

This is our summary of some of the key legal developments across a range of sectors for the week of 25 May 2009. It is intended for reference purposes only and does not constitute definitive advice. Links to the original source materials are included where there are no restrictions in terms of access. References may also be made to sources that require separate registration or subscription. A link to a source does not necessarily imply endorsement of the source or the material provided through the link.

For further information on any of the matters discussed in the summary please contact our Professional Support Lawyer, [Sarah Kirkness](#). If you have any comments, queries or suggestions please contact us at [comments](#). All suggestions and comments are most welcome. If you do not wish to receive this summary you can contact us at [unsubscribe](#).

Speed Read

General

SABIP Report on Impact of Digital Consumers in the Online Age

Raising Awareness of Consequences of Counterfeiting and Piracy

Live Conversation Service Providers Compensation Fund Cut Off Date Announced

Retention of Photographs at Protest Meeting - Whether An Infringement of Privacy

Broadcasting

Competition Commission Publishes Draft Undertakings for UK TV VOD Sector

Revision of COSTA Rules on Advertising Minutage, Breaks and Teleshopping

OFT Recommendations to Competition Commission on Revision of CRR Remedy

Broadcast Bulletin - Latest Issue

Sanctions Committee Imposes Fine for Unfair Radio Competition

Corporate

Court Guidance on "Pre-Pack" Administration Applications

Government Response to Consultation on Registration of Charges

LSE Notice on Changes to AIM Rules on Disclosure of Significant Shareholdings

Draft Legislation - Limited Liability Partnerships and Application of Companies Act 2006

Revised Draft Legislation - Companies (Shareholders' Rights) Regulations

Film & TV

Independent Study on Measures Promoting European Works in Audiovisual Media Services

Gambling

Regulatory Statement on Transactional TV Gambling Channels

New Legislation - Limits on Prize Gaming

Litigation

Libel Proceedings - Application to Strike Out Defences of Justification, Fair Comment and Qualified Privilege

Music

PRS for Music Announce Revised Rates for Music Streaming

Commissioner Welcomes Online Commerce Roundtable Report on Online Music Retailing

Publishing

Article - Media Access to Family Courts

Consultations & Reports

General

SABIP Report on Impact of Digital Consumers in the Online Age

The results of a study commissioned by the Strategic Advisory Board for Intellectual Property (SABIP) into digital consumers' behaviour and attitudes and their implications for IP policy have been published. The study made it clear at the outset that the backdrop to the research into online consumer behaviour and the effect this has on legal practices, the content industries and government policy was the "vast economic losses brought about by widespread unauthorised downloading and a huge confusion about (or denial of) the definition of what is and is not legal and copyright protected". The report stated that in April 2009, between 44% and 79% of global Internet traffic was taken up with file sharing (the lower figure is for America, the higher for the "Eastern Europe" region) although it stated there was no way of measuring how much of this traffic was the up or downloading of unauthorised, unlicensed or illegal material. The UK film industry informed the study that there were just under 100 million illegal downloads of DVDs in 2007, and globally the film industry was said to lose approximately US\$6 billion per year. The study quoted industry reports, which suggested that at least seven million British citizens have downloaded unauthorised content, many on a regular basis, and many also without any ethical consideration of their actions. Estimates as to the overall lost revenues (including all creative industries whose products can be copied digitally, or counterfeited) was £10 billion (based on 2004 figures); further, the research found that on the evidence from one peer-to-peer network at midday on a weekday there were 1.3 million users, sharing content. The study estimated that if each peer from this network (which was not the largest) downloaded one file per day (music, film, television, e-books, software and games were all available), the resulting number of downloads would be 473 million items per year. The study raised a number of issues for further consideration, including the concept of online anonymity and the impact that any change in the perception of anonymity might have on online behaviour and the effect on consumer behaviour of education campaigns. See <http://www.sabip.org.uk/sabip-ciberreport.pdf> for the study. (SABIP was established as a result of a Gowers Review recommendation - it is a non-departmental public body that provides strategic independent advice to the Government on IP policy).

