

**DIGITAL COPYRIGHT ENFORCEMENT AND DRM PROTECTION FOR
EXCLUSIVE LICENSEES: AN ASIAN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS**

Mr. Amar Anshul

Research Scholar, YBN University, Ranchi.

Ms. Amrita

Assistant Professor, Department of Law, JIMS EMTC, Greater Noida.

Dr. Mohd. Kaif

Assistant Professor, Department of Law, JIMS EMTC, Greater Noida.

Mr. Randeep Mann

PhD Research Scholar, Department of Law, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda.

Dr. Akanksha Verma

Assistant Professor, Amity Law School, Mohali, Punjab.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20338619>

Abstract

The expansion of digital technology and internet-based communication has significantly transformed the copyright regime across the world. The ease of reproduction, distribution, and dissemination of digital content has increased the risk of copyright infringement, particularly in relation to cinematograph films, music, software, and online media. In this context, exclusive licensees play a crucial role in the commercial exploitation of copyrighted works. Indian copyright law recognizes the rights of exclusive licensees and provides various civil, criminal, and technological remedies for the protection of their interests. The Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 introduced important provisions relating to Digital Rights Management (DRM) and Technological Protection Measures (TPMs) to address digital piracy and unauthorized access. This paper critically examines the legal status of exclusive licensees under Indian copyright law, the remedies available to them, and the effectiveness of DRM protection in the digital environment. The paper further evaluates challenges associated with enforcement and technological circumvention while suggesting reforms for strengthening digital copyright protection in India.

INTRODUCTION

Copyright law seeks to protect the rights of creators and encourage innovation by granting exclusive legal rights over original works. Under Indian copyright law, these rights may be transferred through assignment or licensing. Among various forms of licensing, an **exclusive licence** occupies a significant position because it grants the licensee exclusive rights to use and exploit the copyrighted work to the exclusion of others, including, in certain cases, the copyright owner. With the growth of digital technology and online dissemination of content, the role of **Digital Rights Management (DRM)** and legal remedies available to exclusive licensees has become increasingly important.

The **Copyright Act, 1957** recognizes the concept of exclusive licence under **Section 2(j)**, which defines an exclusive licence as a licence that confers upon the licensee, or persons authorized by him, any right in copyright to the exclusion of all others, including the owner of copyright. Exclusive licences are frequently used in relation to cinematograph films, music, software, broadcasting rights, and digital content distribution. Such licences enable producers and distributors to commercially exploit copyrighted works while ensuring legal protection against unauthorized use.

The legal position of exclusive licensees under Indian law is strengthened through statutory remedies available against copyright infringement. **Section 54** of the Copyright Act recognizes an exclusive licensee as an “owner of copyright” for the limited purpose of instituting infringement proceedings. Consequently, an exclusive licensee possesses the legal standing to file suits and seek remedies against infringers independently or jointly with the copyright owner. This provision is significant because it ensures that the commercial interests of licensees are protected even where ownership remains with the original author or producer.

The remedies available to exclusive licensees under Indian copyright law may broadly be classified into **civil, criminal, and administrative remedies**. Civil remedies constitute the primary mechanism for enforcement and are provided under **Sections 55 to 62** of the Copyright Act. An exclusive licensee may seek **injunctions** to restrain ongoing or threatened infringement. Temporary and permanent injunctions are particularly valuable in digital environments where unauthorized copying and online dissemination can occur rapidly and cause irreparable harm. Courts may also grant **damages** or **accounts of profits**, depending upon the circumstances of the case. Damages compensate the licensee for economic loss, whereas accounts of profits require the infringer to surrender gains derived from unlawful exploitation.

In addition to civil remedies, Indian copyright law provides **criminal sanctions** under **Sections 63 to 70** of the Copyright Act. Copyright infringement involving piracy, unauthorized reproduction, and illegal distribution may attract imprisonment and fines. Criminal remedies serve as deterrents against large-scale commercial piracy, particularly in the entertainment and software industries. Exclusive licensees may lodge complaints and initiate criminal proceedings where infringement significantly affects their licensed rights.

