IP, Personality Rights, & Reputation Management

Technology, Media & Telecoms Law Institute
Centre for Commercial Law Studies
Queen Mary, University of London

1

Introduction

- □ What are personality rights?
- □ What do these protect?
- □ Remedies in the UK
 - Defamation
 - Breach of confidence
 - Copyright
 - Trademarks
 - Passing off
- □ Should there be a personality right?

Character Merchandising

- □ Right of the individual to use their name, image, voice etc as they wish and to prevent others from using it to endorse a product.
- ☐ Celebrities are used in advertising to enhance the commercial attractiveness of product or service
- □ Protection for cartoon and other fictional characters

3

Legal Protections

- □ Right to privacy/right to publicity
 - No such personality right in UK
- □ Various non-specific legal remedies
 - Cases divided into
 - ☐ False endorsement
 - Use of individuals to advertise certain products
 - Merchandising
 - Sale of memorabilia which is linked to a famous person

Legal Remedies

- ☐ How far can libel be used to protect personality rights?
 - Tolley v Fry [1931] A.C. 33
 - Charleston v News Group Newspapers [1995] 2AC 65
- □ Breach of contract
 - Pollard v Photographic Co (1888) 40 Ch.D. 345
- □ Breach of confidence
 - Creation Records v News Group Newspapers [1997] EMLR 444
 - Douglas v Hello! (2007) UKHL 21

5

Legal Remedies



Legal Remedies

- ☐ How far can libel be used to protect personality rights?
 - Tolley v Fry [1931] A.C. 33
 - Charleston v News Group Newspapers [1995] 2AC 65
- □ Breach of contract
 - Pollard v Photographic Co (1888) 40 Ch.D. 345
- □ Breach of confidence
 - Creation Records v News Group Newspapers [1997] EMLR 444
 - Douglas v Hello! (2007) UKHL 21

7

Creation Records



Legal Remedies

- ☐ How far can libel be used to protect personality rights?
 - Tolley v Fry [1931] A.C. 33
 - Charleston v News Group Newspapers [1995] 2AC 65
- □ Breach of contract
 - Pollard v Photographic Co (1888) 40 Ch.D. 345
- □ Breach of confidence
 - Creation Records v News Group Newspapers [1997] EMLR444
 - Douglas v Hello! (2007) UKHL 21

9

Copyright

- □ Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988
 - protects literary, dramatic and musical works
 - Originality
 - May be used to protect images, drawings, photographs, illustrations
 - Where images are copyright material and are being copied to a substantial extent without a licence then this may result in infringement

Copyright

Limitations

- No copyright in celebrity's image or name itself
- only useful for photographs, text where copyright held by celebrity
 - □ what if the images are new photographs?
 - Who owns the copyright in the photograph?
 - □ Who owns performance rights in sound or video recordings?

11

Defences

- □ Duchess of Sussex v Associated News [2021] EWHC273
 - A 21st Century Albert v Strange (1849)
- □ Copyright Infringement: Exceptions
 - Criticism, review or quotation
 - □ Hubbard v Vosper (1972)
 - Reporting current events
 - Courts would consider whether use was fair

Public Interest Defence

- □ Public interest
 - HRH Prince of Wales v Associated Newspapers Limited 2006
 - Lion Laboratories Ltd v Evans (1985)
 - Hyde Park Residence Ltd v Yelland (2000)
 - Ashdown v Telegraph (2001)

13

Trade Mark

- □ Protection of registered trade mark
 - Trade Marks Act 1994
 - □ Use as a trade mark
 - □ Origin of product
 - □ Used in course of business
 - Specified categories of goods and services
 - Use of an identical or similar name for the same or similar goods or services
 - Registering names Elvis Presley Trademark [1999]
 - 'badge of origin'

Betty Boop



- □ Hearst Holdings Inc & Anor v AVELA Inc & Ors[2014] EWHC 439 (Ch)
 - Character must be significantly distinctive Badge of origin or merely descriptive

15

Passing Off

- □ Unregistered trade marks
- ☐ Use of competitor's name misleads purchaser into believing that there is an association with defendant
- □ Protects goodwill associated with the name

Passing Off

- □ Requirements
 - a misrepresentation
 - made by the trader in the course of trade
 - to prospective customers of his or ultimate consumers of goods or services supplied by him
 - which is calculated to injure the business or goodwill of another trader
 - which causes actual damage to a business or goodwill of the trader by whom the action is brought or will probably do so.

17

Passing Off

- □ False endorsement
 - McCulloch v Lewis A May (1947) 65 R.P.C.
 58.
 - common field of activity
- Merchandising
 - Lyngstad v Anabas Products Ltd [1977]F.S.R. 62

False Endorsement

- ☐ Irvine v Talksport (2002)
 - To prove a false endorsement claim, the claimant had to prove
 - □ a) he had a substantial goodwill
 - b) the activities of the defendant gave rise to a false message which would be understood by a not insignificant section of his market that his goods had been endorsed, recommended or approved by Mr Irvine

19

Fenty v Arcadia [2015]

- ☐ Rihanna successfully brought passing off action against Topshop for marketing t -shirts with photographs of her image without her agreement
- ☐ Court emphasised importance of particular facts of case including
 - Image was associated with latest album
 - Rihanna had previous links with Topshop
- □ CA made it clear there is 'no image right'



21

Fenty v Arcadia [2015]

- ☐ Rihanna successfully brought passing off action against Topshop for marketing t -shirts with photographs of her image without her agreement
- ☐ Court emphasised importance of particular facts of case including
 - Image was associated with latest album
 - Rihanna had previous links with Topshop
- □ CA made it clear there is 'no image right'

Other Jurisdictions

US

- Varies across the different states
 - □ eg Californian Celebrities Rights Act 1985
- Voice and distinctive expressions
 - □ Carson v Here's Johnny Portable Toilets Inc 698 F.2d 831 (6th Cir. 1983)
 - □ Midler v Ford Motor Co 849 F.2d 460 (9th Cir, 1988)
- Impersonations
 - □ In Estate of Presley v Russen 513 F.Supp 1339 (DNJ, 1981)
 - □ c/f Elvis Presley Enterprises v Sid Shaw Elvisly Yours [1999] EWCACiv 964

23

Australia

- □ No actual right of publicity
 - Tort of passing off
 - □ Henderson v Radio Corporation Pty Ltd [1969] R.P.C. 218.
 - □ Pacific DunlopLtd v Hogan (1989) 14 I.P.R. 398
 - □ Newton-John v School-Plough (1986) 11 F.C.R. 233
 - Statutory action for deceptive trading
 - □ Hogan v Koala Dundee 83 A.L.R. 187

The Civil Law Approach

□ Protection generally derives from

 broad provisions in the civil code together with specific statutory provisions, related to copyright law and trade mark law

25

The Future?

- Development of tort of passing off
 - Can this provide a sufficient level of protection?
 - Should there be a specific personality right in English law?
 - □ Implications?



Implications?

- □ Who would benefit?
 - The artist / performer?
 - Non-performers?
- □ Does the industry want this?
 - No AI generated crowds / performances?

