

WHO CAN CLEAN THE FLICKS?: ON REMEDIES FOR INFRINGEMENT OF UNUSED DERIVATIVE WORKS

by MARK D. SHTILERMAN*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	497
I. PHILOSOPHY OF COPYRIGHT LAW	498
A. American Copyright Law	498
B. European Copyright Law	499
C. Globalization in the Legal Field.....	501
II. HOW DAVID CHALLENGED GOLIATH	502
A. Gratuitous Sex and Violence	502
B. Clean Flicks Technology	503
C. Clear Play Technology	504
D. The Claims	504
III. THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF LEGAL DECISION	506
A. Lack of Precedent on Video Editing	506
B. Originality and Derivative Works	506
C. Fixation and Derivative Works	507
D. The Family Movie Act of 2005	509
IV. IN THE COURT	510
A. The Case of Filter-Enabled DVD Players: Clear Play ..	510
B. The Case of Edited DVDs: Clean Flicks	510
V. WHO ARE THE REAL LOSERS?	513
VI. RIGHT CALL, WRONG REMEDY?	514
VII. FINAL THOUGHTS.....	516

ABSTRACT

What if you want to see the Oscar-winning movie *Titanic*, but you don't want your kids to see Kate Winslet's breasts exposed? Until the decision in *Clean Flicks of Colorado v. Soderbergh*, you could either buy a DVD disk and send it to a third party editing company to remove sex, profanity and violence, or instead, buy a DVD player which could auto-

*The author is an associate at Dewey & LeBoeuf, LLP. The views expressed in this article are personal to the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of Dewey & LeBoeuf, LLP or of any of the firm's clients. The author wishes to thank Professor Susan Scafidi, who was an inspiration for this article, and his wife, Ingrid Hsu, for her continued support and understanding. This article was first submitted to the Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition administered by ASCAP, where it won the First Prize at Fordham Law School and the National Second Prize