

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LAW



Cavendish  
Publishing  
Limited

London • Sydney

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LAW

Diane Rowland, Lecturer in Law,  
University of Wales, Aberystwyth

Elizabeth Macdonald, Senior Lecturer in Law,  
University of Wales, Aberystwyth  
Both of the Centre for Computers, Technology and Law

With a chapter on evidence by  
Michael Hirst, Reader in Law,  
University of Wales, Aberystwyth



Cavendish  
Publishing  
Limited

London • Sydney

## PREFACE

First published in Great Britain 1997 by Cavendish Publishing Limited, The Glass House, Wharton Street, London WC1X 9PX.

Telephone: 0171-278 8000 Facsimile: 0171-278 8080

e-mail: [info@cavendishpublishing.com](mailto:info@cavendishpublishing.com)

Visit our Home Page on <http://www.cavendishpublishing.com>

© Rowland, D and Macdonald, E 1997

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise, except under the terms of the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or under the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 9HE, UK, without the permission in writing of the publisher.

Macdonald, Elizabeth

Information technology law: text, cases and materials

1. Computers – Law and legislation – Great Britain

2. Electronic data interchange – Law and legislation – Great Britain

I. Title II. Rowland, Diane

344.1'0378'004

1 85941 225 4

Printed and bound in Great Britain

Our impetus to produce this book arose out of our undergraduate and postgraduate teaching in information technology law. Although the number of texts in the area is now increasing, on being asked by students to recommend a casebook we were unable to do so. We have also found that one of the difficulties with a relatively new subject is that materials are not always readily accessible to students. Our aim was to include a range of materials sufficient to aid and enhance the student's study of this topic. In addition, in such a developing area, we felt it helpful to include a substantial element of our own text, where the context required it.

The book is primarily aimed at undergraduate and postgraduate law students. Against that background, we hope that it will provide reassurance that a detailed knowledge of the technology is unnecessary to understand the legal issues. Where some rudimentary understanding is helpful, minimum technical explanations have been included. We think the book may also prove useful, and of interest, to computer scientists, who increasingly have to consider the wider implications of their discipline. They, of course, can skip the brief explanations of the technology!

We think that information technology provides exciting challenges and opportunities for the law and lawyers. We hope that we have communicated something of this to the reader.

We would particularly like to thank Michael Hirst for producing the chapter on evidence. His expertise in the area of evidence in general is well-established and the book has benefited from his contribution. We are also indebted to Jem Rowland for his advice on the more technical aspects of the text and to Michael Hirst, Reader in Law, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, for his contribution of Chapter 9.

*Diane Rowland*

*Elizabeth Macdonald*



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is made for permission to reprint copyright material, and in particular to the following to reprint material from the sources indicated.

Velasco, 'The copyrightability of non-literal elements of computer programs'. The article originally appeared at (1994) 94 Colum L Rev 242.

Tolley Publishing for permission to reproduce extracts from *Computer Law and Practice*.

International Bureau of World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) for permission to reproduce WIPO Model Provisions on the Protection of Computer Software 1978 (Introduction).

Chris Reed for permission to reproduce extracts from Reed, C, 'Digital Information Law – Electronic Documents and Requirements of Form', 1996, Centre for Commercial Law studies, Queen Mary and Westfield College.

Extracts reprinted from *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, Vol 32, Lloyd, pp 198–99, 1991, 'Liability for Defective Software' (1991), Computer Law and Security Report, Vol 12; Smith, G, 'EC Software Protection Directive: An Attempt to Understand Art 5(1), p 148, 1990–91, with permission from Elsevier Science Ltd, The Boulevard, Langford Lane Kidlington OX5 1GB, UK.

Decisions of Data Protection Tribunal, Reports of Patent Design and Trade Mark cases, Law Commission Consultation Paper No 138, 9th and 11th Reports of the Data Protection Registrar, Law Commission Report No 1982, Scottish Law Commission Report on Computer Crime, Cm 174, Law Commission Working Paper No 110, Law Commission Report on Computer Misuse Cm 819. Crown Copyright is reproduced with permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Institute of Electrical Engineers for permission to reproduce extracts from, *Safety Related Systems. A Professional Brief for the Engineer*.

*Official Journal of the European Communities* and *ECJ Reports*. Extracts reprinted with permission.

*The Michigan Law Review* for permission to reproduce extracts from Englund, SR, Note, 'Idea, Process or Protected Expression?: Determining the Scope of Copyright protection of the Structure of Computer programs' (1990) 88 Mich L Rev 866.

Rowland, D and Rowland, JJ, 'Competence and Legal Liability in the Development of Software safety-Related Applications' (1993) 2 *Information and Communications Technology Law* (previously *Law Computers and Artificial Intelligence*) 229 with permission of Carfax Publishing Limited, PO Box 25, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX14 3UE, UK.

LLP Limited for permission to reproduce extract from Faber, D, 'Electronic Bills of Lading' [1996] LMCLQ 23.

Incorporated Council for Law Reporting for England and Wales for permission to reproduce extracts from the *Law Reports* and the *Weekly Law Reports*.

Burton, 'Regulation and Control of the Internet: Is it Feasible? Is it Necessary?' (1995) 21 *Journal of Information Science*. Reprinted with the kind permission of Bowker-Saur, a division of Reed Elsevier (UK) Ltd and the Institute of Information Scientists.

West Publishing Co for permission to reproduce extracts from the *Federal Reporter*.

*Cambridge Law Journal* and Professor Brian Napier for permission to reproduce extracts from Napier, B, 'The Future of Information Technology Law' [1992] CLJ 46.

Butterworth & Co Ltd for permission to reproduce extracts from the *All England Law Reports*, Stapleton, *Product Liability*, 1994, and Aldhouse, 'UK Data Protection - Where are we in 1991?' (1991) 5 *Yearbook of Law, Computers and Technology* 180.

*Stanford Law Review*, Stanford, California 94305, USA and Fred B Rothman & Co, 10368 West Centennial Road, Littleton, Colorado 80127 for permission to reproduce extracts from Dunn, 'Defining the Scope of Copyright Protection for Computer Software' (1986) 38 *Stanford LR* 497 (© 1986 by the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University); Menell, 'An Analysis of the Scope of Copyright protection for Applications Programs' (1989) 41 *Stanford LR* 1045 (© 1989 by the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University).

Macmillan, for permission to reproduce extracts from Walden, 'EDI and the Law' in Edwards, Savage and Walden (eds), *Information Technology and the Law*.

*Harvard Law Review* and Professor AR Miller for permission to reproduce extracts from 'Copyright Protection for Computer Programs, Databases and Computer Generated Works' (1993) 106 *Harv LR* 510.

