

“Piggy Backing” on the Web 2.0 Internet: Copyright Liability and Web 2.0 Mashups

by
LISA VEASMAN*

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. Introduction..... | 312 |
| II. Web 2.0 and Web Mashups | 313 |
| A. The Internet and Web Pages | 313 |
| B. What is Web 2.0?..... | 314 |
| C. Mixing and Mashing..... | 315 |
| D. Where and How Liability May Arise | 317 |
| III. Types of Copyright Liability..... | 318 |
| A. Direct Infringement | 318 |
| B. Liability for the Infringing Acts of Others | 319 |
| 1. Vicarious Liability | 319 |
| 2. Contributory Liability | 320 |
| 3. Inducement Liability – <i>MGM v. Grokster</i> | 322 |
| C. Saved by the DMCA Safe Harbor | 323 |
| IV. Copyright Liability and Web 2.0 Mashups | 325 |
| A. Primary Liability – Direct Infringement..... | 325 |
| 1. Mashup Creators Should Not Be Liable for Direct Infringement Because They Lack Volition. | 326 |
| 2. Policy Reasons Disfavor Finding Mashups Directly Liable . | 327 |
| 3. A Court Should Not Hold Mashups Directly Liable Because the Mashup Only Occupies a Passive Role to the Infringing Acts. | 328 |
| B. Secondary Liability – Indirect Infringement | 329 |
| 1. Vicarious Infringement | 330 |
| 2. Contributory Infringement | 331 |
| 3. Inducement Infringement..... | 332 |
| V. Escaping Liability | 333 |
| A. Battling Forces..... | 333 |

* University of California, Hastings College of the Law, Juris Doctor Candidate, 2008; University of California, Santa Barbara, B.A., English, 2003. Ms. Veasman wishes to send sincere thanks to Professor Margreth Barrett for her insight and suggestions in writing this note.