VOLUME 5 | ISSUE 3

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH

COPYRIGHT LAW WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DIGITAL RIGHTS MANAGEMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

- Reshma Hayat[1]

ABSTRACT

Copyright law is based on the idea that an author's work, in any form, is the result of his own labour, skills, and efforts, and that it is produced for the author's benefit. Because copyright law is a negative right that can be used for good, the goal is to stop others from using a copyrighted work without permission. Contrarily, freedom of information, or the unrestricted flow of information online, is the philosophy behind the internet. DRM-also known as "restrictive measures"-gives copyright holders a new tool for online content distribution, protection, and payment. Because there was no legal protection for the same, the person committing copyright infringement continued to infringe on the online content, and it was believed that it was incompetent to protect the content online and could be circumvented by any ordinary skilled person with ordinary computer skill, it was initially not the primary choice of the content producers. With the development of new DRM technologies, content owners began to use DRM to protect their online digital content, but there was still no legal safeguard against DRM circumvention. Then the creators and the substance holders began requesting lawful cure against evasion of DRM.

KEY WORDS: Digital Rights Management, WIPO, Rights Management Information, The Millennium Digital Copyright Act, Anti-piracy.

[1] Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, Integral University, Lucknow.

INTRODUCTION

The administration of digital rights in the context of copyright law in the digital sphere is known as digital rights management, or DRM.DRM includes the three in conjunction, fundamental elements: digital, rights, and management. It encompasses a range of technological protection measures (TPM) employed by the owners of the rights to safeguard their licensed digital content from being utilized in ways that could undermine its commercial value. DRM serves as a means to secure and govern copyright works in the digital domain. It can be can be characterized as a

collection of interconnected technologies utilised to establish secure channels for distributing digital content, as well as mechanisms that impose specific conditions on the usage and sharing of digital products[2]. These protective measures include encryption, monitoring mechanisms, license management functionality, and technological safeguards. DRM may also encompass techniques such as copy control, digital watermarking, fingerprinting, piracy tracking, authentication architectures, integrity verification, access control, resistance to tampering, key management and revocation, and risk management. DRM involves the management and enforcement of usage rules, including copyright regulations, for digital content, and can optionally encompass accounting aspects. Digital Rights Management (DRM) refers to the technologies that support the legal distribution of digital content while safeguarding intellectual property rights. Instead of determining whether or not content should be shared, DRM technology offers tools to control access to digital media. Ultimately, DRM frameworks provide a set of instruments for protecting digital media, but their existence does not imply that all digital media should be protected.[3]

TREATIES ON DIGITAL RIGHTS MANAGEMENT

[2]Davina M. DesRoches, "Rights or Restrictions? An Examination of Several key Issues and Debates Surrounding the Use and Potential Legislative Protection DRM Systems", Available at:http://carl abrc.ca/uploads/pdfs/copyright/drm.pdf (accessed on 5 may 2023).

[3] Wenjun Zeng Heather yuching- Yung Lin, Multimedia Security technologies for Digital Rights Management, Digital Rights Management Systems, Marina Bosi pg. 23

DRM (Digital Rights Management).These elements are Technological Protection Measures (TPMs) and Rights Management Information (RMI). The provisions regarding TPMs and RMI in the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) are aimed at addressing the challenges posed by digital technology to the protection of copyright and related rights, particularly in the context of digital networks such as the internet.

TPMs refer to the technological measures employed to protect copyrighted works from unauthorized access, use, or distribution. They include encryption, access controls, copy protection mechanisms, and other security measures. The provisions in the WIPO treaties recognize the importance of TPMs in safeguarding the rights of copyright holders and provide legal protection for effective technological measures used for this purpose. RMI, on the other hand, refers to information that identifies the work or performance, its author or performer, or other relevant information, such as copyright notices or licensing terms. The WIPO treaties recognise the significance of RMI in facilitating the management and enforcement of rights in digital works. They require protection against the unauthorized removal or alteration of such information and promote the integrity of RMI associated with digital content. It is important to note that while the WIPO treaties address both TPMs and RMI[4], the term DRM itself is not explicitly used. The concept of DRM often refers to systems or technologies that incorporate both TPMs and RMI functionalities. However, in criticism or discussions surrounding DRM, it is typically TPMs that are primarily mentioned due to concerns about potential restrictions on access to works. Overall, the WIPO Internet Treaties acknowledge the importance of technological measures and rights management information in the digital environment, aiming to strike a balance between protecting the rights of copyright holders and ensuring access to creative works for user's DRM systems consist of two key elements: Technological Protection Measures (TPMs) and Rights Management Information (RMI). While these elements are often used together and may interact with each other, it is important to discuss them separately due to their distinct regulatory treatment and the different legal issues they raise. This separate analysis helps to clarify the significant differences between DRM systems and DRM-free systems.