Raising Awareness of Consequences of Counterfeiting and Piracy

The Intellectual Property Office (IPO) has published a brief guidance note warning consumers about the risks of trading in illegal goods. The note is intended to raise awareness about the consequences of trading in counterfeit goods, which is classified as a "serious crime" and highlights briefly what those consequences can be. The Minister of State for Intellectual Property said "Legislation alone will not combat counterfeiting and piracy. Laws must be fit for purpose but effective enforcement is key. The Proceeds of Crime leaflet sends a clear message that we are all serious about tackling this problem". See <http://www.ipo.gov.uk/pocaleaflet.pdf> for details.

Live Conversation Service Providers Compensation Fund Cut Off Date Announced

The Trustees of the Live Conversation Service Providers Compensation Fund have announced that they have resolved to commence the winding up of the Fund effective 22 May 2009 (the Cut-Off Date). All contributors eligible as at the Cut-Off Date will be entitled to participate in the distribution of monies presently held in the Fund - according to the Trustees there will be a maximum of 75 eligible contributors entitled to share in about £540,000 giving approximately £7,200 available to each eligible contributor. There were originally 96 contributors, some of whom ceased to exist or whom the Trustees are currently tracing. Accordingly, the Trustees have proposed making an initial distribution of £6,500 to each of the potential eligible contributors with the balance being distributed as and when possible. (The Fund was an independent fund established by PhoneyPayPlus, which provided compensation at the direction of PhoneyPayPlus in circumstances where live conversation telephone services have not been conducted in accordance with the rules in force for their operation).

Retention of Photographs at Protest Meeting - Whether An Infringement of Privacy

The appellant, a media co-ordinator employed by the Campaign Against Arms Trade, appealed an Administrative Court judgment that dismissed his application for the judicial review of a decision of the defendant's police officers to photograph him at a protest meeting and then retain those photographs on the grounds that they considered that there was a risk of unlawful activity. The appellant argued that the defendant's actions were unlawful and in violation of his

rights under Articles 8, 10, 11 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The Court of Appeal, in a majority decision, allowed the appeal. The court held that the appellant's right to privacy under Article 8(1) was breached by the police operation of taking the photographs, combined with their actual or intended use as a whole (and not merely by the taking of the photographs). Although the court found that this was done in pursuit of legitimate aims under Article 8(2), the majority held that the Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis had failed to show that the interference with the appellants Article 8 rights was proportionate to those aims. The court noted that the mere taking of photographs was not enough to interfere with a person's right to privacy. It was the police operation from the taking of the photographs to their actual or intended use as a whole that was found to engage Article 8(1). (*Wood v Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis* [2009] EWCA Civ 414 - see <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2009/414.html> for the judgment, which also made the point that it was "plain that the last word has yet to be said on the implications for civil liberties of the taking and retention of images in the modern surveillance society. This is not the case for the exploration of the wider, and very serious, human rights issues which arise when the State obtains and retains the images of persons who have committed no offence and are not suspected of having committed any offence").

Broadcasting

Competition Commission Publishes Draft Undertakings for UK TV VOD Sector

The Competition Commission has published for comment a draft of the Undertakings given to the Competition Commission ahead of the anticipated joint venture between BBC Worldwide Limited (BBCW), Channel Four Television Corporation and ITV plc relating to the video on demand sector. The matter had been referred to the Competition Commission by the OFT in June last year. After investigation, the Commission decided that the proposed joint venture would result in the creation of a relevant merger situation in accordance with the Enterprise Act 2002 and that this was likely to result in a substantial lessening of competition (SLC) in the supply of UK TV video on demand (VOD). The Commission said that it has now reached agreement with each of the parties as to the terms of the draft undertakings to remedy the SLC in respect of the supply of UK TV VOD content at the wholesale and retail levels. Under the terms of the various draft Undertakings, the parties will agree that they will not try to acquire any part of their rivals video-on-demand activities and that directors of all three broadcasters would be prevented from defecting to one of their rivals to head up VOD services, without the prior written consent to Office of Fair Trading. Comments are invited - see http://www.competition-commission.org.uk/inquiries/ref2008/kangaroo/pdf/draft_final_undertakings.pdf for the draft Undertakings.