The digital era has introduced new challenges that traditional copyright remedies alone cannot adequately address. Unauthorized streaming, digital downloads, and online sharing platforms enable instantaneous infringement on a global scale. To address these concerns, Indian copyright law incorporates provisions relating to **Digital Rights Management (DRM)** and **Technological Protection Measures (TPMs)** through the **Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012**.

DRM refers to technological tools and access-control systems designed to prevent unauthorized use, copying, or distribution of digital content. DRM technologies include encryption, password protection, digital watermarking, licensing controls, and restricted-access software systems. Under

Section 65A of the Copyright Act, the circumvention of technological protection measures applied for protecting copyright is prohibited and punishable by law. This provision is particularly beneficial to exclusive licensees because it safeguards their digital distribution rights against hacking, piracy, and unauthorized access.

Further, **Section 65B** protects **Rights Management Information (RMI)**, which includes electronic information identifying the work, author, owner, or terms of use attached to digital content. Removal or alteration of such information without authority constitutes an offence. These provisions collectively strengthen the legal position of exclusive licensees by protecting not merely the copyrighted work itself but also the digital systems regulating access and usage.

In conclusion, Indian copyright law provides substantial legal remedies and technological safeguards to exclusive licensees. Civil and criminal remedies ensure enforcement against infringers, while DRM and TPM provisions introduced through the 2012 amendment address contemporary digital threats. However, effective implementation, technological expertise, and stronger digital enforcement mechanisms remain essential for ensuring comprehensive protection of exclusive licensing rights in the evolving digital environment.

CIVIL REMEDIES UNDER SECTION 55 OF THE COPYRIGHT ACT, 1957

Section 55 of the Copyright Act, 1957 is the principal provision conferring civil remedies for copyright infringement. Sub-section (1) provides that where copyright in any work has been infringed, the owner of the copyright shall be entitled to all such remedies by way of injunction, damages, accounts and otherwise as are conferred by law for the infringement of a right.⁴⁷ This provision, read together with the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 and the Specific Relief Act, 1963, establishes the framework within which a copyright owner - and, pursuant to Section 61, an exclusive licensee - may seek civil relief for copyright infringement.

The remedies available under Section 55 fall into four principal categories. The first is the permanent injunction, which is a court order restraining the defendant from continuing to infringe the plaintiff's copyright. A permanent injunction is granted following a full trial on the merits. In the OTT piracy context, a permanent injunction is of limited practical utility: by the time it is obtained - typically a process of several years in the Delhi High Court - the infringing activity will have caused its damage and the specific website targeted may have moved to new domains.

The second remedy is interim injunctive relief - a temporary injunction granted at an interlocutory stage pending the final determination of the suit. Interim injunctions are the most practically significant remedy in the OTT piracy context, because they can be obtained relatively quickly. The standard under Order XXXIX, Rules 1 and 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 requires the plaintiff to demonstrate: first, a prima facie case of copyright infringement; second, that the balance of convenience favours the grant of the injunction; and third, that the plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted.

In *Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. v. Santosh V.G 2009 SCC OnLine Del 1113*, The Delhi High Court granted an urgent interim injunction restraining the defendants from hosting, distributing, or otherwise making available pirated copies of Warner Bros. films, recognising that irreparable harm would be caused to the exclusively licensed content if immediate relief were not granted. The court, in its reasoning, underscored the time-sensitive nature of film exploitation in the digital environment, noting that the commercial value of a film is heavily concentrated within its initial release period, particularly in the context of OTT and digital-first distribution models. It further observed that any delay in restraining infringing activities would result in widespread dissemination of pirated copies, thereby permanently eroding the exclusivity that forms the basis of the licensee's commercial investment. The court emphasised the commercial significance of the release window and the concentrated value of content in the period immediately following release, and held that the balance of convenience clearly favoured the grant of immediate injunctive relief in order to preserve the economic integrity of the licensed rights.