[4]IriniA.Stamatoudi(ed.),CopyrightEnforcementandtheInternet,(pp.257-302)(KluwerLaw International).

1. Technological Protection Measures (TPMs): TPMs are the technical mechanisms employed to safeguard copyrighted works and control their access, use, and distribution. These measures can include encryption, access controls, digital rights encryption, watermarking, copy protection, and other security features. TPMs are designed to prevent unauthorized copying, sharing, or modification of digital content. The WIPO treaties recognize the importance of TPMs in protecting the rights of copyright holders. They provide legal protection for effective technological measures used to safeguard copyrighted works. However, concerns have been raised about TPMs potentially limiting user rights, such as fair use, and impeding access to works for legitimate purposes.

2. Rights Management Information (RMI): RMI refers to the information associated with copyrighted works or performances that identifies the rights holders, the work itself, or other relevant information. This can include copyright notices, licensing terms, metadata, digital signatures, or other identifiers. RMI serves as a means of managing and enforcing copyright and related rights.

The WIPO treaties recognize the importance of protecting RMI and prohibit the unauthorized removal or alteration of such information. Preserving RMI is essential for identifying and attributing rights, facilitating licensing and transactions, and maintaining the integrity of digital content. Removing or tampering with RMI can undermine the ability to enforce copyright and impede the proper management of rights. It's important to note that while TPMs and RMI are often used together in DRM systems, they have different legal implications and raise distinct concerns. The analysis of these elements separately helps to understand their individual roles and the legal issues associated with them. Furthermore, this distinction helps to highlight the differences between DRM systems, which incorporate TPMs and RMI, and DRM-free systems that do not employ such technological measures or rights management information.

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DRM IN OTHER COUNTRIES

To understand the approach taken by the governments of different regarding DRM, it can be helpful to compare it with the policies implemented in other jurisdictions that have adopted provisions of the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms

Treaty (WPPT). The DRM policies of different countries can be considered for this purpose. These regions are selected due to their significant role in the development of the WCT and the WPPT, as well as their longer involvement in DRM measures.[5]

In 1998, the provisions related to DRM, which were proposed under the WIPO Internet treaties, were implemented through the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) in the United States. One notable aspect that sets the DMCA apart from other DRM enforcement measures is its attempt to distinguish between protection for measures controlling access to a work and protection for measures controlling its use. Interestingly, the DMCA not only prohibits the circumvention of access control measures applied to a work but also aims to prevent activities such as the creation and distribution of tools primarily intended for facilitating circumvention.[6]

However, in comparison to the United States, India has taken a more cautious approach to DRM implementation. While the DMCA focuses on both access control and use control measures, India's policies may prioritize certain aspects or have different emphases. The specific details of India's approach to DRM and its differences from the US, UK and EU policies would need to be explored further.

The DMCA prohibits the circumvention of access control measures[7], while the anti-circumvention measures related to security of management control focus solely on initial activities.[8] The DMCA also prohibits tampering with rights management information and dealing with works in which the rights management information has been altered.[9] The exceptions provided under the DMCA are very limited in scope, primarily allowing for encryption research,

[5] For an interesting historical discussion on how the US attempted to place its digital agenda before the WIPO and also the subsequent negotiations with different parties, including the European Union, that culminated in the present WIPO DRM provisions, Samuelson Pamela, "US Digital Agenda at WIPO", 37(2) *Virginia Journal of International Law* 369-440, (1997).

[6]For the anti-circumvention provisions regarding access control, 17 U.S.C. § 1201 (a) (1) (A) and 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a) (2). For the anti-circumvention provisions regarding usage control, 17 U.S.C. § 1201 (b) (1).