Revision of COSTA Rules on Advertising Minutage, Breaks and Teleshopping

Ofcom has published details of revisions to the Code of Scheduling of Television Advertising (COSTA), which are closely related to the changes to the regulation of TV gambling channels (see the Gambling section, below for details). As a result of this second stage review of advertising regulation, a number of changes have been made to the number and length of advertising breaks permitted and to teleshopping. Despite the fact that there have been significant changes in market conditions since the general review commenced, with year on year advertising and sponsorship falling for PSBs and non-PSBs having seen a corresponding increase, Ofcom has perhaps taken a more pragmatic approach to dealing with pressures on broadcasters and reduced some of the restrictions they faced and allowed changes that will allow PSB channels to schedule up to six hours of teleshopping between midnight and 6am and remove the restrictions on the amount of teleshopping that non-PSB channels may schedule. The number of advertising breaks PSB channels can run in programmes with a scheduled duration of 60 minutes or less is maintained, the number of breaks in longer programmes is being increased so as to bring it into line with those which apply for non-PSB channels (this however doesn't apply to certain programmes such as films, news or children's programmes). Pending the outcome of further review, Ofcom has said that, at present, it does not propose making any changes to the overall amount of advertising permitted on PSB and non-PSB channels or to the limits on how much may be scheduled during the evening peak time on PSB channels (6pm - 11pm). However, it has acknowledged that there is a "strong case" for harmonising the amount of advertising minutage on the services within the next few years and indicated that there will be a consultation to this effect some time next year. See <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/consult/condocs/rada08/statement/costa.pdf> for details.

OFT Recommendations to Competition Commission on Revision of CRR Remedy

The Office of Fair Trading (OFT) has published a summary of its advice to the Competition Commission on the Contract Rights Renewal (CRR) remedy, which was applied to the sale of advertising on ITV1 in 2003 as a precondition for permitting the proposed merger of Carlton and Granada. In January 2009, following an initial review, the OFT said it was now appropriate for the Commission to vary the remedy. The OFT said that although they believed it remained possible that without CRR, ITV1's negotiating power would be such that it would be able to extract more revenue from media buyers, which may be achieved even without targeting specific advertisers, the circumstances had changed and ITV1's market position appeared to have eroded to some extent so that a less burdensome remedy might effectively address the remaining concerns. Accordingly the OFT said it was necessary to remit this matter to the Commission to amend the definition of ITV1 in the remedy to take account of various ways in which the programme schedule was delivered. They also recommended that the Commission should consider whether the decline in ITV1's market position meant that it was

now possible to find a more proportionate remedy, which creates less costs and distortions than CRR but would nevertheless address any remaining detrimental effects of the merger arising from ITV1's unique position in the supply of mass audiences. See http://www.ofcom.gov.uk/shared_ofcom/register_of_orders_and_under taki/CRR-review/exec-sum.pdf for details.

Broadcast Bulletin - Latest Issue

The latest issue of Ofcom's Broadcast Bulletin has been published with details of adjudications on breaches of Rules 1.24 (restriction on broadcast of adult material), 2.1 (generally accepted standards), 2.3 (offensive material justified by context), 9.5 (no promotional reference to sponsors), 9.6 (sponsors must be clearly identified) and 9.7 (relationship between sponsor and programme or channel must be transparent) of the Broadcasting Code. A complaint of unfair treatment and unwarranted infringement of privacy was partly upheld and Ofcom also adjudicated on a breach of Section 2 of Rule 15 of the BCAP Radio Advertising Standards Code (political broadcasts). The Bulletin also contains a summary of the sanctions imposed on RHF Productions Limited and Portland (CI) Enterprises Limited, which were discussed in last week's Need to Know - see http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/obb134/issue134.pdf for the Bulletin.

