

This unofficial translation is available from www.hssph.net/misc.html#Cases & <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1649682>



Translation by Senior Researcher Henrik Spang-Hanssen
Silicon Valley
Research website www.hssph.net

*1¹ [Docket #] B053000D-SF-MKC²

Court of Appeals Eastern Division

DECISION

**Delivered on 26 November 2008 by 11. Chamber of
the Eastern Division.**

(Judges: Karsten Bo Knudsen, Koch Clausen (kst.)
and Thomas Trier Hansen (kst.)).

Appeal case No. B-530-08

Sonofon A/S (formerly DMT2 A/S)
(Lawyer Niels Christian Ellegaard)

¹ Number after a bold “*” state the page of the original decision.

² Original decision in Danish *SONOFON A/S (tidligere DMT2 A/S) v. IFPI Danmark* (Østre Landsrets 11. afdelings kendelse af 26 november 2008 - Kæresag B-530-08) can be found through Computerworld DK at <http://www.computerworld.dk/art/49101> or <http://www.computerworld.dk/modules/davinci/getfile.php?id=26993&attachment>.

v.

IFPI Denmark
(Lawyer Peter Schønning)

as agent for

- 1) Aller International A/S
- 2) Artpeople A/S
- 3) Bellevue Entertainment A/S
- 4) Bonnier Amigo Music Denmark ApS
- 5) Circle Records Ltd
- 6) COPE Records Ltd.
- 7) Crunchy Frog Ltd
- 8) Da Capo Records
- 9) Egmont Serieforlaget A/S
- 10) EMI Music Denmark A/S
- 11) Exlibris Music Gyldendal A/S
- 12) Flex Records Ltd.
- 13) Folkeskolens Musiklærerforenings Forlag
- 14) Publishing GUF v / Jan Østergaard Nielsen * 2
- 15) Kick Music A/S
- 16) Lifted House Ltd.
- 17) MBO Group A/S
- 18) MUSIC of Dreams v / Kenneth Baker
- 19) Now Music I / S
- 20) OH Music ApS
- 21) Olga Musik ApS
- 22) Playground Music Denmark A/S
- 23) Recart Music ApS
- 24) Rigel ApS
- 25) Sand ApS
- 26) SonyBMG A/S
- 27) Spin Entertainment ApS
- 28) SteepleChase Productions ApS
- 29) Sundance ApS

Unofficial Translation of the Danish Court of Appeals case *Sonofon (DMT2) v IFPI Denmark*
– the so-called Danish “thepiratebay.org” case

- 30) Tuba Entertainment v / Jerry Ritz Blom
- 31) Tutl
- 32) Universal Music Group A/S
- 33) Warner Music Denmark A/S
- 34) Voices Music & Entertainment Denmark ApS

and

Danish Videogram Distributors Association
(Lawyer Peter Schønning)

as agent for

- 35) Buena Vista A/S
- 36) Nordisk Film Video A/S
- 37) Paramount International
- 38) SF Film A/S
- 39) Sandrew Metronome Video Denmark A/S
- 40) Scanbox Entertainment A/S
- 41) Universal Pictures Denmark A/S
- 42) Warner Bros.. Entertainment

and

43) Gyldendals Nordisk Publishing A/S * 3
(Lawyer Peter Schønning)

and

44) JP / Politiken A/S
(Lawyer Peter Schønning)

Sonofon A/S, which is merged with DMT2 A/S with Sonofon A/S as the continuing corporation, has appealed the order of 29 January 2008 from Bailiff's Court of Frederiksberg³ (FS 1432 / 2007)⁴ alleging that the prohibition and injunction should be lifted.

The Appellees, IFPI Denmark as agent for the Aller International A/S and others, Association of Videogram distributors as agent for Buena Vista A/S

and others, Gyldendals Nordisk Publishing A/S and JP/Politiken A/S, claims the order should be affirmed.

Additional facts

Contest A/S gave in a letter dated 2 August 2006 signed by its managing director, Erik Testmann the following opinion to Johan Schlüter Lawfirm I/S on the possibilities for a ISP (Internet Service Provider, abbreviated ISP) to block access to specific websites and categories:

"...

The AntiPiracyGroup has asked Contest A/S for an expert statement of the possibility of closing access to a particular website and how this is done in practice.

Just as the child-porn-filter that certain serious ISPs use to prevent their customers from access to this category of websites, one can block other pages and categories in several ways.