[7] 17 U.S.C., § 1201(a)(2)

[8] 17U.S.C.,§1201(b)(1).

[9] 17U.S.C.,§1202.

law enforcement and security-related government activities, networking, and acquisition evaluation for non-profit libraries, archives, and educational institutions.[10]

Although the DMCA grants limited authority to the Librarian of Congress to periodically establish rules for specific exemptions, the number of exemptions granted so far has been relatively small. The DMCA provides both civil and criminal remedies for violations of anti-circumvention provisions[11]. Civil remedies include injunctions to prevent or restrict further infringements, as well as damages and attorney's fees.

It is important to note that the above information pertains to the DMCA in the United States. The specific provisions and approach to DRM enforcement in India may differ, and a detailed comparison would be required to understand the nuances of India's DRM policies in relation to the DMCA. Under the DMCA, copyright holders have the option to seek both actual damages and any profits resulting from the infringement or statutory damages. Civil remedies may include monetary compensation for the harm[12] caused by the infringement.

Regarding criminal remedies, the DMCA applies to cases of willful infringement and situations where the infringement was conducted for commercial gain or private financial profit. The prescribed penalties for criminal infringement include imprisonment for up to 5 years and/or fines of up to US$500,000.[13] In cases of repeat or serious violations, the penalties can increase to imprisonment for up to 10 years and/or fines of up to US$1,000,000.[14]

It's worth noting that these provisions specifically pertain to the DMCA in the United States. The penalties and remedies for DRM infringement in India or other jurisdictions may differ, and a thorough examination of the specific laws and regulations in each jurisdiction is necessary for a comprehensive understanding.

[10] 17U.S.C.§1201.
[11] 17U.S.C.§1203and17U.S.C.§1204.
[12]17 U.S.C. § 1203. The statutory damages prescribed for violations of Sec. 1201 can vary from $200 to $2,500 per act of circumvention, device, product, component, offer, or performance of service, whereas the same for violations of Sec. 1202 ranges from $2,500 to $25,000. In the case of repeated violations within three years after a final judgment was entered, the Courts are allowed to increase the award of damages up to triple the amount that would have been otherwise awarded
[13] 17 U.S.C. § 1204 (a) (1).
[14] 17U.S.C.§1204(a)(2).

DRM SYSTEM IN EUROPE

In Europe, the intellectual property laws are still not fully harmonized at the regional level, and there are significant differences in the approaches taken by various member states of the European Union regarding intellectual property law.

The Information Society Directive of 2001 was a significant initiative aimed at harmonizing copyright laws within the European Union. It also required member states to implement DRM regulations in their national legislation. However, the implementation of DRM regulations and their specific details vary across different member states.

Due to the diversity of national laws and regulations, the DRM landscape in Europe can be complex and fragmented. Each member state may have its own approach to DRM, leading to inconsistencies and challenges in cross-border digital content distribution and protection.

It is important to note that the information provided here is a general overview, and the specific DRM laws and regulations within each European country may differ. A comprehensive analysis of individual member states' legislation would be necessary to gain a complete understanding of DRM laws in Europe.

Under Article 6 of the Information Society Directive, member states are required to establish legal protection against the circumvention of effective technological measures, if the person engaging in circumvention knows or has reasonable grounds to know that they are pursuing that objective. The Directive also explicitly prohibits several key commercial activities related to circumvention of technological protection measures. These activities include manufacturing, importing, distributing, and even possessing circumvention tools, devices, or services for commercial purposes. The Directive aims to provide a consistent framework for addressing the circumvention of technological measures across member states. It emphasizes the importance of protecting the integrity of technological measures implemented by rights holders to control access to and use of their protected content.[15] It should be noted that the specific implementation

[15] Information Society Directive, Art. 6(2)

of the Directive's provisions may vary among member states, and each state may have its own additional measures or interpretations to enforce DRM regulations.

For a more detailed analysis of the implementation of the Information Society Directive and the specific DRM provisions within member states, further research and examination of individual national legislation would be necessary. The Information Society Directive significantly expands the scope of anti-circumvention protection by encompassing various types of access and use protection measures. Its impact is comparable, if not broader, to that of the DMCA. Article 7 of the Directive specifically prohibits the alteration of rights management information and dealing with such altered works if it is done with knowledge or reasonable grounds to believe that it induces, enables, facilitates, or conceals copyright infringement or database rights infringement.