Sanctions Committee Imposes Fine for Unfair Radio Competition

Ofcom's Content Sanctions Committee has fined Lakeland Radio Limited £15,000 in respect of its local radio service Lakeland Radio for serious breaches of Rule 2.11 of the Broadcasting Code. Rule 2.11 states that "Competitions should be conducted fairly, prizes should be described accurately and rules should be clear and appropriately made known". The Committee found that three listener competitions had been conducted in such a way that in most of the daily rounds of the competitions, the presenter had deliberately selected telephone or SMS entrants who had submitted incorrect answers, which he then broadcast. The Committee said "This led to another round of the competition, in which the prize fund was greater, thereby increasing the competition's 'entertainment value'. The practice resulted in all listeners who paid to enter the affected rounds having no chance of winning". The breaches were described as serious and had taken place after a significant number of high-profile and well publicised cases involving the unfair conduct of audience competitions by a number of other broadcasters had been adjudicated. The Committee said the fact this was a small local radio station with a limited audience did not detract from the seriousness of the Code breaches, nor did it consider that it in any way abrogated the licensee's fundamental responsibility, under the terms of its licence, to ensure the compliance of its broadcast content. In addition to the fine, the licensee was also ordered to broadcast a summary of the finding at a specified occasion, at a time, and in a form, to be determined by Ofcom. - see http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/ocsc_adjud/lakeland.pdf for the adjudication.

Corporate

Court Guidance on "Pre-Pack" Administration Applications

The court was asked to give some guidance on the approach of the court to what have come to be called "pre-pack" administration applications, in the light of the recently promulgated Statement of Insolvency Practice 16, "Pre-Packaged Sales in Administrations". The court acknowledged that "It has been the deliberate policy of the legislature, embodied in the changes to the regimes of administration, receivership and voluntary arrangements made by the Insolvency Act 2000 and the Enterprise Act 2002, to reduce the involvement of the court in the initiation of insolvency processes, and, where an application to the court is still required, to simplify the requirements and particularly the information that has to be provided for the purpose. This raises the question whether, if pre-packs are thought to be potentially subject to abuse, the courts realistically can, or should seek to, do anything about the problem by the approach taken in the relatively small number of cases that do come before them before the sale is made, or whether this is a matter for the legislature". The court examined the nature of the concerns that have been expressed about pre-packs, and the way in which the provisions of the Insolvency Act 1986 as now in force, and the case law to date, have operated to give rise to them. The court said it "must be alert to see, so far as it can, that the procedure is at least not being obviously abused to the disadvantage of creditors. If it is, or may be, the court may conclude that it is inappropriate to give the pre-pack the apparent blessing conferred by making the administration order". (*In the matter of Kayley Vending Limited and In the matter of the Insolvency Act 1986 [2009] EWHC 904 (Ch)* - see <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Ch/2009/904.html> for the judgment; PLC have done a useful note summarising the ruling and its implications for pre-pack administrations - see <http://corporate.practicallaw.com/3-386-1622> for details).