In *Shemaroo Entertainment Ltd. v. Mango Technologies Pvt. Ltd.*, CS(COMM) 104/2019 (Delhi High Court), The Delhi High Court granted an interim injunction in favour of Shemaroo, the exclusive licensee of a portfolio of Hindi films, restraining the defendant from streaming the films without authorisation. The court undertook a detailed consideration of the nature of exclusive licensing arrangements and the extent to which such arrangements confer enforceable commercial interests upon the licensee. It held that the exclusive licensee's commercial interest in the exclusivity of its licensing arrangement was a legally cognisable interest worthy of immediate equitable protection. The court further recognised that unauthorised streaming directly undermines the exclusivity granted under the licence, thereby diminishing both the present and future economic value of the licensed catalogue. In granting the injunction, the court reinforced the principle that interim relief plays a critical role in safeguarding exclusive rights in the digital context, where infringement can occur rapidly and at scale.

The third remedy is damages. Section 55(1) provides that a plaintiff who establishes copyright infringement is entitled to damages. However, the quantification of damages in OTT piracy cases is inherently problematic: the actual damages depend on assumptions about how many visitors to an infringing website would have subscribed to the legitimate platform in the absence of free access - a counterfactual that is inherently speculative. This evidentiary difficulty is compounded by the anonymity of infringers, the lack of reliable data on user behaviour, and the multiplicity of channels through which pirated content is disseminated. As a result, courts are often required to rely on approximations or indirect indicators of harm, which may not fully capture the extent of the economic loss suffered by the exclusive licensee. This inherent uncertainty highlights a structural limitation in the traditional damages framework when applied to digital piracy scenarios.

THE ANTI-CIRCUMVENTION PROVISIONS: SECTIONS 65A AND 65B OF THE COPYRIGHT ACT, 1957

The Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 introduced Sections 65A and 65B into the Copyright Act, 1957, specifically to address the circumvention of technological protection measures

(TPMs) and the alteration or removal of rights management information (RMI). These provisions represent India's principal legislative response to Article 11 of the WIPO Copyright Treaty, 1996, which requires contracting parties to 'provide adequate legal protection and effective legal remedies against the circumvention of effective technological measures'.

Section 65A(1) provides that any person who circumvents an effective technological measure applied for the purpose of protecting any of the rights conferred by the Act, with the intention of infringing such rights, shall be punishable with imprisonment which may extend to two years and shall also be liable to fine. Section 65A(2) contains exceptions permitting circumvention for cryptography research, security testing, intelligence gathering for law enforcement, privacy testing, and achieving interoperability of computer programmes.

Section 65B provides that any person who knowingly removes or alters any rights management information without authority, or distributes, imports, broadcasts, or communicates to the public any work knowing that the electronic rights management information has been removed or altered without authority, shall be punishable with imprisonment which may extend to two years and shall also be liable to fine.

A careful analysis reveals several significant structural limitations on the adequacy of these provisions as remedies for exclusive OTT licensees. The first and most significant structural limitation is that both Section 65A and Section 65B are framed exclusively as criminal offences rather than as civil causes of action. The provisions prescribe criminal punishment - imprisonment and fine - but do not expressly confer a civil right of action on the holder of a technological protection measure or on the exclusive licensee. This is in direct contrast to the approach taken in the United Kingdom, where Section 296 of the CDPA confers an express civil right of action enabling civil proceedings against anyone who circumvents copy-protection technology. The absence of an express civil remedy under Section 65A means that an exclusive OTT licensee whose DRM system has been circumvented must rely on Section 55 (civil remedy for copyright infringement) rather than on Section 65A to obtain civil relief.

The second structural limitation concerns the definition of 'effective technological measure'. The Act does not provide a statutory definition of this term, leaving its scope to be determined by courts.