However, the Directive includes a narrow provision for exemptions to anti-circumvention measures under Article 6(4). Unlike the recent DRM provisions in India or the DMCA, the Directive does not provide specific exemptions for particular groups. Instead, member states have the flexibility to ensure the legitimate use of exemptions provided under their national copyright laws, as long as they do not involve deliberate measures taken by right holders, including agreements between right holders and other parties. This complexity poses challenges for users in the digital world, as even the most common acts of circumvention could potentially be subject to legal consequences.It is important to note that the specific implementation and interpretation of the Directive's provisions may vary among member states, and further analysis of national legislation and court decisions would be required to fully understand the implications and practical application of DRM laws within Europe.

The implementation of DRM provisions under the Information Society Directive varies among different member states, with each state adopting different approaches.[16] Some member states have restricted the protection to cases of copyright infringement, while others have provided broader protection for technological measures. It is worth noting that none of the member states

[16] Information Society Directive, Art.6(4); West Kamp Guido, Study on the Implementation and Effect in Member States' Laws of Directive 2001/29/EC on the Harmonization of Certain Aspects of Copyright and Related Rights in the Information Society: Part II - Implementation of Directive 2001/29/EC in the Member States, 70-71.

have explicitly granted users the right to circumvent technological measures for non-infringing purposes. Instead, users who wish to exercise legitimate copyright exemptions may need to approach designated authorities or courts directly, without relying on voluntary agreements with right holders.

This fragmented approach to implementation raises concerns about the availability and accessibility of legitimate exceptions for copyright infringement. Users may face challenges in navigating the procedures established by different member states to exercise their rights. It also highlights the absence of clear provisions granting users the freedom to circumvent DRM for non-infringing purposes.It is important to consider the specific national legislation and court decisions within each member state to gain a comprehensive understanding of how DRM laws are being applied in practice and the implications for users seeking to exercise their rights.

The comparison of the new DRM provisions in India with the DRM provisions in the US and the EU reveals that the scope of the new DRM provisions in India is less extensive compared to both the DMCA and the Information Society Directive. This difference may have been intentional and influenced by the experiences and lessons learned from the implementation of more draconian and anti-reformist DRM provisions in the US and the EU over the past decade.

The DRM provisions in the US and the EU have faced criticism for their potential negative impact on freedom of speech, scientific research, market competition, and the principles of fair use and fair dealing. These provisions have been seen as favoring the interests of copyright holders at the expense of the public and limiting the ability of users to exercise their rights.

While the number of cases that have reached the courts may be limited, organizations like the Electronic Frontier Foundation have documented numerous instances where the application of DRM provisions has resulted in negative consequences. These cases have highlighted the importance of striking a balance between the rights of copyright owners and the rights of the public.

By adopting a less extensive approach to DRM provisions, India may be attempting to avoid some of the pitfalls and negative impacts experienced in other jurisdictions. It is important to

continually evaluate and learn from the implementation of DRM provisions to ensure that they do not unduly restrict users' rights and stifle innovation and creativity.

The cases that have arisen under the anti-circumvention provisions in other jurisdictions have highlighted instances where certain companies have attempted to misuse these provisions to prevent competition in technologies such as garage door openers and ink cartridges. This misuse goes against the original intentions of lawmakers when drafting DRM provisions, as these provisions were not meant to stifle competition or restrict consumer choices.[17]

DRM SYSTEM IN UK

Communication to the public of works where electronic rights management information has been removed or altered without authority (CDPA S. 296ZA)[18].This provision aims to protect the integrity of rights management information and discourage the unauthorized distribution or use of copyrighted works.The DRM system in the UK, as governed by the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act, provides legal protection for technological protection measures (TPMs) that control access to and use of digital content. The law prohibits the circumvention of TPMs and the manufacture or distribution of tools that enable circumvention. This is aimed at preventing unauthorized access and use of copyrighted material.However, the law also includes exceptions for certain activities such as preservation copying by libraries and archives. Nonetheless, the narrowness of the exceptions and the complexity of the process for appealing restrictions may make it difficult to effectively preserve digital material. The burden of proof falls on the user to demonstrate that circumvention tools are intended for legitimate uses under the exceptions, which can be challenging.Additionally, UK law protects against the removal or alteration of electronic rights management information. This provision aims to prevent the tampering or concealment of infringement by prohibiting the distribution or communication of works where rights management information has been unauthorised modified or removed.

