, 52, 56, 58, 60, 62, 63, 68, 72, 98, 108, 226 Macmillan & Co. Ltd. v Dent, 64, 65 Macmillan Co. Ltd v. King, 267, 271, 305 Maheshwar Swami v. Bidyut Probha Art Press, 350 Mahomed Tahir In re, 365 Manohan v. Denville, 224 Manohar Lal Gupta v. State of Haryana, 33 Mansell v Valley Printing Co, 5, 109 Mansell v Wesly Ltd., 340 Manson v. Murray, 72 Maple & Co. v. Junior Army & Navy Stores, 56, 327 Marsh v. Conquest, 328 Marshall v. Ram Narain, 62, 224, 257 Marshall & Co., Ltd. v. Bull, Ltd., 138, 156 Martin v. Wright, 130 Martinetti v. Maguire, 79 Marks v Leo Feist Inc, Marzials v. Gibbons, 211 Massine v. De Basil, 80, 81, 126 Masson Seeley, Ltd. v. Embosotype Manufacturing Co., 51 Matthewson v. Stockdale, 56, 86, 96, 98, 226, 249 Maung Nyi Pu v. East End Films, 221 Maurel v. Smith et al, 120, 122, 152, 236 Mawman v. Tegg, 61, 268, 306, 309, 324 M. B. Kavyalaya v. Shiv Ratan Lal, 139 McCarthy & Fisher v White, 221 McClintic v. Schedon, 88 McCrum v. Eisner, 85 McFarlane v. Hulton, 103

M. C. Productions v. A. Sundaresan, 185. Measures Ltd. v. Measures, 112 Meikle v. Maufe, 86, 278, 342 Mellor v. Australian Broadcasting Commission, 83, 220, 221 Milville v. Mirror of Life Co , 151 Messager v. British Broadcasting Co, 139, 155, 157, 220, 221
Metro-Goldwyn Mayer Distributing Corporation v. Bijou Theatro Co., 159, 305 Metzler v Wood, 71 Metzler & Co. Ltd. v. Curwen (J.) & Sons, Ltd., 136 M. H. Alexander v. Claira Alexander, 354, 355 Miffin v. Dutton, 104 Miffin v. White, 104 Miller v. Boothman, 384 Millar v. Taylor, 2, 28 Milligan v. Broadway Cinema Productions, Ltd., 89, 130 Mischeff v. Springett, 254 Mishrabandhu Karyalaya v. Shivaratanlal Koshel, 185 M. N. Adhikari v. Food Inspector, 360 Mobarik Ali v State of Bombay, 354 Moffatt & Piage, Ltd. v. Gills & Sons Ltd., 72, 229 Mohammed Kasim v. Hanuman Industries, 372 Mohan Singh v. Lajya Ram, 371 Mohendra Chandra v. Emperor, 100 Mohindar Singh v. State, 360 Moir v. Williams, 16 Mood Music Publishing Co. v. De Wolfe Ltd., 301 Moore v. Clarke, 308 Moore v. Rugg, 127 Morison v. Moat, 110 Morris v. Ashbee, 56, 60, 227, 295 Morris v. Wright, 56 Morrison S. S. Co. v. Greystoke Casile, 318 Moss v. Christ Church Rural District Council, 361 Moul v. Groenings, 379 M. P. Kumaraswami, In re, 383 M. P. Sharma v. Satish Chandra, 365 Muddock v. Blackwood, 337 Murray v. Benbow, 74, 75 Murray v. Bogue, 68, 215, 223, 324 M. Witmark & Sons v. Pastime Amusement Co, 241

Nag Book House v. State of West Bengal, Nance v. British Columbia Electric Rly. Co., Ltd., 314 National Geographic Society v. Classified Geographic, 133 Natt v. National Institute, 232, 252 Nav Sahitya Prakash v. Anand Kumar, 5, 158, 184, 185, 189, 290