Method 1: Installation of hardware and software between the ISP's Internet connection and their customers' Internet access. * 4

There exist many different types of tools of this nature. I will in this presentation focus on just one, I know well, namely Content Filtering from the American company Sonicwall.

It is this solution we ourselves use in cooperation with the Library Board and Atea at more and more libraries around the country to prevent users here in accessing websites with pornographic content.

In practical terms, the solution of one or more units from Sonicwall of varying capacity, but common to them all is that one can block access to a wide range of categories, such as pornography, hacking areas, areas with rabid political messages, drugs and many other categories. Furthermore, it is possible to block areas based on website names and/or IP addresses.

The unit is placed as a filter between the ISP's customer area and their connection to the Internet. As mentioned, the filters exist in

³ Original decision *IFPI Danmark v. DMT2 A/S* (Frederiksberg Fogedrets Kendelse, 5 Februaray 2008 - FS 14324/2007) in Danish can be found through Computerworld DK at <http://www.computerworld.dk/art/44102?a=newsletter&i=1592> or <http://www.computerworld.dk/modules/davinci/getfile.php?id=18886&attachment>.

⁴ Unofficial English translation at www.hssph.net/misc.html#Cases or http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1093246.

Unofficial Translation of the Danish Court of Appeals case *Sonofon (DMT2) v IFPI Denmark*
– the so-called Danish “thepiratebay.org” case

various variants and sizes, but as the largest of the units can operate at higher speeds than they most ISPs have available, this is not an argument not to acquire them.

This solution is clearly the safest and easiest for the ISP to use. Thus it is possible for the ISP to block access to a specific website for all its customers, including access to a website which www.allofmp3.com.

Method 2: Establishing of a so-called Proxy.

It is possible for an ISP to ensure that all traffic to WEB (so-called http and https) is run through a so-called proxy server. This means that the users' machines must be configured so that all traffic to WEB shall go through a particular machine or machines at the ISP, so-called proxy servers. These proxy servers provide the users' search to the network and can therefore be configured so that some addresses are not allowed.

It is this solution in combination with method 1, that several large companies are using. However, it requires strong - and thus expensive equipment – and at the same time that customers must be burdened with cumbersome configurations, where fore this technique probably is less interesting for the ISP.

Method 3: Blocking at the DNS level.

DNS (Domain Name Services) is the mechanism used to translate web addresses into the unique IP addresses, on which the Internet operates.

Many ISPs ... allows DNS access to their customers, and it will be possible to prevent translation of specific addresses to IP addresses, alternatively, to send the inquiry on to a different address than the intended, and there give the user a warning that he is out in illegal business. However, this solution has the weakness that an IT-savvy user can force a second DNS server into his/her system than the one the provider offers, and thus still get access to undesirable sites.

Method 4: Blocking at the IP level. * 5

Into modern routers it is possible to put filters that prevent access to certain pages, either via IP addresses or DNS lookups. The later most ISP will try to avoid, since DNS lookups takes time, thus giving disproportionate load on the router. One can more easily block specific IP addresses, but it requires that routers continuously are being updated, especially since the unwanted areas on the Internet is changing IP address from time to time. Furthermore, the same IP address can cover both wanted and unwanted pages.

However, it would in principle be sufficient for the ISP to get the name of a particular site - and then the IP address or a specific IP address and thus blocking access to that.

In this context, I just think I owe to explain what a router is. A router is the device that controls traffic from the ISP's network, and thus the ISP's users and the Internet.

Information that an ISP needs to conduct blocking.

For a ISP to be able to block a page, the only information needed, is the name of the page or domain to be blocked. This applies even if there should blocking has to be done at the IP-level, since the ISP by a so-called DNS-lookup by itself can access the at any time valid IP address.

Conclusion

As stated above, there is a wide variety of opportunities for an ISP to block access for its customers to a particular website. There are different advantages and disadvantages of each method, but they all offer the opportunity to effectively close down access to a single site.
... "

Contest A/S made in a letter dated 24 January 2008, also signed by its managing director, Erik Testmann, the following statement to Johan Schlüter Lawfirm I/S

Unofficial Translation of the Danish Court of Appeals case *Sonofon (DMT2) v IFPI Denmark*
– the so-called Danish “thepiratebay.org” case

on the options to block access to pages from www.thepiratebay.org :

"...