*Harvard Law Review* for permission to reproduce extracts from 'Computer Ass v Altai (Casenote)' (1992) 106 *Harvard L Rev* 510.

IBC Business Publishing Ltd for permission to reproduce extracts from Bergsten and Goode, 'Legal Questions and Problems to be Overcome', in Thomsen and Wheble (eds), *Trading with EDI - The Legal Issues*, 1989.

Sweet & Maxwell Ltd for permission to reproduce extracts from the *Criminal Appeal Reports*, *Criminal Law Review*, *Law Quarterly Review*, *Fleet Street Reports*, *Journal of Business Law*, *European Intellectual Property Review*, *Commonwealth Law Reports*, *Encyclopedia of Data Protection*, 1995 Supplement; Rogers, WHV, *Winfield and Jolowicz on Tort*, 14th edn.

Fleming, G, *The Law of Torts*, 8th edn, The Law Book Company.

DTI for permission to reproduce extracts from *Implementation of the EC Directive on Product Liability*, November 1985, DTI.

Oxford University Press, Walton St, Oxford, OX2 6DP for permission to reproduce extracts from Carson, 'White Collar Crime and the Enforcement of Factory Legislation' (1970) 10 *British Journal of Criminology*. Stapleton, J, 'Three problems with the new product liability' in Cane and Stapleton (eds), *Essays for Patrick Atiyah*, 1991, Oxford University Press.

Poulet, 'Data Protection Between Property and Liberties' in Kaspersen and Oskamp (eds), *Among Friends in Computers*, 1990, Kluwer.

Every effort has been made to trace all the copyright holders but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangement at the first opportunity.

# CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>Table of cases</i>	xv
<i>Table of statutes</i>	xxiii
<i>EC legislation and statutory instruments</i>	xxv
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>SECTION A THE CHALLENGES OF COMPUTER SOFTWARE</b>	
<b>2 PROTECTING AND EXPLOITING RIGHTS IN SOFTWARE – INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS</b>	5
INTRODUCTION	5
THE SCOPE OF PROTECTION	28
The situation in the US	31
The situation in the UK	45
REVERSE ENGINEERING AND DECOMPIlation	54
THE 'SOFTWARE DIRECTIVE'	56
UK implementation of the software directive	60
<i>Sui generis</i> rights revisited	63
PATENTS AND COMPUTER PROGRAMS	64
<b>3 PROTECTING AND EXPLOITING RIGHTS IN SOFTWARE – CONTRACT</b>	75
INTRODUCTION	75
Types of contract	75
Bespoke and standard software	75
The software licence	76
Goods or services or something else?	76
Scope of the chapter	77
SUITABILITY/QUALITY OF SOFTWARE	77
Pre-contractual statements	77
TERMS	83
DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS	84
Delivery and further work	86
Acceptance tests	87
MODIFYING THE CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS	88
Consideration	89
Duress	93
COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP	96
THE LICENCE	98
Licence terms	98
EC DIRECTIVE	99
Basic use of software	99
Back-up copies	102
Error correction	103

THE "SHRINK WRAP" LICENCE	106
Acquisition contract	107
Opening the envelope	109
A third possibility	112
Pragmatism	114
Damages	115
EXEMPTION CLAUSES	117
CONSTRUCTION	117
The Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977	119
Scope of the Act	126
The active sections	128
Definitions – 'deals as consumer'	130
Definitions – 'The requirement of reasonableness'	133
<b>4 DEFECTIVE SOFTWARE – CONTRACT</b>	151
INTRODUCTION	151
SALE OF GOODS	152
INFORMATION	154
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY	158
SALE OF GOODS	160
HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE AND PRAGMATISM	161
Hardware and software	161
Pragmatism	163
SERVICES	166
The supply of software	170
SECTIONS 13–15 OF THE SALE OF GOODS ACT 1979	171
'By description'	172
SECTION 13 – SALE BY DESCRIPTION	172
What constitutes a 'description' for the purposes of s 13?	175
SATISFACTORY QUALITY	182
IMPLICATION OF THE TERM	183
Sale 'in the course of a business'	183
'Goods supplied under the contract'	185
Exceptions	185
WHAT CONSTITUTES SATISFACTORY QUALITY?	187
FITNESS FOR THE BUYER'S PARTICULAR	190
PURPOSE – s 14(3)	191
Particular purpose	196
SALE BY SAMPLE	197
RELEVANCE OF THE IMPLIED TERMS	199
<b>5 DEFECTIVE SOFTWARE – PRODUCT LIABILITY AND TORT</b>	199
INTRODUCTION	199

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 1987	200
Is software a product?	200
Is there a defect?	205
Causation	207
The development risks defence	209
NEGLIGENCE	212
<b>SECTION B THE CHALLENGES OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY</b>	
<b>6 ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE</b>	225
INTRODUCTION	225
EDI VS PAPER	225
Network provider	228
Network users	229
Contracting with the network provider and each user	230
Formalities	231
FORMATION OF A CONTRACT BY EDI	234
The symbolic function	240
Data protection	242
European Model EDI Agreement	242
<b>7 PROTECTING THE PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL</b>	249
INTRODUCTION	249
DATA PROTECTION	249
DATA PROTECTION ACT 1984	258
ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS	267
INTERPRETATION BY THE DATA PROTECTION REGISTRAR	272
INTERPRETATION BY THE DATA PROTECTION TRIBUNAL	275
(a) Information shall be obtained fairly	275
(b) Information shall be processed fairly	279
Information shall be relevant and not excessive	286
INTERPRETATION BY THE COURTS	288
EXEMPTIONS	296
ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION OF THE DATA PROTECTION ACT	297
DATA PROTECTION DIRECTIVE: DIRECTIVE 95/46/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL	301
COMPARISON OF THE DIRECTIVE AND THE DATA PROTECTION ACT	303
Data protection principles	307
Rights of data subjects	308
Notification	311
Exemptions	311

Transborder data flows	313
IMPLEMENTATION IN THE UK	314
FURTHER ASPECTS OF DATA PROTECTION	315
DEFAMATION	318
Is it libel or slander?	319
Publication	320
Who is liable for the publication?	322
<b>8 POLICING 'CYBERSPACE'</b>	331
INTRODUCTION	331
COMPUTER FRAUD	333
THE OPERATION OF THE ACT	354
LEGAL PROBLEMS OF COMPUTER NETWORKS	358
EUROPEAN INITIATIVES	371
<b>9 EVIDENTIAL ISSUES</b>	375
INTRODUCTION	375
CRIMINAL CASES	376
Rules of admissibility	376
The hearsay rule	377
Automatic recordings	381
Computer evidence as admissible documentary hearsay	381
Computer evidence and proof of reliability	383
Proposals for reform	389
CIVIL CASES	390
Introduction	390
Hearsay and the Civil Evidence Act 1995	391
No special 'reliability' rules for computer evidence	392
Proving the contents of documents: originals, copies and business records	392
Contractual stipulations	394
<i>Index</i>	397