Neilson v. Betts, 323, 324 Neilson v. Horniman 137, 139 Newberry's case, 15 New Hindustan Bank Ltd. v. Amritsar-Pathankot Transport Ltd., 308 Newman v. Tecc, 302 Newton v. Cowice, 87, Nichols v. Pitman, 64 Nichols v. Universal Pictures Corporation, 217, 233, 235 Nisbet (J) & Co. Ltd. v. Golf Agency, 56 Norden v. Oliver Dikson & Co., 83 Norendra Nath v. Kamalbasini Das i, 6 Norman Kark Publication Ltd. v. Odhams Press, Ltd., 71 Novello v Ludlow, 36, 104 N. T. Raghunathan v. All India Reporter, 62, 224

Oakley v. Lyster, 338 Odhams Press Ltd. v. London & Provincial Sporting New Agency, 76 Omar Ali v. Jnan Niranjan. 63 Om Prakash Sharma v. Surendra Kumar, O. V. Narayanan v. Executive Officers, 359

Page v. Wisden, 76, 77 Pagla Baba v. State, 365 Paker v. Libbie, 65 Palin v. Gathercole, 65 Palmer v. Ded Witt, 220 Palmer v. Wilcox, 304 Pandurangan v. Govinda, 277 Prabhudas v. Law Reporters Ltd., 296 Panna Lal v. Kasturchand, 310 Park and Pollard v. Kellestrauss, 306 Pasickhiach v. Dogacek, 74 Pathe Pictures, Ltd. v. Bancroft, 88, 157 Pearl Cooper Ltd. v. Richmond Hill Press, Ltd., 71 Penguin Books Ltd. v. India Book Distributors, 31, 283, 284 Perceval v. Phipps, 66 Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Camelo, Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Ciryl Theatrical Syndicate Ltd, 221, 327 Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Gillette Industries Ltd., 219, 220 Performing Righits Society Ltd. v. Hammond's Bradford Brewery Co., 215, 220 Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Harlequin Records Shops Ltd., 104, 215, 219, 314 Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Howthorn Hotel (Bournemouth) Ltd., 104, 215, 218 Performing Rights Society v. Indian Morning Post Restaurant, 257 Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. London Theatre of Varieties, 136 Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Mitchell and Booker, 222, 293 Performing Right Society v. Thompson, 328

Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Urban District Council, 330 Perkin v. Ray Brothers, 81, 82 Phillip v. Pennell, 65 Photo Drama Motion Picture Co. v. Social Uplift Film Co. 138 Pike v. Nicholas, 76, 225 Pillaiamarri Lakshmikanthan v. Ramakrishna Pictures, Vijayawada, 291, 292, 312, 323, 324 Pitman v Hine, 51 Pitt Pitts v. George & Co., 137, 141, 143 Plauche v. Braham, 240 Platt v. Walter, 5 Polemis' case, 318 Polydor v Harlequin Record Shop, 283 Pope v. Curl, 61, 64, 65 Poplett v. Stockdale, 74 Portway Press, Ltd. v. Hague, 57 Powell v. Aiken 323 Powell v. Head, 158, 290 Poznanski v. London Film Production Ltd., Pratap Chandra v. Union of India, 372 Pratap Singh v Gulzari Lal, 12, 13 Press Publishing Co. v. Falk, 128 Preston v. Raphael Tuck, 144 Prince Albert v. Strange, 35 Province of Madras v. Boddu Paidanna, Purefoy Engineering Co. Ltd. v. Sykes Boxall & Co., 60