AntiPiracyGroup has approached Contest A/S for a professional evaluation of the possibilities to terminate access to the above website-material.

In this context, I refer to my letters regarding a similar case of 2 August 2006 ...

Opposite the above mentioned case, in this case no material is downloaded directly from www.thepiratebay.org whereas the site instead is used as a website containing links to material provided by other users. However, this has no significance as it still is via the site that the link between users and providers of the material is offered. Thus, traffic to and from users of a particular ISP is still going through the provider's network. * 6

It is possible for the ISPs to block access to www.thepiratebay.org, just as in the case for www.allfmp3.com.

If the ISPs are blocking access to the website www.thepiratebay.org underlying links referring to or through www.thepiratebay.org will also be inaccessible to the Internet providers' customers.

... "

During the proceedings before the Courts of Appeals there has been a demonstration of the website www.thepiratebay.org.

Evidence

Before the Courts of Appeals there have been given statements of the witnesses Nicholai Kramer Pfeiffer and Henrik Lund Kramshøj and additional explanation of Kristian Løkkegaard.

Nicholai Kramer Pfeiffer has explained that he is section chief of Telenor Denmark, which took over Tele2 on 13 June 2007. He was from 2002 employed in Cybercity, which was acquired by Telenor in 2005. After the allofmp3 case⁵ there had been truce with

⁵ Translator: Allofmp3.com operated by Mediaservices, Inc, a company founded in 2000 in Moscow, Russia]],

rightholders in the sense that Telenor was getting involved in cases of similar nature. The present case began in autumn 2007. They became belatedly aware that they had inherited such an action with the takeover of Tele2 and it was their own intern lawyer that to deal with the case in the Baliff's court. They consider the issue a matter of principle and there is common ground on this in the telecommunications industry.

With regard to the different methods mentioned in Contest A/S's letter of 2. August 2006, they do not have filter-hardware as mentioned in method 1. It would be extremely expensive. It is also a very simplistic setup that has used as basis. Libraries and the like have only one connection towards the Internet Telenor's core network is associated with redundancy, that is, the connection is double, so that if something breaks down, it's not all. Part of their traffic is also outside the historic center of Lyngby city, thus there are more links out. The network chief has estimated that it would cost 30-40 millions [Danish Crowns⁶] for a filter solution. Method 2, uses a proxy server, was efficient until 2003, but cannot be used with the traffic volumes on the Internet today. Method 3, DNS blocking, is not something they use, but a facility that they have made available to the National Police Unit in the fight against child pornography. He cannot give estimate of the extent of * 7 piracy over the Internet, but he is convinced that it is a major issue for rightholders.

After the injunction-orders⁷ in the allofmp3,

Mikkel Aabenhus Hemingsen, *Fogedretten beordrer Tele2 til at blokere for mp3-site*, COMPUTERWORLD-DK, 16 August 2007 at <http://www.computerworld.dk/art/40824?a=rss&i=0> and Wikipedia at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AllOfMP3>.

⁶ Translator: 6 DKK ~ 1 USD.

⁷ Translator: *IFPI Denmark as agent for Aller International A/S et al. v. Tele2 A/S* (Bailiff's Court of Copenhagen, 25 October 2006 - Docket no. F1-15124/2006)(The court issued an injunction against ISP's contributing to and giving access to Russian www.allofmp3.com, which distributed illegal music). On 22 November 2006, Tele2 decided to accept the court order and permanently block [allofmp3.com](http://www.allofmp3.com), Robert Vanglo, *Tele2 lukker permanent for Allofmp3.com*, COMPUTERWORLD-DK 22 November 2006 at <http://www.computerworld.dk/art/36684?a=newsletter&i=763> &

IFPI v. Tele2 (Bailiff's Court of Frederiksberg, 15. August 2007 – Docket FS 7509/2007)(Similar decision concerning [mp3sparks.com](http://www.mp3sparks.com)).

Unofficial Translation of the Danish Court of Appeals case *Sonofon (DMT2) v IFPI Denmark*
– the so-called Danish “thepiratebay.org” case

mp3sparks⁸ and the present case, they have established DNS blocking of those websites. There have been no rightholders who subsequently have made complaints that they have not done what they should according to the court orders. If the rightholders obtained judgments against the website owners, stating that the contents of the websites were unlawful, they would on that basis be willing to help hinder prevent access to those pages. They estimated that mp3sparks was a Russian website through which one could buy copyrighted material as those who was behind the website, had no rights. It was not possible to have closed the site in Russia. However, Sweden is bound by the same directives as Denmark, and therefore it would in this case be more compelling to pursue its rights directly against the source of the alleged violation.