Government Response to Consultation on Registration of Charges

The DBERR has published the Government's response to its May consultation on the registration of charges created by overseas companies. At present, every overseas company that has an established place of business in a UK jurisdiction is required to register any charges it creates over property in that jurisdiction and charges on property in that jurisdiction which it acquires if that charge would be registrable if created by a UK company. However, after 1 October 2009, all the provisions relating to registration of charges will be replaced by provisions in the Companies Act 2006. Under the Act, the requirement to register charges applies only to those overseas companies that have registered a UK establishment with the UK Registrar of Companies. The Government said it shared respondents' concern as to the possible consequences of

the lack of clarity as to which intangible assets were registrable. It acknowledged that this was a complex issue over which there was no consensus. As a result, the Government announced it would maintain the status quo as to which charges should be registrable. They have decided that the 2009 Regulations should differ from the April 2009 draft only so that there is no longer a criminal sanction on a company for failure to register a registrable charge and to retain the existing provisions for late registration of a charge. See <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file51518.pdf> for details.

LSE Notice on Changes to AIM Rules on Disclosure of Significant Shareholdings

The London Stock Exchange (LSE) has published a notice about the intended changes to the AIM Rules for Companies concerning the disclosure of significant shareholdings. The changes are result of amendments to Chapter 5 of the Financial Services Authority's Disclosure and Transparency Rules concerning the disclosure of shareholdings held via Contracts for Differences (CfDs) or other related financial instruments. See <http://www.londonstockexchange.com/NR/rdonlyres/911A53A0-8BB9-483C-957B-959743C1E5A9/0/AIMNotice32final.pdf> for details.

Draft Legislation - Limited Liability Partnerships and Application of Companies Act 2006

The draft Limited Liability Partnerships (Application of Companies Act 2006) Regulations 2009 have been published. The Regulations will complete the application of the Companies Act 2006 to limited liability partnerships. The accounts and audit provisions of the 2006 Act have already applied to LLPs since 1 October 2008. These Regulations apply as appropriate to the remaining provisions of the Act. They will come into force on 1 October 2009, to coincide with the final implementation of the Act. See http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2009/draft/pdf/ukdsi_9780111479612_en.pdf for the draft Regulations and http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2009/draft/em/ukdsiem_9780111479612_en.pdf for the accompanying Explanatory Memorandum.

Revised Draft Legislation - Companies (Shareholders' Rights) Regulations

A revised draft of The Companies (Shareholders' Rights) Regulations 2009 has been published for comment. The Regulations will implement the Shareholder Rights Directive in the UK by amending the Companies Act 2006 and will, according to PLC, correct two anomalies in the existing law on shareholders' rights relating to voting by proxy and notice of general meetings for traded companies. See <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file51502.pdf> for details. The Regulations will come into force on 3 August 2009.

Film & TV

Independent Study on Measures Promoting European Works in Audiovisual Media Services

According to a lengthy and detailed independent study on the application of measures concerning the promotion of the distribution and production of European works in audiovisual media services (including television programmes and non linear services), carried out on behalf of the European Commission by a number of consultants, films and television programmes made in Europe represent almost three-quarters of European channels' peak viewing time. The study aimed at providing an analysis and description of the current market structure and revenue of the EU audiovisual sector (linear and non-linear) to create as accurate a picture as possible of the whole sector and its three main component parts - content creation, channel management and TV delivery. Despite the high level of European material, the study also showed that just over half of the broadcasters' acquisitions were sourced from the US and just under 25% from content owners in another European country. Further, all broadcasters stated that feature films and fiction from outside Europe (mainly from the US) were attractive and tended to be "very successful" in their primetime schedules. The study was carried out to examine the promotion of European works by television channels and on-demand services in the Member States, as required by the audiovisual rules. Under the TVWF Directive, European channels are required to devote the majority of their programming time to European works and at least 10% of that time or of their programming budgets to independent European productions. In 2007 the Directive's scope was extended to on demand services by the AVMS Directive, which requires Member States to ensure that providers of on demand audiovisual media services promote, where feasible and by appropriate means, the production of and access to European works. The Study concluded that the transposition of Articles 4 and 5, which exist to create minimum standards for the national measures on linear services, varies from Member State to Member State by the strictness of the application of the legislation, and the number of additional requirements imposed. (*EC Press Release IP/09/840, 28 May 2009 and see http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/docs/library/studies/art4_5/final_report.pdf for the Final Study Report (which runs to over 560 pages!)*).