ACLU v Reno (1996) (unreported)	359-60, 363-67
Adams v Lindsell (1818) 1 B & Ald 681	235
Advent Systems Ltd v Unisys Corp 925 F 2d 670	159, 164
Ailsa Craig Fishing Co Ltd v Malvern Fishing Co Ltd [1983] 1 WLR 964	118
Alderslade v Hendon Laundry Ltd [1945] 1 KB 189	118
Alexander v Railway Executive [1951] 2 KB 882	109
Alphacell Ltd v Woodward [1972] AC 824	217
Anglia TV v Reed [1971] 3 All ER 690	115
Apple Computer Inc v Computer Edge Pty Ltd (1983) 50 ALR 581; [1984] FSR 246	22, 23-27
Apple Computer Inc v Franklin Computer Corp 714 F2d 1240; 219 USPQ 762; 70 ALR Fed 153	21
Apple Computer Inc v Microsoft Corp (1994) 35 F3d 1435 (9th Cir)	41-42
Arcos Ltd v EA Ronaasen & Son [1933] AC 470	179
Ashington Piggeries v Christopher Hill [1972] AC 441	175-79, 181, 194
Ashley v London Borough of Sutton [1995] TR L Rep 350	157, 170
Aswan Engineering v Lupdine [1987] 1 All ER 135	190
Atlantic Baron, The [1978] 3 All ER 1170	94
Atlas Express v Kafco (Importers and Distributors) Ltd [1989] 1 All ER 641	
Attorney-General's Reference No 1 of 1991 [1992] WLR 432	349-50
Aztech Systems Pte Ltd v Creative Technology Ltd [1996] FSR 54	56
Baker v Selden 101 US 99 (1879) 25 Led 891	11, 31-32, 35
B & S Contracts and Designs Ltd v Victor Green Publications Ltd [1984] ICR 419	95
Bannerman v White (1861) 10 CBNS 844	78
Bartlett v Sydney Marcus Ltd [1965] 2 All ER 753	183, 187
Barton v Armstrong [1976] AC 104	95
Beale v Taylor [1967] 1 WLR 1193	174
Bernstein v Pamson Motors (Golders Green) Ltd [1987] 2 All ER 220	183
Beta Computers (Europe) Ltd v Adobe Systems (Europe) Ltd [1996] FSR 371	107, 112-14, 159, 165
Betts v Willmott (1871) LR 6 Ch App 239	110
Bevan Investments v Blackhall and Struthers (No 2) [1973] 2 NZLR 45	218
Biddell Bros Ltd v E Clemens Horst & Co Ltd [1911] KB 934	241
Birch v Paramount Estates Ltd (1956) 16 EG 396	79
Bissett v Wilkinson [1927] AC 177	81
Boardman v Phipps [1967] 2 AC 46	155
Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee [1957] 1 WLR 582	217-18
Brinkibon Ltd v Stahag Stahl und Stahlwarenhandelsgesellschaft mbH [1982] 1 All ER 293	237-38, 240
British Leyland Motor Corp Ltd v Armstrong Patents Co Ltd [1986] AC 577	105
British Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co Ltd v Underground Electric Railways Co of London [1912] AC 673	116



Brogden v Metropolitan Railway Co (1877) 2 App Cas 666	109
Brown v Raphael [1959] 1 Ch 636	82
Brown Bag Software v Symantec Corp (1992) 960 F2d 1465 (9th Cir)	43
Business Applications v Nationwide Credit Corp [1988] RTR 332	183
Byrne v Dean [1937] 1 KB 818	321-22
Cammell Laird & Co Ltd v Manganese Bronze and Brass Co Ltd [1934] AC 402	195
Canada Steamship Lines Ltd v R [1952] AC 192	118
C & P Haulage v Middleton [1983] 3 All ER 94	115
Castle v Cross [1984] 1 WLR 1372	381, 390
CCC Films (London) Ltd v Impact Quadrant Ltd [1984] 3 All ER 298	115
CCN Systems Ltd and CCN Credit Systems Ltd v Data Protection Registrar Case DA/90 25/49/9	279-81
Chapelton v Barry UDC [1940] 1 KB 532	108
Chappell & Co v Nestle Co [1960] AC 87	90
Chester Grosvenor Hotel Co Ltd v Alfred McAlpine Management Ltd (1992) Build LR 115	128
Circle Freight International v Medeast Gulf Exports [1988] 2 Lloyd's Rep 427	83
Clarke v Dunraven [1897] AC 59	230
Collins v Godefroy (1831) 1 B & Ad 950	90
Community Charge Registration Office of Rhondda BC v Data Protection Registrar Case DA/90 25/49/2	287-88
Community Charge Registration Officers of Runnymede Borough Council v Data Protection Registrar Case DA/90 24/49/3, 4 and 5	286-87
Computer Aided Design v Bolwell (1989) (unreported)	45, 48
Computer Associates v Altai (1994) 104 Yale LJ 435	13, 30, 37-38, 40, 42-45, 47-51, 54
Conegate v HM Customs and Excise [1986] ECR 1007	372
Conopco Inc v McCreadie 826 F Supp 855	159
Couchman v Hill [1947] 1 All ER 103	79
Cox v Riley [1986] CLR 460	155, 339, 352
Credit and Marketing Services Ltd v Data Protection Registrar Case DA/90 25/49/10	283
Cubby Inc v Compuserve Inc 776 F Supp 135 (SDNY 1991)	323
CTN Casn and Carry v Gallaher [1994] 4 All ER 714	96
Currie v Misa (1875) LR 10 Exch 153	89
Curtis v Chemical Cleaning and Dyeing Co [1951] 1 KB 805	83
Darby v DPP (1994) <i>The Times</i> , 4 November	231
Darlington Futures Ltd v Delco Australia Property (1986) 68 ALR 385	118
Data Protection Registrar v Amnesty International (British Section) (1994) <i>The Times</i> , 23 November	290
Data Protection Registrar v Griffin (1993) <i>The Times</i> , 5 March	289