Rights of Exclusive Licensees under Indian Law

The Copyright Act, 1957 grants significant legal recognition and protection to exclusive licensees in order to safeguard their commercial and proprietary interests in copyrighted works. Under Section 2(j) of the Act, an exclusive licence refers to a licence that confers upon the licensee, to the exclusion of all others including the copyright owner, any right contained in the copyright. Such recognition becomes particularly important in industries such as cinematograph films, music, broadcasting, software, and digital media, where copyright owners frequently transfer exploitation rights to distributors, producers, streaming platforms, and publishers through exclusive licensing agreements.

One of the most important protections available to exclusive licensees is contained in Section 54

of the Copyright Act, 1957. The provision includes an exclusive licensee within the meaning of the term “owner of copyright” for the limited purpose of infringement proceedings. This legal recognition enables exclusive licensees to independently initiate legal action against persons who unlawfully infringe the rights granted under the licence. Consequently, the law acknowledges that exclusive licensees possess substantial economic and commercial interests deserving of independent legal protection.

Exclusive licensees possess the right to commercially exploit the copyrighted work in accordance with the terms of the licence agreement. This may include rights relating to public exhibition, broadcasting, streaming, sale, licensing, communication to the public, or digital dissemination of the work. In the entertainment industry, for example, exclusive licensees often acquire territorial or platform-specific rights for distribution of cinematograph films and sound recordings.

The exclusive licensee also enjoys the right to reproduce, distribute, and market the copyrighted work to the exclusion of others. Since exclusive licensees frequently invest substantial financial resources in promotion, advertising, and distribution, unauthorized copying or piracy directly affects their economic interests. Therefore, the law permits them to protect such rights independently through civil and criminal remedies.

Further, exclusive licensees are entitled to institute infringement proceedings before competent courts and seek remedies such as injunctions, damages, accounts of profits, seizure of infringing materials, and website blocking orders in cases of digital piracy. In the modern digital environment, these rights extend to the protection of online distribution systems, streaming services, and digital platforms through technological measures and digital rights management systems.

The recognition of exclusive licensees under Indian copyright law is therefore essential for ensuring commercial certainty, encouraging investment in creative industries, and strengthening copyright enforcement in the digital age.

Economic Perspective of Digital Copyright Enforcement and DRM Protection

The issue of digital copyright enforcement and DRM protection has acquired substantial economic significance across Asian countries due to the rapid expansion of the entertainment, broadcasting, and digital streaming industries. Asia has emerged as one of the largest markets for cinematograph films, music, online gaming, and OTT platforms, with countries such as India, China, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore becoming major contributors to the global digital economy. The growth of internet penetration, smartphone usage, and digital content consumption has created enormous commercial opportunities for copyright owners, producers, broadcasters, and exclusive licensees. However, the same technological growth has simultaneously intensified digital piracy, unauthorized streaming, and online infringement, causing severe economic losses to creative industries across the region. In countries like India, where the film and music industries contribute significantly to employment generation and national revenue, weak copyright enforcement directly impacts economic growth, investment in creative sectors, and the sustainability of digital media businesses.

Asian Perspective on DRM Protection and Copyright Enforcement

From an Asian legal perspective, different countries have adopted varying approaches toward DRM protection and copyright enforcement based upon their economic priorities and technological capabilities. Nations such as Japan and South Korea have implemented technologically advanced anti-piracy frameworks and strict enforcement mechanisms, while developing economies continue to struggle with regulatory gaps, lack of technological infrastructure, and enforcement limitations. India has introduced important reforms through the Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012; however, practical challenges relating to intermediary liability, digital piracy, and implementation continue to persist. The increasing importance of cross-border digital trade and regional streaming services has made harmonization of copyright standards within Asia more essential than ever before. Consequently, stronger DRM mechanisms, regional cooperation, and economically balanced copyright policies are necessary to protect exclusive licensees, encourage foreign investment, promote digital innovation, and strengthen the creative economy within the Asian region.