Gambling

Regulatory Statement on Transactional TV Gambling Channels

Ofcom has published its regulatory statement on the position of TV channels and programmes that offer transactional gambling services to viewers. Before the Gambling Act 2005 came into force on 1 September 2007, gaming had not been

permitted to be offered on UK television and fixed odds bets were offered as "editorial" programming. Ofcom recognised that the effect of the new gambling legislation was that gambling channels could exist as either editorial or teleshopping services and having gambling services operating under two different codes operated by two different media regulators could cause difficulties for consumers and regulators. After consultation Ofcom decided that licensees who choose to provide services which involve transactional gambling should be treated as providing teleshopping services and be licensed accordingly; licensees who provide a genuinely editorial service where transactional participation is not the main priority may continue to be licensed as editorial service providers. Where a service carries transactional gambling services within what would otherwise be genuinely editorial services Ofcom will now regard such content as a teleshopping "window". Existing broadcast licenses will be varied accordingly. The implementation of these changes will take place quickly (from 1 June 2009, to coincide with the coming into force of new rules on the scheduling of TV advertising). See <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/ifi/guidance/gambling/gambling.pdf> for the Statement.

New Legislation - Limits on Prize Gaming

The Gambling Act 2005 (Limits on Prize Gaming) Regulations 2009, SI 2009/1272 come into force on 11 June 2009. The Regulations revoke and replace the Gambling Act 2005 (Limits on Prize Gaming) Regulations 2007, SI 2007/1777. In doing so they increase the maximum participation fee that may be charged for any one chance to win a prize in a game from 50 pence to £1 (the maximum participation fee remains £1 and there is a limit of £500 on the aggregate amount of the participation fees that may be charged in a particular game) and impose limits on the amount or value of prizes for which games may be played. Where all the prizes are money, the amount of any one prize for which the game is played must not exceed £70, and the aggregate of all the prizes must not exceed £500. In any other case (where not all the prizes are money), the value of any one prize for which the game is played and which is money must not exceed £70, and the aggregate of all the prizes must not exceed £500. The Government said the increases in the limits would "assist the operators of seaside arcades while still maintaining the essential character of prize gaming as intended by Parliament - as a low level, family orientated amusement in seaside arcades, fairs and similar venues". See http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2009/pdf/uksi_20091272_en.pdf for details.

Litigation

Libel Proceedings - Application to Strike Out Defences of Justification, Fair Comment and Qualified Privilege

The claimants were all members of a musical group that performed under various names. The first defendant was one of two directors of the second defendant, 1311 Events Ltd, which provided entertainment-booking services. The claimants complained about a statement which appeared on the company's website for several weeks, which claimed that they were not professional enough to be booked for gigs and commenced libel proceedings, which included a claim for general damages and special damages in respect of two engagements alleged to have been cancelled by hirers of their services who had read the words complained of. The defendants pleaded justification, fair comment and qualified privilege. The claimants applied to strike out all three defences. In the event that the defence of justification survived, the defendants applied to add a further paragraph to the particulars of justification. They sought to add a new Lucas-Box meaning to the effect that the first claimant, on behalf of the claimants, had "behaved in an unprofessional and untrustworthy manner", and to add a proposed sub-paragraph to the particulars of justification. The court ruled that the trial should proceed by reference to the defence of justification only and that the other defences should be struck out. The defendants' application to supplement the particulars of justification by reference to a different matter was allowed. The court said the words seemed to be capable of bearing the meaning that the claimants had behaved in an unprofessional and untrustworthy manner. Further, the claimants themselves had pleaded that the words complained of meant that they were "grossly unprofessional and untrustworthy". Accordingly, it would seem to accord with principle that the defendants should be allowed to justify the claimants' chosen meaning. (*Joseph & Ors v Spiller & Anor* [2009] All ER (D) 215 (May) - see <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/QB/2009/1152.html> for the judgment).