Kristian Løkkegaard has further explained that www.thepiratebay.org not the only site of that nature. There exists a number of different, similar websites, www.thepiratebay.org is one of the largest if not the largest. It is a very popular part of Denmark. Today more than 5% of Dtecn Software ApS' revenue is derived from assignments from lawfirm Johan Schlüter. The company no long has a lease with the lawfirm. The company develops applications that scan the network for illegal activity. There is probably no software that is relevant software for telecommunications companies in a case like this.

Henrik Lund Kramshøj has explained that he has no connection to any of the parties in the case. He is educated as a computer scientist and cand. scient. He runs his own company as an IT-security consultant. A torrent-file is a small data file that contains a description of how to get a file and a reference to a tracker. It points at specific file. If one downloads a torrent-file, one gets not automatic the file pointed at; one must first have a tracker, which then has to be activated, possibly by double-clicking on the torrent-file. Major Internet providers often will not have just one central Internet connection. Filter-boxes have

become faster, but the width of the broadband and the speed increases, and the boxes are no longer always big enough. With regard to the methods mentioned in Contest A/S's letter of 2 August 2006, as for method 1, there must either be used many boxes if they are placed in close to the customers, or fewer giant-boxes, * 8 if they should be located where the traffic goes out to the Internet. As a minimum at least two boxes is needed for each output to ensure against outages. At a library the filter often sits close to the line going out of the house to the telephone-central. A much smaller box is needed if one does weight security so high and just settles for only one box. Today, it is not a true statement to claim the units can operate at higher speeds than most ISPs have available. The boxes will work delaying and as for Internet telephony words or sounds will be lost. It is expected that Internet consumption will double within a few months and it will be six times as large by 2010. A filter solution for an ISP will cost 100,000 [Danish Crowns] per box, but it may well cost one million [Danish Crowns] to operate it. The figures must then be replicated over each connection. As for method 2, a proxy could look at a list of websites, one do not want to visit, and for contents one do not want, such as porn or music. A proxy has insight into all aspects of an http-connection, but not in an https-connection, which is a secure connection. Should people behind www.thepiratebay.org choose to encrypt the traffic, it could be through https. The installing of a proxy server often imply that traffic must be a detoured, which results in a delay. At the ISP-level, one would probably set up the proxy-servers at 3-4 points, and one would probably duplicate. Such a solution would at that the level cost a couple of millions annually. With regard to method 3, blocking at the DNS-level, each ISP has its own name service that it offered to customers to use. One can circumvent a DNS-blocking, for example by having ones own name-server, and thus get to the site, which the ISP has blocked. DNS-blocking at the provider involves administration of a blacklist and will probably cost a few millions per year. In Method 4, one puts a number of IP-addresses into a list, and those one then cannot connect to. There will be a need to update the list since it is very easy to change an IP-address. Some are changed many times a day. There may be several websites on the same IP-address, which for example is the case for so-called web-hosting/web-hotels. If one blocks at the IP-level, one will block all these websites. The difference between Method 1 and Method 4 is that by method 1 one looks "inside the envelope", while with method 4 only the address of "outside" is being checked. Method 4 will probably not cause delays, since it is a much more simple filter-function. One can to some degree

⁸ Translator: allofmp3 & mp3sparks are a brand of online music store that were operated by Mediaservices, Inc., a company founded in 2000 in Moscow, Russia. In January 2008 it was reported that MP3Sparks.com and its associated web sites were being hosted (since December 2007) by AbdAllah Internet, a Turkish web hosting service, which has been blocked by several ISPs, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mp3sparks#MP3Sparks.com> .26 MemphisMembers.

automatize the process. It is hard to come up with solutions other than the 4 mentioned. The DNS-method is the easiest of the four methods to use, from Internet providers perspective.