Digital Piracy and Emerging Challenges

The rapid growth of digital technology and internet-based communication has transformed the manner in which copyrighted works are created, distributed, stored, and consumed. While technological advancements have expanded access to creative content and contributed to the growth of the entertainment and media industries, they have simultaneously created serious challenges for copyright enforcement. Digital technology enables instant reproduction and transmission of copyrighted works across geographical boundaries at minimal cost, thereby making cinematograph films, sound recordings, and other digital content highly vulnerable to piracy and unauthorized dissemination. As a result, digital piracy has emerged as one of the most significant threats to the global copyright regime.

Digital piracy refers to the unauthorized reproduction, distribution, communication, downloading, streaming, or sharing of copyrighted content through digital means without the permission of the copyright owner or authorized licensee. Unlike traditional piracy, which primarily involved physical duplication of CDs, DVDs, or videotapes, digital piracy occurs on online platforms and internet-based networks, making infringement more widespread, organized, and difficult to control. The advancement of high-speed internet, smartphones, cloud computing, and digital storage technologies has further intensified the problem.

One of the most common forms of digital piracy is **torrent sharing**. Torrent websites and peer-to-peer (P2P) file-sharing networks enable users to upload and download copyrighted films, music, television shows, and software without authorization. Such systems decentralize file sharing, making it difficult for authorities to identify the original infringer. Torrent piracy causes substantial economic losses to copyright owners because copyrighted content becomes available to millions of users immediately after release.

Another major challenge is the rise of **illegal streaming websites**. These websites provide unauthorized online streaming of cinematograph films, television programmes, sports broadcasts, and sound recordings without obtaining valid licences. Illegal streaming platforms often operate through anonymous servers located in foreign jurisdictions, making enforcement complicated. Such platforms generate revenue through advertisements, subscriptions, and data collection while depriving creators and producers of legitimate income.

Camcorder piracy remains a significant issue particularly in the film industry. In this form of piracy, newly released films are illegally recorded inside cinema halls using cameras or mobile devices and subsequently uploaded to online platforms for unauthorized distribution. Camcorder piracy often leads to severe financial losses because pirated copies become available on the internet shortly after theatrical release, affecting box office collections and lawful streaming revenues.

Another widespread form of infringement involves **unauthorized downloads** of films, music, games, and digital content through websites, applications, or file-sharing platforms. Many users illegally download copyrighted works without payment, thereby undermining lawful distribution systems. Digital downloading has become easier due to advancements in mobile technology and internet accessibility, especially in developing countries.

The emergence of **IPTV piracy** has also created serious enforcement concerns. Illegal Internet Protocol Television (IPTV) services provide unauthorized access to television channels, live sports events, films, and premium entertainment content through internet-based applications and devices. Such services frequently bypass subscription-based broadcasting systems and cause significant losses to broadcasters, cable operators, and OTT platforms.

In recent years, **social media piracy** has become increasingly prevalent. Users often upload copyrighted films, songs, clips, and live broadcasts on social networking platforms without authorization. The viral nature of social media allows infringing content to spread rapidly among millions of users within a short period of time. Monitoring and removing infringing material from multiple platforms remains a difficult task for copyright owners and enforcement agencies.

Similarly, **cloud storage sharing** has emerged as another modern challenge. Cloud-based platforms enable users to store and share large quantities of copyrighted content through private links and shared folders. Such technologies facilitate hidden distribution networks that are difficult to detect and regulate. In many instances, infringing copies are circulated globally through encrypted cloud-sharing systems.

Digital piracy adversely affects multiple stakeholders within the entertainment and creative industries. **Film producers** suffer substantial financial losses due to unauthorized distribution of films before or shortly after official release. **Music companies** lose revenue from illegal downloads and streaming of sound recordings. **Broadcasters** and television networks experience reduced subscription and advertising revenues due to unauthorized retransmission of content.

Similarly, **OTT platforms** and streaming services face challenges in protecting subscription-based digital content from piracy and illegal access. **Exclusive distributors and licensees**, who invest heavily in acquiring and marketing copyrighted works, are also severely impacted by digital infringement.