Davies v Sumner [1984] 1 All ER 831	130-31, 132
De Freitas v O'Brien [1995] 6 Med LR 108	221
Denco v Johnson [1992] 1 All ER 463	355
Derby & Co Ltd v Weldon [1991] 1 WLR 73	394
Devlin v Hall (1990) RTR 320	132
Dick Bentley Productions Ltd v Harold Smith (Motors) Ltd [1965] 2 All ER 65	78, 79-80
Dimskal Shipping Co SA v International Transport Workers Federation (The Evia Luck) [1991] 4 All ER 871	96
Dodd v Wilson [1946] 2 All ER 691	165, 166
Donaghue v Allied Newspapers Ltd [1938] Ch 106	50
DP Anderson & Co v Lieber Code Co [1917] 2 KB 469	21
DPP v McKeown [1997] 1 WLR 295	383
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co v Selfridge & Co [1915] AC 79	89, 107
Edgington v Fitzmaurice (1885) 29 Ch D 459	81
Edwards v National Coal Board [1949] 1 QB 704	207
Emmens v Pottle (1885) 16 QBD 354	322
Enimont Overseas v Rojogutanker Zadar (The Olib) [1991] 2 Lloyd's Rep 108	95
Entores Ltd v Miles Far Eastern Corp [1955] 2 QB 325-26	235-38, 240
Equifax Europa Ltd v Data Protection Registrar Case DA/90 25/49/7	284-86
Eso Petroleum Co Ltd v Mardon [1976] QB 801	82
Eurodynamics Systems v General Automation Ltd (1988) (unreported)	158
Feist Publications Inc v Rural Telephone Service Co 113 LED 2d 358	42
Flamar Interoccean Ltd v Denmac Ltd [1990] 1 Lloyd's Rep 434	128
Fraser v Evans [1969] 1 QB 349	155
Frost v Aylesbury Dairy Co [1905] 1 KB 685	166
Fujitsu Ltd's Application [1996] RPC 511	71-72
Gale's Application, Re [1991] RPC 305	70-72
Geier v Kujawa, Weston and Warne Bros (Transport) [1970] 1 Lloyd's Rep 364	108
George Mitchell (Chesterhall) Ltd v Finney Lock Seeds Ltd [1983] 2 AC 803	118, 133, 137
Gibson v Manchester City Council [1979] 1 WLR 294	107
Goodman v J Eban Ltd [1954] 1 QB 550	232-33
Gran Gelato Ltd v Richcliff (Group) Ltd [1992] 1 All ER 865	83
Grant v Australian Knitting Mills [1936] AC 85	173
Greaves & Co v Baynham Meikle [1974] 1 WLR 1261	218
Griffiths v Peter Conway Ltd [1939] 1 All ER 685	192-94
Hadley v Baxendale (1854) 9 EX 341	116
Harling v Eddy [1951] 2 All ER 212	79
Harlington & Leinster Enterprises v Christopher Hull Fine Art [1991] 1 QB 564	173-74, 175, 188

Harris v Watson (1791) Peake 102 .....	92
Hartley v Ponsonby (1857) 7 El & Bl 872 .....	90
Havering LBC v Stevenson [1970] 3 All ER 609 .....	131, 132
Hawkes & Son (London) Ltd v Paramount Film Services Ltd [1934] Ch 593 .....	28
Hedley Byrne & Co Ltd v Heller & Partners Ltd [1964] AC 465 .....	213
Heilbut, Symons & Co v Buckleton [1913] AC 30 .....	78
Hird v Wood (1894) 38 Sol J 235 .....	329
Hitachi's Application [1991] RPC 415 .....	69
Hollier v Rambler Motors Ltd [1972] 2 QB 71 .....	118
Hollinrake v Truswell [1894] 3 Ch 420 .....	22, 23, 25
Hong Kong Fir Shipping Co Ltd v Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha [1962] 2 QB 26 .....	172
Hood v Anchor Line [1918] AC 837 .....	108
Houghton v Trafalgar Insurance Co [1954] 1 QB 247 .....	117
Household Fire Insurance v Grant (1879) 4 Ex D 216 .....	239
Household Fire Insurance v Hughes [1974] 1 All ER 261 .....	
Howard Marine & Dredging Co Ltd v A Ogden & Sons (Excavations) Ltd [1978] QB 574 .....	83
Hyde v Wrench (1840) 3 Beav 334 .....	234
IBA v EMI and BICC (1980) BLR 1 .....	214, 218, 219
Ibcos Computers Ltd v Barclays Mercantile Highland Finance Ltd [1994] FSR 275 .....	5, 51-53
IBM/Data Processor Network T06/83 [1990] EPOR 91 .....	69
IBM/Semantically related expressions .....	69
Infolink Ltd v Data Protection Registrar Case DA/90 25/49/9 .....	281-83
Innovations (Mail Order) Ltd v Data Protection Registrar Case DA/92 31/49/1 .....	276-78, 306
Interfoto Picture Library v Stiletto Visual Programmes [1988] 1 All ER 348 .....	108
J Marcel (Furriers) Ltd v Tapper [1953] 1 WLR 49 .....	169
Jacobs v Batavia and General Plantations Trust [1924] 1 Ch 287 .....	80
John Richardson Computers v Flanders [1993] FSR 497 .....	28, 42, 45-48, 50, 53
Johnstone v Bloomsbury Health Authority [1991] 2 All ER 293 .....	84
Jones v Daniel [1894] 2 Ch 332 .....	107
Kendall v Lillico & Sons [1969] 2 AC 31 .....	83, 166, 190, 191, 196, 212
Kerrick and Co v Lawrence & Co (1890) 25 QBD 99 .....	50
Koufos v Czarikow Ltd [1969] 1 AC 350 .....	116
Ladbrooke (Football) Ltd v William Hill (Football) Ltd [1964] 1 WLR 273 .....	23, 28, 46-50
Lady Gwendolen [1965] P 294 .....	213
Lee v Griffin (1861) 1 B & S 272 .....	167, 168, 169
L'Estrange v F Graucob Ltd [1934] 2 KB 394 .....	83