Procedures * 9

The Appellant has declared before the Court of Appeals that is undisputed that Appellant’s transmission in its telecommunications network of copyrighted works on behalf of its subscribers may constitute a violation of Appellees copyrights, see Copyright Act § 2 and special the exception in § 11 a, which implements Article 8, paragraph 3 of the Infosoc Directive.⁹

Appellant has in support of its claim essentially proceeded in accordance with the brief-document of 29 October 2008, in which is argued,

that it is undisputed by Appellees that transmission of the torrent files do not involve transmission of copyright works,

that the appellant’s transmission of files to and from the website does not imply temporary reproduction of musical works, see Copyright Act § 11 a, since there is no transmission of copyright works in the Appellant’s network in connection with the website,

that the bailiff’s court’s ruling thus is based on a factual error, which means that the bailiff’s court assessment of the case is incorrect,

that the prohibition and injunction are not formulated with required clarity in relation to which acts are prohibited, respectively ordered,

that to Appellant thus cannot determine with certainty when one have met the prohibition respectively the order requirements,

⁹ Translator: InfoSoc Directive = Information Society Directive = The Copyright Directive. Officially, Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonization of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society, E.U. Official Journal L 167, 22/06/2001 pp. 0010-0019 or <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32001L0029:EN:HTML>. The directive enacted to implement the WIPO Copyright Treaty adopted in Geneva on 20 December 1996 (text at www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/treaties/en/ip/wct/pdf/trtdocs_wo033.pdf), see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/InfoSoc_Directive.

that violation of the prohibition or the injunction is subject to criminal liability, wherefore the prohibition and the injunction must be formulated with the same clarity as a criminal offense statutory provision

that the words “contribute to”¹⁰ does not with sufficient clarity, describe the specific acts which the Appellant is prohibited to do. Contribution is a legal concept that relates to the action of another, not to the contributor’s own actions

that a ban should include those verbs, which describes those acts that Appellant must not do

that the prohibition by its content does not reflects a duty not to act, but in stead a duty to act, since Appellant only can observe the ban by making a large number of active actions

that the ban thus is contrary to the principle that an injunction in overall should be a duty not to act,

that the order goes further than permitted by Code of Civil Procedure¹¹ § 641, paragraph 2, * 10

- as the order contains a duty for Appellant to achieve a certain mentioned result, and
- as the order is not limited to “undertake individual actions to ensure the by the ban imposed investigation,” § 641, paragraph. 2

that the order does not contain the required objective description of the acts as Appellant has to perform,

that the prohibition and injunction is manifestly disproportionate, see Code of Civil Procedure § 643, paragraph. 2, since

- the holder and the people behind the website is identified and established/domiciled in the E.U.
- the substantive rules on copyright, see Infosoc Directive, are harmonized. Thus, the court can take as a fact that the copyright holders’ rights in this case are protected in Sweden at least the same level as in Denmark,
- Appellee has not brought an action against the people behind the site in Sweden, even though this is possible,
- Appellee has not brought an action against the people behind the website in Denmark, even though this is possible,

¹⁰ Translator: In original Danish: “medvirke til”.

¹¹ Translator: “Retsplejeloven” or “Rpl” (Official: “Lov om rettes pleje”) ~ Danish Civil Procedure Code or Danish Administration of Justice Act. Latest consolidated version (in Danish) no. 1053 of 29 October 2009 (without later amendments) at www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=126338 (last visited July 2010).

Unofficial Translation of the Danish Court of Appeals case *Sonofon (DMT2) v IFPI Denmark*
– the so-called Danish “thepiratebay.org” case

- the uncertainty about whether the activities at the site are illegal should be given importance as to the assessment of proportionality,
- the question of the legality of www.thepiratebay.org should be assessed in a case where www.thepiratebay.org is a party, at least where the owner of the site is identified and domiciled within the E.U.
- the prohibition and injunction are so vague that it is impossible to determine with certainty what the costs Appellant will suffer for the fulfillment of its duty not to act and its duty to act, and what other consequences the Bailiff court's order will have on Appellant. The Bailiff's Court therefore has been unable to consider the possible consequences of the prohibition and the injunction, in its proportionality evaluation.

that the Infosoc Directive and the Law-enforcement Directive¹² are not directly applicable to the Appellant and only in the present case can be used as help for interpretation

that there exists a general E.U. legal principle of proportionality,

that article 8, paragraph 3 of the Infosoc Directive includes a requirement on a proportional balance between rightholders' interests and telecompany's interests

that the fact that there pursuant to the Infosoc Directive is an obligation for the Member States to take effective measures, means that it is for the national * 11 courts to choose such concrete measures, which on the one hand are effective, and on the other hand are proportional,

that the desire to achieve a "effective" ban cannot lead to the prohibition/injunction can be formulated unclear - the effectiveness may instead be achieved by imposing proportional concrete omission-obligations under national law and

that the § 643, paragraph. 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure must be interpreted in light of this, see in particular UfR¹³ 2006.1474 H.¹⁴