[17]The Chamberlain Group Inc V. Skylink Technologies Inc, 381 F.3d 1178 (2004) and Lexmark International Inc v. Static Control Components Inc, 387 F.3d 522 (2004).

[18] See, Copinger and Skone James on -Copyright‖ 2010. Para 15-19 to 15-47 at Pages.987-1001.

Overall, the DRM system in the UK aims to strike a balance between protecting the rights of copyright holders and allowing for certain exceptions and limitations. However, the practical implementation of the system may present challenges, particularly in preserving digital material and navigating the appeal process for restricted acts. Yes, under UK law, it is prohibited to distribute, import for distribution, broadcast, communicate, or make available to the public any works or subject matter from which electronic rights management information has been removed or altered without authority. This provision aims to prevent the unauthorized distribution or communication of works that have been tampered with to conceal infringement or bypass rights management information. The intention behind this provision is to maintain the integrity of electronic rights management information associated with copyrighted works and ensure that such information is not unlawfully tampered with or removed. By protecting the electronic rights management information, the law aims to discourage infringement and promote the proper attribution and management of copyrighted content.

DRM SYSTEM IN USA

The United States, recognizing copyright as a form of ownership right for literary and artistic works, ratified the internet treaties of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and addressed the issue of copyright piracy through the enactment of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) in 1998. The primary objective of the DMCA is to prohibit the circumvention of anti-piracy technologies, while also providing exemptions for Internet service providers. Section 1201 of Title 17, which is part of the DMCA, makes it illegal to circumvent a technological measure that effectively controls access to a work.[19] However, there is no ban on circumventing a technological measure that protects the rights of a copyright owner. This section also prohibits the manufacture, provision, or trafficking of devices or services primarily intended to circumvent access controls or rights controls.[20]

While there are several exceptions to the anti-circumvention provisions outlined in Section 1201, such as the exception for reverse engineering under Section 1201(f), none of these exceptions

[19] 260 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a)(1)(A) (2006).
[20] 17 U.S.C. 1201(a)(2) and (b) (2006).

apply to library and archival copying for preservation purposes. It's worth noting that the DMCA does not affect the scope of the fair use principle, which allows for certain uses of copyrighted works without permission. However, there have been concerns about the potential negative impact of the DMCA's anti-circumvention provision on fair use, as highlighted in the case of ***United States of America v. Elcom Ltd and Dmitry Sklyarov.***[21]It's important to recognize that the DMCA and its effects on fair use continue to be subjects of debate and interpretation, and court cases play a significant role in shaping the application of these provisions.

DRM SYSTEM IN INDIA

In India, the Copyright Amendment Act of 2012 introduced new provisions related to Digital Rights Management (DRM). Section 65A of the Act focuses on the protection of Technological Protection Measures (TPM) used by copyright owners to safeguard their rights. It criminalizes the circumvention of effective technological measures applied for the protection of copyright. Anyone who intentionally circumvents such measures with the intention of infringing copyright can be punished with imprisonment for up to two years and may also face a fine. The objective of this provision is to prevent widespread infringement in the digital media and address the issue of circumvention's impact on public access to copyrighted works. Sub-section (2) allows for circumvention in specified circumstances. Section 65B has been introduced to provide protection for Rights Management Information (RMI), which refers to information associated with copyrighted works. It prohibits the unauthorized and intentional removal or alteration of any RMI without authority and the distribution of works, fixed performances, or phonograms after removing RMI. Such actions are considered civil and criminal offenses punishable by imprisonment for up to two years and a fine. The proviso to the clause allows copyright owners whose works have tampered RMI to seek civil remedies against those involved in such acts.