Linguaphone Institute Ltd v Data Protection Registrar Case DA/94 31/49/1 .....	306
Liverpool City Council v Irwin [1976] 2 All ER 39 .....	84
London and Globe Finance Corp Ltd, Re [1903] 1 Ch 732 .....	336
Lotus v Borland Copyright and Computer Programs (1996) Tulane LR 2397 .....	12
MacKenzie Patten & Co v British Olivetti Ltd (1984) (unreported) .....	77, 80
Manchester Liners Ltd v Rea Ltd [1922] AC 74 .....	193, 194
Marcel v Metropolitan Police Commissioners [1992] Ch 225 .....	250
Maskell v Horner [1915] 3 KB 106 .....	95
McGregor v Procurator Fiscal of Kilmarnock (1993) (unreported) .....	295-96, 311
McGruther v Pitcher [1904] 2 Ch 306 .....	100
Micron Computer Systems Ltd v Wang (1990) (unreported) .....	77, 84, 189, 192
Miller v California (1973) 413 US 15 .....	365
Ministry of Housing and Local Government v Sharp [1970] 2 QB 223 .....	1, 213
Mondial Shipping and Chartering BV v Astarte Shipping Ltd [1995] Comm LC 1011 .....	239
Monson v Tussauds Ltd [1894] 1 QB 671 .....	319
Moorcock, The (1889) 14 PD 64 .....	84
Moore & Co and Landauer & Co, Re [1921] 2 KB 519 .....	175
MS Associates v Power [1987] FSR 242 .....	29
Myers v DPP [1965] 1 AC 1001 .....	377-78
New Zealand Shipping Co Ltd v Satterthwaite [1974] 1 All ER 1015 .....	109
Niblett Ltd v Confectioner's Materials Co Ltd [1921] 3 KB 387 .....	112
Nichols v Universal Pictures Corp (1930) 45 F2d 119 (2nd Cir) .....	30
Norman v Bennett [1974] 1 WLR 1229 .....	278
North Ocean Shipping v Hyundai Construction Co Ltd (The Atlantic Baron) [1978] 3 All ER 1170 .....	90
Occidental Worldwide Investment Corp v Skibs A/S Avanti (The Siboen and the Sibotre) [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep 293 .....	94
Olib, The [1991] 2 Lloyd's Rep 108 .....	95
Olley v Marlborough Court Hotel [1949] 1 KB 532 .....	107
Oscar Chess Ltd v Williams [1957] 1 All ER 325 .....	78-79
Oxford v Moss [1978] 68 Cr App Rep 183 .....	155, 157
Parker v South Eastern railway Co Ltd [1877] 2 CPD 416 .....	
Parons (H) (Livestock) v Uttley Ingham & Co Ltd [1978] 1 All ER 525 .....	116
Pau On v Lau Yiu Long [1980] AC 614 .....	95
People v Esposito (1990) 553 NY Supp 2d 612 .....	291
Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain v Boots Cash Chemists [1953] 1 QB 401 .....	1-7
Photo Production Ltd v Securicor [1980] AC 827 .....	118, 136, 137
Preist v Last [1903] 2 KB 148 .....	192

Prince Albert v Strange (1849) 1 Mac & G 25	154
ProCD v Zeidenberg US Ct of Appeals (1996) No 96-1139 (7th Cir), 20 June	108, 114
R v Bedworth (1993) (unreported)	356, 57
R v Brown [1996] 2 WLR 203	260-61, 291-96
R v Burdett (1820) 4 B & Ald 95	321
R v Caldwell [1982] AC 341	289
R v Cochrane [1993] Crim LR 48	387
R v Coventry Justices Ex p Bullard (1992) 95 Cr App R 175	391
R v Fellows and Arnold [1997] 2 All ER 548	369
R v Fisher (1865) LR 1 CCR7	339
R v Gold & Shifreen [1988] AC 1063	337-38
R v Golizadeh [1995] Crim LR 232	388
R v Griffiths Ex p Attorney-General [1957] 2 All ER 379	326
R v Henderson and Battley (1984) (unreported)	339
R v Henn and Darby [1979] ECR 3795	372
R v Kopsch [1925] 19 Cr App Rep 50	357
R v Lawrence [1982] AC 510	289, 290
R v Lawrence [1989] Crim L Rev 309	357
R v Munden (1996) (unreported)	336
R v Newbury (1995) (unreported)	387
R v Pettigrew [1980] 71 Cr App 39	379, 381
R v Phipson [1984] 1 WLR 1372	390
R v Pile (1995) (unreported)	357-58
R v Ponting [1985] Crim L Rev 318	356
R v Poplar Coroner Ex p Thomas [1993] 2 WLR 547	216-17
R v R [1991] 3 WLR 767	272
R v Reid [1992] 3 All ER 673	289
R v Shephard [1993] AC 380	375, 384-87
R v Spiby (1990) 91 Cr App R 186	375, 381, 385-86
R v Thompson [1984] 1 WLR 962	333-35
R v Whiteley (1991) <i>The Times</i> , 6 February	155, 156-57, 340-41, 352
R v Wood (1982) 76 Cr App R 39	375, 379-80
Raffles v Wichelhaus (1862) 2 H & C 906	235
R & B Custom's Brokers v United Dominion Trust [1988] 1 All ER 847	130, 184, 186-87
Reardon Smith Line v Hansen Tangen [1976] 1 WLR 989	175, 179-80
Rees Hough Ltd v Redland Reinforced Plastics Ltd [1985] 2 Con LR 109	133
Rindos v Hardwick (1994) (unreported)	319
Robinson v Graves [1935] 1 KB 579	167, 168-69, 170
Robinson v Harman (1880) 5 App Cas 25	82, 115
Roe v Naylor [1971] 1 KB 712	278
Rogers v Parish Ltd [1987] 1 QB 933	183, 187-89

Routledge v Mackay [1954] 1 All ER 855	79, 83
Royscott Trust Ltd v Rogerson [1991] 3 All ER 294	82, 83
Saloomy v Jeppesen (1983) 707 F 2d 671	158
Salvage Association v CAP Financial Services Ltd [1995] FSR 654	116, 127, 128, 137, 138
Saphena Computing Ltd v Allied Collection Agencies Ltd [1995] FSR 616	85-86, 88-89, 97, 104, 170, 186, 196
Scotson v Pegg (1861) 6 H & N 295	90
Scruttons v Midland Silicones Ltd [1962] AC 446	109
Sega Enterprises Ltd v Accolade Inc 977 F2d 1510	13, 48, 55-56
Shevill v Presse Alliance SA Case C68/93 [1995] All ER (EC) 289	326-28
Siboen and the Sibotre [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep 293	94
Slater v Finning [1996] 3 All ER 398	192
Smedley v Breed [1974] AC 839	212
Smith v Chadwick (1884) 9 App Cas 187	81
Smith v Eric S Bush (a firm) [1990] 1 AC 831	134-38
Smith v Land & House Property Corp (1884) 28 Ch D 7	81-82
Sophocleous v Ringer [1988] RTR 52	388
South Central Bell Telephone Co v Barthelemy (1994) 643 So 2D 1240 (La)	156, 157
Spriggs v Sotheby Parke Bernet & Co [1986] 1 Lloyd's Rep 487	118
Spurling v Bradshaw [1956] 1 WLR 461	108
St Albans v ICL [1995] FSR 686	12, 86, 128, 137, 152-54, 155, 157, 161, 163, 164, 165, 171, 188, 197
StepSaver Data Systems Inc v Wyse Technology and Software Link Inc (1991) 939 F 2d 91	114
Stewart Gill Ltd v Horatio Myer & Co Ltd [1992] 2 All ER 257	133
Stilk v Myrick (1809) 2 Camp 317	91-93
Stratton Oakmont Inc v Prodigy Services Co (1995) NY Sup Ct Nassau Co; WL 323710; 63 USLW 2765	324
Sugar v LM & S Railway [1941] 1 All ER 172	109
T & J Harrison v Knowles & Foster [1918] 1 KB 608	175
Tehran Europe v ST Belton [1968] 2 QB 545	195
Thomas v Thomas (1842) 2 QB 851	90
Thompson v LM & S Railway [1930] 1 KB 41	83, 108
Thornett and Fehr v Beer & Son [1919] 1 KB 486	185
Thornton v Shoe Lane Parking [1971] 2 QB 163	107, 108
Toby Constructions products Pty Ltd v Computa Bar (Sales) Pty Ltd [1983] NSWLR 48	153, 161, 170-71
Total Information Processing Systems Ltd v Daman Ltd [1992] FSR 171	48-50
Tweddle v Atkinson (1861) 1 B & S 393	107