The Appellee has essentially proceeded as it did for the Bailiff's Court. Appellee has moreover particular remarked that the bailiff's court ruling has not been based on a factual error. The prohibition is formulated with sufficient clarity. The order does not go further than permitted by § 641, paragraph 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure. A similar formulation of the prohibition and the injunction has been used in other similar cases. The technical differences in the structure of the website, as this case deals with, and the structure of websites in previous decided cases does not change how the ban should be formulated. The Appellant is the closest to decide which measures are best and most efficient to use in Appellant's networking. Blocking at the DNS-level are generally sufficiently effective. It is settled law that Appellee does not have to refer to assert its rights against the owners of the website. If Appellee had to take legal action against the owners of the website abroad, it would mean a substantial extension of the time of the case, just as it would increase the scope of violations against Appellee and its members' rights. It follows from Article 8 (3) of the Infosoc Directive that the rightholders in cases of this nature shall be able to get a court-injunction and therefore is not be referred to first to apply the general rules for penalties and damages. After a proportionality balancing under Code of Civil Procedure § 643, paragraph 2, the prohibition is applied correctly. The issue of possible administrative work on the Appellant's side to complying with the ban does not prevent the abandonment of the prohibition, see Supreme Court

¹² Translator: Danish: “Retshåndhævelsesdirektivet”. Enforcement Directive = IPR Enforcement Directive = IPRED Enforcement Directive. Officially, Directive 2004/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights. E.U. Official Journal L 157 30/4/2004 corrected by as L 195, 02/06/2004 pp. 0016-0025 or http://eur-lex.europa.eu/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_195/l_19520040602e_n00160025.pdf. See also Wikipedia at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Directive_on_the_enforcement_of_intellectual_property_rights.

¹³ Ugeskrift for Retsvæsen [Danish Case Reporter] Year 2006 page 1474 (Supreme Court).

¹⁴ Translator: *TDC Totalløsninger A/S v. IFPI Danmark* as agent for Arcade Music Company et al., UfR 2006.1474 H (Supreme Court of Denmark, 10 February 2006 - Docket no. 49/2005) (Plaintiff was service provider for A, which had two servers with amongst others illegal copyrighted music. The Court held the plaintiff's transmission was a temporary illegal copying. It was not disproportional that plaintiff would have to disconnect A's servers. As A did not have static IP-addresses, the injunction should only cover subscribers, which at a specific given time had been issued certain given IP-addresses. The parties agreed that plaintiff was free from responsibility pursuant to article 14 of the Danish E-commerce Act).

Unofficial Translation of the Danish Court of Appeals case Sonofon (DMT2) v IFPI Denmark
– the so-called Danish “thepiratebay.org” case

ruling referenced in UfR 2006.1474 H.¹⁵ The investment and inconvenience as Appellant has been imposed in connection with the ban, is modest.

Court of Appeals’ reasoning and result

After the demonstration for Court of Appeals of the disputed site, www.thepiratebay.org in conjunction with Contest A/S's opinion of 24.januar 2008 the court holds that Appellant by giving its customers access to that website contributes to reproduction and making available of works to the public, to * 12 which the Appellees have the exclusive right to reign over pursuant to Copyright Act § 2 Since the rightholders have not given consent, the conditions of Code of Civil Procedure § 642, No. 1 and 2, are met.

In the light of information of the extent of the piracy through the Internet, the purpose seems to would be lost if the Appellee were to be referred to enforce their rights by common trial, see Code of Civil Procedure § 642, No 3. This applies not matter that the people behind www.thepiratebay.org according to the information are identified and residents in Sweden. The general rules for penalties and damages do not seem to provide the Appellee adequate protection pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 643, paragraph 1.

Given the information about the effects of the by the Appellant’s established DNS-blocking and the lack of information from Appellant about the cost of managing the blocking, the court holds an injunction on the Appellant does not to contravene the requirement of proportionality, see Code of Civil Procedure § 643, paragraph. 2.

As the Court of Appeals holds the formulations of the prohibition and the injunction are sufficiently clear and specific, the court affirms the order of the Bailiff’s Court.

Decision:

The decision of the Bailiff’s court is affirmed.

(Signature)

¹⁵ See above footnote 14.