Music

PRS for Music Announce Revised Rates for Music Streaming

PRS for Music has announced that has agreed to significantly reduce the minimum royalty rates to be paid for streaming services for its new Online Music Licences. With effect from 1 July 2009, the minimum rate to stream a track will be reduced from 0.22p to 0.085p, while the higher royalty rate will be increased from 8% to 10.5%. Similar changes are also being made to the royalty rates and minima for Premium Interactive Webcasting Services and Pure Webcasting Services. According to PRS for Music, the decision "took into account feedback from the consultation process and reflects the changes that have occurred in this part of the digital market place since the Copyright Tribunal's 2007 decision". The new rates will apply for three years. (*PRS for Music Press Release, 25 May 2009*).

Commissioner Welcomes Online Commerce Roundtable Report on Online Music Retailing

The European Commissioner for Competition has welcomed progress made towards pan-European music licensing, following discussions in the Online Commerce Roundtable. The Commissioner particularly welcomed confirmation by

French collecting society SACEM that it was willing, in principle, to entrust other collecting societies with pan-European licensing of its repertoire and to act as non-exclusive rights manager for publishers and other collecting societies and confirmation by multinational record company EMI that it was ready to entrust rights managers to offer its repertoire for the whole European Economic Area (EEA). The Commissioner had been concerned about restrictions that prevent EU consumers from legally accessing to and benefiting from goods and services online, wherever these consumers are located, despite the technology being available and the demand growing for such goods and services. The Roundtable Report noted that in spite of the open and borderless nature of the Internet, territorial restrictions prevented a true and genuine internal market for online services, limited business opportunities and harmed consumers. It said that in the field of online retailing of music, the iTunes case (see <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/07/126&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&> for details) had shown that there was no EU common market for digital music downloads. The Roundtable Report said that "the de facto impossibility to buy IP-protected content from any EU online store is particularly harmful to consumers from the new Member States, who currently have a very limited choice of what music they can legally buy on the Internet, even though the demand for such content is growing". See http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2009_online_commerce/roundtable_report_en.pdf for the Roundtable Report, which acknowledges that there are a range of views on the way forward to solve the music online licensing issue and considers in detail the suggestions of Apple, EMI, SACEM and consumer group Which. (*EC Press Release IP/09/832, 26 May 2009*).

Publishing

Article - Media Access to Family Courts

The latest New Law Journal considers the impact of the recent changes to the Family Proceedings Courts (Children Act 1989) Rules 1991 and Family Proceedings Courts (Child Support Act 1991) Rules 1993 concerning the attendance of persons and in particular, representatives of the media, during proceedings in the Family Court relating to children and the reporting of information about such proceedings (and see the Need to Know of 6 - 27 April 2009 for details). The article makes the point that access to any proceedings covered by the legislation is still subject to very stringent rules. (*"Transparency rules, ok?" (2009) 159 NLJ 750 - the article is available via LexisNexis*).

Consultations & Reports

Ofcom Consultation - London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games - Draft Spectrum Plan - <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/consult/condocs/london2012/london2012.pdf> (details Ofcom's proposals for managing the spectrum required for the London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games to support the range of different wireless services needed in the run-up to and during the seven weeks of the events including private mobile radios in and around Games venues across the UK, and wireless cameras and microphones to broadcast sound and pictures to a global audience)

Ofcom Consultation - The Wireless Telegraphy (Short Range Devices) (Exemption) Regulations 2009 - <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/consult/condocs/shortrange09/shortrange09.pdf> (consultation on draft regulations to exempt the use of a certain short range devices (SRDs) from the requirement to be licensed - under section 8(1) of the Wireless Telegraphy Act 2006, it is an offence to establish, install or use equipment to transmit without holding a licence granted by Ofcom, unless the use of such equipment is exempted)