#### 0

Qadar Baksh v. Gulam Mohammad, 107 Quarlaz Hill Gold Mining Co. v Eyre, 314

#### R

Rabari Ramji v. State, 360 Radha Krishna v. State of Bihar, 189 Raghubir Singh v. Secretary of State, 309 Raghunath Das v. All-India Reporter, 297 Raj Narain v. Newton, 372 Ramabandhu v. Brahmananda, 13 Ramdas v. Raja, 311 Ram Narain v. Shib Kumar, 48 Reade v. Bentley, 67 Reade v. Lacy, 269 Reddaway v. Banham, 71 Read v. Carusi, 23 Rees v. Melville, 80, 213, 229 R. G. Anand v. Delux Films, 234, 235 Rickman v. Thierry, 107 Ricordi & Co. v. Columbia Gramophone Co, 122 Ridgeway Co. v. Amalgamated Press, Ltd., Ridgeway Co. v. Hutchinson, 71 Robertson v. Lewis, 17 Rodricks v. Secretary of State, 372 Roe Lawton v. Hall E. Roach Studio, 232 Romesh v. K H. Ali Mohd, 227

Rubber & Technical Press, Ltd. v. Maclaren & Sons, 71 Rundell v. Murraey, 295 Rush v. Oursler, 216, 231, 232, 235

#### S

Sahadat Ali v State, 360 Saltman Engineering Co. Ltd. v. Campbell Engineering Co. Ltd., 108 Sampath Aiyyangar v. Jamshedji Kanga, 227, 307 Sampson and Murdock v. Seaver Redford, 264, 299, 303 Samuelson v Producer's Distributing Co., Sanaveratne v. R., 359 Satsang v. Kiron Chandra Mukhopadhyay, 64, 185 Saunders v. Smith, 268, 295 Savage v. Hoffman, 79 Savory v. World of Golf Ltd., 327 Schauer v. Field, 380 Schellberg v Empringham, 213 Schove v. Chmincake, 76, 77 Schumacher v. Schwenke, 251 Scott v. Stanford, 61, 227 Scottish Insurance Co. v. Royal Edinburgh Infirmary, 124 Scribner v. tClark, 308 Sebring Po tery v. Steubeanville Pottery, 317 Seddon v. Tutop, 309 Seltzer v. Sunbrock, 80, 229 Serana v. Jefferson, 234 Shambhu Nath v. State of Ajmer, 359 Shamnugger Jute Factory Co. v. Ram Narain, 292 Sharp v Powell, 317 Shearman v. Folland, 311, 314 Sheldon v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures Corporation, 231, 232, 233, 234, 236 Sheo Ratan v. Gopal Chandra, 358 Shephered v. Conquest, 17, 119, 121 Shyam Lal v. Gaya Prasad, 33, 51 Siddhanti v. Venkateswar Publishing House, 118, 137 Simmons v. Health Laundry, 122, 123, 124 Simms v. Marryat, 102 Simonton v. Gordon, '33, 235 Sinanide v. La Maison Kosmee, 51, 55 Sinclar v. Eldred, 314 Singh v. A. W. N. Wyatt3, t0 Singsby v. Bradford Paten1Truck & Trolly Co, 72, 75 S. K. Dutt v. Law Book Co. 21 Skimmer & Co. v. Pogson, ,44 Stockdale v. Onwhipyme, 753 Smith v. Chatto, 68, 272 Smith v. Faker, 338 Smith v. Johnson, 303, 305 Sohan v. Jagat, 292 Sophia Orde v. Alexander Skinner, 371