United Sattes v Thomas (1995) 74 F 3d 701 (6th Cir) .....	365
Universe Tankships Inc of Monrovia v International Transport Workers Federation [1983] 1 AC 366 .....	94-95
University of London Press v University Tutorial Press Ltd [1916] 2 Ch 601 .....	5, 23
Vacwell Engineering Co Ltd v BDH Chemicals Ltd [1971] 1 QB 88 .....	162
Vantage Navigation Corp v Suhail and Saud Bahwan Building Materials (The Alev) [1989] 1 Lloyd's Rep 138 .....	95
Varley v Whipp [1900] 1 QB 513 .....	172
Vicom/Computer-related invention: T208/84 [1987] EPOR 74 .....	68, 69, 73
Victoria Laundry (Windsor) Ltd v Newman Industries Coulson & Co Ltd [1949] 2 KB 528 .....	116
Wang Laboratories Inc's Applications [1991] RPC 463 .....	69
Ward v Byham [1956] 2 All ER 318 .....	90
Whelan Associates v Jaslow Dental Laboratory Inc [1987] 797 F2d 1234 .....	31-40, 42-43, 45-46, 48, 53
White v Bluett (1853) 23 LJ Ex 36 .....	90
White v John Warwick & Co Ltd [1953] 2 All ER 1021 .....	118
Williams v Roffey Bros & Nicholls (Contractors) Ltd [1991] 1 QB 1 .....	90-91, 93
Wilson v Rickett, Cockerell & Co Ltd [1954] 1 QB 598 .....	185
Wimpey Construction v Poole [1984] 2 Lloyd's Rep 499 .....	221
Winter v GP Puttnam & Sons (1991) 938 F 2d 1033 (9th cir) .....	158
Wormell v RHM Agriculture Ltd [1986] 1 All ER 769 .....	161-63

## TABLE OF STATUTES

## UK LEGISLATION

Banking Act 1979 .....	393	Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 .....	278-79, 368
Carriage of Goods by Sea Act 1992 .....	241	Data Protection Act 1963 .....	263
Children and Young Persons (Harmful Publications) Act 1955 .....	369	Data Protection Act 1984 .....	252, 256-318, 347
Civil Evidence Act 1968		s 1 .....	259, 261-62, 279, 284, 295, 296
s 5 .....	375, 392	s 2 .....	259
Civil Evidence Act 1995 .....	375, 391-92	s 5 .....	268, 269, 275, 279, 288, 291, 293-95
s 8 .....	394	s 7 .....	286
s 9 .....	393-94	s 10 .....	268
s 13 .....	394	s 11 .....	268
Communications Decency Act 1996 .....	363	s 12 .....	268
Companies Act 1985 .....	231	s 13 .....	275
Computer Misuse Act 1990 .....	341, 353-58	s 20 .....	269
s 1 .....	346, 349	s 21 .....	269-70
s 2 .....	346-49	s 22 .....	270, 272
s 3 .....	348, 351-52	s 23 .....	270-72
s 17 .....	347-48, 352	s 24 .....	271-72
Consumer Protection Act 1987 .....	199-212	s 27 .....	296, 305
s 1 .....	202	s 28 .....	285
Copyright (Computer Regulations) 1992 .....	60	s 29 .....	296
Copyright (Computer Software) Amendment Act 1985 .....	27	s 32 .....	296
Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 .....	27-28, 54, 56	s 33 .....	296
s 1 .....	76	s 34 .....	296
s 17 .....	99	s 36 .....	263, 267-68, 272
s 3 .....	76	Sched 1 .....	262, 263, 275, 293
s 21 .....	61, 62	Defamation Act 1996	
s 29 .....	61, 63	s 1 .....	324-25
s 50A .....	60-61, 102	Deregulation and Contracting Out Act 1994 .....	314
s 50B .....	61-62	Finance Bill 1996 .....	250
s 50C .....	60-61, 98, 101, 104, 106, 110	Food and Drugs Act 1955 .....	212
s 296A .....	63	Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 .....	207, 265
Criminal Damage Act 1971 .....	157, 338, 340, 341, 352	s 6 .....	212
s 1 .....	339	Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1989	
s 10 .....	156, 339	s 2 .....	231
Criminal Evidence Act 1965		Malicious Communications Act 1988 .....	320
s 1 .....	382	Malicious Damage Act 1861 .....	339
Criminal Justice Act 1988		Misrepresentation Act 1967	
s 24 .....	381, 382, 385	s 2 .....	82-83
s 25 .....	382-83		
s 27 .....	382		



Obscene Publications Act 1959		Theatres Act 1968	
s 1	368	s 4	320
Official Secrets Act 1911	356	Theft Act 1968	
Occupiers' Liability Act 1957	128	s 15	334-35
		Trade Descriptions Act 1968	130, 131, 184
Patents Act 1977	64-65		
s 1	65	Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977	84, 88, 99,
s 91	65, 67		117, 118, 119-38,
Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984			150, 152, 184, 185, 229
s 68	382	s 1	119, 126, 127, 128
s 69	376, 383-85, 387,	s 2	119, 127, 134
	388, 389, 390, 392	s 3	119-20, 127, 128, 129
Sched 3	387-88	s 4	120, 127, 129
Protection of Children Act 1978	368	s 5	120, 129-30
s 1	369	s 6	121, 129, 134, 171
Public Order Act 1994	369	s 7	121-22, 134
		s 9	122
Sale and Supply of Goods Act 1994	175, 182	s 10	122
s 4	171	s 11	122-23, 133, 134, 136
Sale of Goods Act 1893	162, 165	s 12	123, 128, 129, 130, 172
s 14	190, 193	s 13	123, 129, 180-81
Sale of Goods Act 1979	76, 86, 151,	s 14	123-34, 129
	152, 158, 160,	s 15	129
	165, 166, 184	s 26	124
s 12	162	s 27	124-25
s 13	83-84, 151, 166, 171-81	Sched 1	125-26
s 14	83-84, 89,	Sched 2	126, 150
	130, 151, 153,		
	154, 161, 162, 164,	Unfair Terms in Consumer	
	166, 171, 181-83, 185,	Contracts Regulations	
	186, 187, 188, 189-96	1994	90, 99, 117, 138-49
s 15	83-84, 151, 171, 196-97		
s 15A	171		
s 35	87-88		
s 61	153, 154, 183		
Social Security Administration			
(Frauds) Bill 1996	250		
Statute of Frauds 1677	231		
Supply of Goods and Services			
Act 1982	76, 160, 184, 216		
s 8	151, 197		
s 9	151, 197		
s 10	151, 197		
s 13	166, 229		
s 18	153		