The Indian approach, as reflected in Section 65A and 65B, aims to provide limited legislative guidelines while allowing the judiciary to evolve the law based on practical situations. This

[21]2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9161 on VasilikiSamartzi,-Optimal vs sub-optimal use of DRM-Protected work‖, European Intellectual Property Review 2011.

approach takes into account the larger public interest of facilitating access to copyrighted works by the public.

ACT OF 2012 TO AMEND DRM AND COPYRIGHT LAW IN INDIA

DRM (Digital Rights Management) systems employ technologies and tools to secure the packaging, distribution, and access of protected content. Watermarks, encryption, and usage rules are some of the mechanisms used to ensure authorized use and prevent illegal sharing. In the context of the Indian Copyright (Amendment) Bill of 2012, the enactment aimed to address the challenges posed by digital technology to copyright protection. The bill incorporated provisions from the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, which focus on protecting copyright in the digital environment and cover various artistic and creative works.

The Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 introduced Sections 65A and 65B to punish individuals engaged in piracy and copyright infringement facilitated by technological means. Section 65A pertains to circumventing technological measures used to protect copyright, while Section 65B deals with the removal or alteration of rights management information. Both offenses are subject to penalties, including imprisonment and fines. Libraries face a conflicting situation concerning DRM and copyright. While libraries strive to provide access to digital content, DRM may impose restrictions that can hinder their ability to exercise their lawful rights under copyright law. Additionally, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) criminalizes copyright infringement and tampering with copyright protection systems, further complicating the landscape for libraries.

Overall, the relationship between DRM, copyright, and legal battles in the digital era is complex and continues to evolve as technology advances and copyright laws are enforced.

The enactment of the Indian Copyright (Amendment) Bill, 2012 in May 2012 reflects the growing recognition of the challenges posed by digital technology to the protection of copyright and related rights. This amendment bill was largely influenced by two treaties, namely the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Copyright Treaty, 1996, and the WIPO Performances

and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT), 1996. The bill addresses the issues related to the dissemination of protected material over digital networks like the internet and provides copyright protection for various creative works such as writings, computer programs, databases, musical works, audio-visual works, fine art, and photographs.

The Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 introduced two new sections, 65A and 65B, to combat piracy and the misuse of copyrighted material for profit. Section 65A pertains to the circumvention of effective technological measures applied to protect the rights granted by the Act. Anyone found guilty of intentionally infringing such rights by circumventing these measures can be punished with imprisonment up to two years and may also be liable to pay a fine. Section 65B deals with the unauthorized removal or alteration of rights management information, as well as the distribution, importation, broadcasting, or communication to the public of copies of copyrighted works or performances without authority, knowing that the electronic rights management information has been tampered with or removed. Similar penalties of imprisonment up to two years and fines can be imposed under this section.

The Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 represents significant progress in addressing the gaps in the existing copyright legislation (the parent Act of 1957) to benefit all stakeholders involved. It provides a clearer framework for the rights of authors and their creative works. Libraries are faced with a conflicting situation as they navigate the realms of both DRM and copyright. With the increasing shift towards digital holdings, libraries are realizing that they cannot afford to maintain dual formats and are increasingly focusing on digital content. They are licensing a diverse range of "born digital" information to meet the evolving needs of their patrons. However, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) criminalizes copyright infringement by imposing penalties for circumventing copyright protection systems and tampering with copyright management information. These terms, including copyright law, infringement, DMCA, and DRM, have become focal points of contention in the digital era, leading to battles in courtrooms over their interpretation and application.

CONCLUSION

A valid point can be raised regarding the potential challenges faced by users who aim to exercise their legitimate rights, especially when technical protection measures (TPMs) are involved. It is crucial for copyright laws and regulations to strike a balance between the protection of copyright holders' interests and the accessibility of works for various purposes, including those related to disabilities or other legitimate uses. In a situation where users, such as disability organizations, need to adapt copyrighted works to make them accessible, it is important to consider the availability of resources and technical expertise required to bypass TPMs. This can include provisions for reasonable access or exceptions to TPMs in cases where it is necessary to exercise legitimate rights.Overall, combating piracy and copyright infringement requires a collaborative effort involving various stakeholders, including the government, law enforcement agencies, educational institutions, copyright societies, associations, and the public. By raising awareness, promoting education, and enforcing copyright laws effectively, it is possible to reduce the extent of piracy and protect the rights of copyright holders.