Southy v. Sherwood, 74, 295 Spiers v. Brown, 225 Springfield v. Thame, 18, 19, 65, 120 Srimagal & Co. v. Books (India) Private, Ltd., 145 Standard v. Harrison, 24 Standard v. Lee, 86 Standard Tubewell and Engineering Works v. Jogendra Nath, 372 State v. Garasea Natubha, 360 State of Bombay v. F. N. Balsara, 281 State of Rombay v United Motors (India) Ltd., 376, 383 State of Madras v. A. L. S. Productions, 130 Stecher Lith Co. v. Dunston Lith. Co., 25, Stephens v. Cady, 138 Stephenson v. Chappel & Co. Ltd., 244 Stevens v. Benning, 139, 151 Stevens v. Brett, 323 Stevenson v. Crook (Canada), 51 Stevenson v. Haris, 216, 232 Stevenson Jorden and Harrison, Ltd. v. Macdonald and Evans, 124 St. Helens Colliery Co. Ltd. v. Hewiston, 123 Stockdale v. Onwhn 74. 75 Stodart v. Mutual Film Corporation, 232 Story's Exors v Holcombe, 15 Stovin Bradford v. Volpoint Properties Ltd., 245 Sudhir Chandra Gupta v. State of Assam, 360 Sukha v. Ninni, 131 Simonton v. Gordon, 229 Sunley & Co. v. Cunard White Star, 307 Sun Newspapers Ltd. v. Whipple, 124 Surridges Patents Ltd. v. Trico Folberth Ltd, 344 Survey Bureau Ltd. v. Massie & Renwick, Ltd., 5 Susiah v. Muniswamy, 145, 146, 333, 352 Sutherland Publishing Co. v. Caxton Publishing Co., 303, 313, 315, 336, 337, 339, Sutton Vane v. Famous Players Film Co, Ltd., 237 Sweet v. Benning, 61, 62, 126, 224 Sweet v. Cater, 67, 137, 139

Tata Oil Mills Co Ltd., Delhi v. Reward Soap Works, 350 Tata v. Fullbrook, 19, 27, 79, 81, 82 Tata v Thomas, 23, 81, 119, 120 Taylor v. Neville, 137, 139 Taylor v. Pillow, 141 Technical Productions (London) Ltd. Contemporary Exhibition & Whittaker, Tett Bross, Ltd. v. Trake and Gorham Ltd, 64 Thankappan v Vidyarambhan Press and Book Depot (P.) Ltd., 137, 214, 325

Thomas v. Turner, 67, 85, 127

Thompson v. American Law Fook Co., 267 Tiffany Production v. Dewing, 305 Tilmus v. Littlewood, 254 Time-Life International (Nederlands) v. Interstate Parcel Express Co. Ltd, 283 Tinsley v. Lacy, 106 Tituram v Cohen, 292 Trade Auxiliary Company v. Middlesborough & District Trademen's Protection Association, 56, 60 Trow Directory Printing and Book Binding v. Boyd, 303 Tubb etux v. Laidler, 83 Tuck & Sons v. Priester, 141 Turner v. Robinson, 252 Turner V. C. Mc Nicol v. Sportman's Book Stores, 110 Tutelman v. Stokowski, 95

Ugal Chand v. Suraj Mal, 371 Underhill v. Schenck, 112, 159 Underwriters Survey Bureau, Ltd. v. Amer Homefire Ass. Co., 57 Universal City Studios Inc. v. Mukhtar & Sons, 300 University of London Press v. University Tutorial Press, 14, 33, 47, 50, 63, 64, 124, 271, 272 Upmann v. Forester, 237 Uproar Co. v. National Broadcasting Co., 220, 221 Uslie v. Young & Sons, 98

Veeranna v. Mastan, 360 Vincent v. Universal Housing Co, Ltd., 91 Viswanath v. Muthu Kumaraswami, 140 V. M. Sayed Mohammad & Co.v. State of Andhra, 383 V. S. Sharma v. Dharma Rao, 360

Wagon Mound Overseas Tankship v. Morts Dock & Engineering Co., 318 Waite's Exors v. Commissioners of Inland Revenue, 16 Walcot v. Walker, 74 Walker v. Crystal Palace Football Club, 85, Wallerstein v. Herbert, 23 Walter v. Lane, 19, 53, 57, 65, 91, 97, 98, 119, 120, 225 Walter v. Steinkopff, 51, 110, 111, 256, 272, 273, 327 Warne v. Routledge, 157, 159 Warne & Co. v. Seebohm, 324 Warner Brothers Pictures Inc. v. Nelson, Warmick Tyre Co. v. New Motor Co., 71 Waterson, Berlin & Slyder Co., In re, 139 Watson v. Coupland, 254 W. B. Yeates v. Eric Dickinson, 339