## OVERSEAS LEGISLATION

Copyright Act (Singapore)	
s 35	56
Copyright Act 1976	
(United States)	21, 35, 59
s 117	63-64
Uniform Commercial Code	
(United States)	
Art 2	159, 160, 164

## EC LEGISLATION AND STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

## EC Legislation

Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works 1886	57
Brussels Convention on Jurisdiction and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters 1968	327
Commercial Agents (Council Directive) Regulations 1993	77
Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data 1981 (Council of Europe)	251, 257-58, 276, 281, 303, 311
Council Directive, 85/374 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning liability for defective products	204, 209, 210
Art 2	200
Art 6	205-06
Council Directive 91/250 on the legal protection of computer programs	54, 57, 59-60, 62, 99-106, 110, 159
Art 1	57
Art 4	58, 99
Art 5	58, 59, 63, 100, 101, 102, 110, 111
Art 6	58-60
Council Directive 87/54 on the legal protection of topographies of semiconductor products	12
Council Directive 95/46 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data	258, 291, 299-318
Art 1	304, 313, 315
Art 2	304, 307
Art 3	304-05
Art 6	307, 312
Art 7	306
Art 8	305-06
Art 9	312, 313
Art 10	308
Art 11	308-09
Art 12	309
Art 13	310
Art 14	310
Art 15	311
Art 18	311
Art 19	311
Art 18	311
Art 25	313-14
Art 26	314
Council Directive 93/13 on unfair terms in consumer contracts	141-49
Art 1	144
Art 2	144
Art 3	144-45, 147-49
Art 4	145
Art 5	145
Art 6	145
Art 7	145-46

Art 8.....	146
Art 9.....	146
Art 10.....	146
Art 11.....	146
European Convention on Human Rights 1950.....	258, 302
Art 12.....	258
European Patent Convention 1973.....	64-65
Art 52.....	65, 67, 68
Lugano Convention on Jurisdiction and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters 1988.....	327
Single European Act.....	302
Strasbourg Convention on products liability in relation to physical injury and death.....	206-07, 209-11
Treaty on European Union Art 189b.....	303
Vienna Convention on Treaties Art 31.....	67

### Statutory Instruments

Design Right (Semiconductor Topographies) Regulations 1989 SI 1989/1100.....	12
--	----

## INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of information technology presents challenges for the law. Challenges which are not confined to any single one of the traditional legal categories but which arise in, for example, criminal law, intellectual property law, contract and tort. Even land law may not be untouched!<sup>1</sup> Initially, these challenges manifested themselves at the micro, rather than the macro level, with questions such as the applicability of copyright protection for computer programs. More recently, with the accelerating growth of the Internet and the World Wide Web, some of these problems, such as privacy, have been exacerbated, and others, like the regulation of offensive material, have come to the fore. In effect, the questions posed for the law by the advancing technology are many and various but some idea of their scope can be gained by brief illustration:

- How does the law deal with computer hackers or those who introduce viruses?<sup>2</sup>
- ✓ Should a contract for the acquisition of software be categorised as one dealing with goods?<sup>3</sup>
- ✓ Similarly, should software be regarded as a product?<sup>4</sup>
- ✓ Can copyright subsist in a computer program? Would patent protection be more appropriate?<sup>5</sup>
- Does the widespread dissemination of text on networks herald the death of copyright?<sup>6</sup>
- Should the content of the material on the Internet be regulated and, if so, by whom?<sup>7</sup> What about freedom of information and expression?<sup>8</sup>
- How is the privacy of the individual to be protected amid the increasing capacity for storing, gathering and collating information?<sup>9</sup>

1 Through, for example, computerisation of the land registry raising the question of who could be liable if a defect in the software resulted in an inaccurate certificate. See *Min of Housing and Local Gov v Sharp* [1970] 2 QB 223 for consideration of a slightly different question (p 213).

2 See Chapter 8.

3 See Chapter 4.

4 See Chapter 5.

5 See Chapter 2.

6 For discussion of this question see, for example, Christopher Kervégant, 'Are copyright and droit d'auteur viable in the light of information technology?' (1996) 10 Int Review of Law, Computer and Technology 55.

7 See Chapter 8.

8 See Chapter 7.

9 See Chapter 7.

Concrete illustrations of these problems are regularly reported in the press. These cover a spectrum from the amusing and inconsequential to the highly significant. Recently in the news, was the 'points of view' problem, the *Shetland News* newspaper controversy and the millennium issue:

A hacker reportedly changed the message on the BBC 'Points of View' answer machine to the surprise of those attempting to leave legitimate comments for Ann Robinson.<sup>10</sup>

The *Shetland News* newspaper included on its World Wide Web site hypertext links to the Web pages of its rival, *The Shetland Times*. *The Shetland Times* took exception to this and claimed it was a breach of copyright. A Scottish court has, thus far, issued an interim interdict, pending full trial.<sup>11</sup>

Computers everywhere, from those in the home to those which are vital to commerce and industry, contain calendars. Commonly, these only refer to the last two digits of the year. Huge costs (and doubtless questions of liability) will be involved in attempting to prevent the chaos which would ensue if these machines register 00 as 1900 – a mere 100 years behind the times!

The point has already been made that the developments in information technology present challenges for many of the established categories of law. This leads to the question of whether information technology law should be regarded as a subject in its own right. Obviously, the initial reaction to attempt to deal with novel problems is to try to accommodate them within existing legal frameworks. This results in a fragmentary approach which may or may not be appropriate in the particular case. One of the important benefits of looking at the subject of information technology law as a whole is the opportunity to consider how apposite and coherent are piecemeal solutions which borrow from the different established legal areas. It may even lead to the recognition that there is a need for new legal concepts, transcending the traditional boundaries. The acknowledgment of information technology law as a subject worthy of study in its own right also produces a focus upon the issues which might not otherwise occur, with the risk that the particular problems generated by the scientific advances are otherwise merely regarded as footnotes to the established categories. Nonetheless, we have found it convenient to divide the discussion which follows in a way which largely reflects different established legal subjects and this also reflects the current state of the law. We have also found it useful to divide the book into two sections – the first of these concentrates on problems generated by the nature of computer software, whereas the second considers the impact of computer technology. However, the reader is invited to consider the aptness of the solutions arrived at and the desirability of a more integrated approach.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Guardian* (1997) 31 March.

<sup>11</sup> See, eg, *BNA's Electronic Information Policy and Law* (1996) Vol 1, p 723; *The Times* (1997) 21 January.

## SECTION A

### THE CHALLENGES OF COMPUTER SOFTWARE

## PROTECTING AND EXPLOITING RIGHTS IN SOFTWARE – INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

### INTRODUCTION

Although it may be rather hackneyed to repeat the practical test of Petersen J in *University of London Press Ltd v University Tutorial Press Ltd*<sup>1</sup> that what is worth copying is *prima facie* worth protecting, the truth underlying this statement is demonstrated nowhere so strikingly as in the commercial exploitation of computer software. As the industry has developed there has been a trend towards general applications programs, rather than specific bespoke software, and a massive amount of research and development time and money is devoted to the creation of such new computer software. A further feature is the vulnerability of the medium to reproduction by individuals and the consequent threat of widespread copying and piracy. The commercial factors alone would suggest powerful reasons for protecting the intellectual property rights in such software, but when coupled with the ease of copying, make such protection imperative.

Despite these reasons and the fact that computers have now been in existence for almost half a century, protection of the intellectual property rights in computer programs has only really become an issue since the advent of microcomputers, a much more recent development. In the early stages of development of the industry, the problem was not particularly acute since computer systems were large, custom-built affairs. They were only used by large institutions, whether commercial, industrial or educational, and the public had no general access to them. In those cases where intellectual property rights might have been an issue, the software and programs written for them could be adequately protected by contract, supplemented by actions for breach of confidence. These methods may still provide a useful remedy in certain cases.<sup>2</sup> This situation changed dramatically as microprocessors and personal computers became commonplace; their use became widespread and was no longer confined to large institutions. At this point it was not possible to rely purely on contract and confidence to protect intellectual property rights in computer programs. As early as the beginning of the 1970s, the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) had begun to turn their attention to the issue, and, in 1978, produced model provisions for the

<sup>1</sup> [1916] 2 Ch 601 at 610 *per* Petersen J.

<sup>2</sup> The case of *Ibcos Computers Ltd v Barclays Mercantile Highland Finance Ltd* (1994) (discussed later at p 52), concerns an action for breach of confidence as well as an action for copyright infringement.



protection of intellectual property rights in computer software. The following extract summarises the desirability of legal protection for computer programs.

#### WIPO Model Provisions 1978 – Introduction Paragraph 6

Legal protection of computer software is desirable for the following reasons:

- (a) *Investment and time required.* The investment in computer software is large: under a recent estimate based on the number of computers currently in use, and the past and expected increase in that number, together with estimates of the staff employed on programming activities and the cost of software, it is possible that a sum of the order of 13 billion US dollars is spent annually on the creation and maintenance of software systems. Although this must vary considerably, the time required for the planning and preparation of computer programs is long, often amounting to many man-months of total effort. The need for legal protection of computer programs should be seen not only in terms of the large-scale investment in computer software but also from the viewpoint of the small software enterprise or individual creator of software. The existence of strong legal protection would encourage the dissemination of their creations and enable such creators to avoid duplication of work. Without such dissemination, numerous programmers may spend considerable time and effort in order to accomplish, in parallel work, the same objective; although the programs created by them may be different, any one of those programs would probably fully accomplish the said objective. In any case, legal protection will encourage exploitation of software for purposes other than internal use.
- (b) *Likely future developments.* Already, software is estimated to account for by far the greater part of the total cost of computer systems. The proportions of 70 per cent and 30 per cent representing the expenditure on software and hardware, respectively, would seem to be a reasonable estimate. In any case it can be expected that the software elements will, in the future, account for a substantial, if not a predominant, proportion of the expenditure and that the total expenditure on computer software will constantly increase. At present, the largest amount of expenditure on computer software seems to be devoted to the creation and maintenance of specific purpose user programs, not of general applicability; since such programs are not of direct interest to third parties, their misappropriation is relatively unlikely in view of the adaptation required. However, there is a trend towards the creation of computer programs that are of interest to more than one user or even of general and widespread utility and thus can help to save expenditures; such a trend towards standardised user software is likely to increase as computers become more accessible to the public and easier to operate and as the proportion of the cost of the hardware components in computer operations decreases. In the context of the increasing accessibility of computer software, reference should be made to two important developments: the creation of computer networks among nations aided by sophisticated telecommunications systems (a trend which highlights the need for international protection), and the move towards new programming techniques facilitating the use of computers by persons other than trained programmers.

- (c) *Protection as an incentive to disclosure.* The importance of ensuring the ready accessibility of the important form of modern technology represented by computer software has been referred to on many occasions, particularly in the context of the needs of developing countries ... Although some computer programs would not be made publicly available in any event (for example, programs revealing a trade secret of an enterprise or those designed to complement computer hardware and transferred only with the corresponding computer), it is reasonable to suppose that many proprietors of the rights in other programs would at present rely primarily on secrecy either in order to exclude all others from using the software or to permit only selected persons to use it under a confidential disclosure contract. Where effective legal protection is available, the proprietors of rights could instead rely on that protection and disclose the software.
- (d) *Protection as a basis for trade.* The lack of legal protection may be particularly harmful in the context of trade. Both the seller and the buyer of computer software are interested in legal protection because it increases the legal security of their relationship. A system of protection would also be of advantage to developing countries; such a system would encourage dissemination of software to those countries, not only because the publication of the software would not defeat protection but also the protection would eliminate the uncertainty of enforcing a confidential disclosure contract. Also, legal protection would enable dissemination on favourable terms in some cases; for example, the proprietor of the rights in computer software might be encouraged to license it in a developing country at an especially low royalty if he could be sure of being able to take action against users in other countries if his software were accidentally disclosed by the licensee in the developing country. Moreover, the greater disclosure in the advertisement of software which, it is hoped, will result from legal protection may help such countries to evaluate the alternatives on the international market.
- (e) *Vulnerability of computer software.* Consideration should also be given to the vulnerability of some forms of computer software; for instance, a 'computer software package' consisting of a computer program and related descriptive and explanatory documentation, is expensive to prepare and easy to copy as soon as the prototype is available.

Although the WIPO document was prepared some 20 years ago and, therefore, has the status of a historical document as far as the computer industry is concerned, it shows that major problems were evident even at this early stage. The technology still had a long way to progress before it would be recognisable by present standards, but the trend towards standard application packages had been noted, together with the ease of copying and the global nature of the technology.

The purpose of the model provisions was to provide a framework which countries which were signatories to the agreement could use. Accepting that the legal protection of computer programs was desirable, the question that then had to be addressed was what was to be the most appropriate and