One of the most significant difficulties in combating digital piracy is the **anonymity and borderless nature of the internet**. Infringers frequently operate through anonymous identities, proxy servers, encrypted networks, and foreign jurisdictions, making identification and prosecution extremely difficult. Since digital piracy often involves transnational activities, enforcement agencies face jurisdictional limitations and lack effective international cooperation mechanisms. Moreover, the speed at which infringing content is uploaded, copied, and redistributed online frequently exceeds the capacity of legal enforcement systems to respond effectively.

Therefore, digital piracy presents complex legal, technological, and regulatory challenges for modern copyright law. Effective enforcement requires stronger legislative frameworks, advanced technological protection measures, international cooperation, intermediary accountability, and greater public awareness regarding copyright compliance in the digital age.

Comparative Perspective

The development of Digital Rights Management (DRM) and technological protection mechanisms has received significant attention in major copyright jurisdictions such as the United States and the European Union. These jurisdictions have adopted strong legal frameworks to address the challenges posed by digital piracy, unauthorized online dissemination, and circumvention of technological safeguards. A comparative analysis of these systems demonstrates the evolving global approach toward digital copyright protection and highlights certain shortcomings within the Indian legal framework.

In the United States, the enactment of the **Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), 1998** represented a major development in digital copyright law. The DMCA introduced comprehensive anti-circumvention provisions designed to protect copyrighted works in the digital environment. The legislation prohibits unauthorized circumvention of technological protection measures used by copyright owners to control access to copyrighted content. It also restricts the manufacture, distribution, and use of technologies or devices intended to bypass such protections. The DMCA further introduced notice-and-takedown procedures requiring internet intermediaries and online service providers to remove infringing content upon receiving proper notice from copyright owners. These provisions have significantly strengthened copyright enforcement in relation to online piracy, streaming platforms, software distribution, and digital media.

Similarly, the **European Union Information Society Directive (2001/29/EC)** provides extensive legal protection for technological measures and digital rights management systems. The Directive

obligates member states to ensure adequate legal remedies against circumvention of technological safeguards protecting copyrighted works. It also imposes responsibilities upon intermediaries and digital platforms to cooperate in preventing copyright infringement. European copyright law emphasizes balancing copyright protection with users' rights, access to information, and technological innovation. The European framework has therefore evolved as a comparatively balanced and structured system for digital copyright governance.

Compared to the United States and the European Union, Indian copyright law has made important progress through the Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012, which introduced Sections 65A and 65B relating to technological protection measures and rights management information. However, Indian DRM provisions remain comparatively less developed, and enforcement mechanisms continue to face practical and technological limitations. Issues such as online piracy, intermediary liability, cross-border infringement, and ineffective implementation continue to weaken copyright protection in the digital environment.

Recent Developments

Recent years have witnessed significant developments in copyright law and digital rights enforcement, particularly concerning online piracy, intermediary liability, streaming platforms, and emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI). Indian courts, especially the Delhi High Court, have increasingly adopted proactive approaches to protect copyrighted works in the digital environment through dynamic injunctions, website blocking orders, and stronger enforcement measures against rogue websites and unauthorized streaming services.

One of the significant developments occurred in **Star India Pvt. Ltd. v. Rogue Websites (2025)**, where the Delhi High Court granted a “dynamic injunction” restraining unauthorized streaming of IPL 2025 matches on rogue websites and digital platforms. The Court recognized that real-time digital piracy causes severe economic harm to broadcasters and exclusive licensees and emphasized the need for immediate preventive remedies in online copyright infringement cases. Similarly, in **JioStar v. Rogue Websites (2025)**, the Delhi High Court restrained illegal streaming platforms from broadcasting cricket matches and protected JioStar's exclusive media rights, thereby reaffirming the importance of protecting digital broadcasting and streaming rights.

Another important development involved the protection of copyrighted music and sound recordings. In **Saregama India Ltd. v. Illegal Stream-Ripping Websites (2025)**, the Delhi High Court restrained several websites facilitating unauthorized downloading and reproduction of copyrighted songs and recordings. The Court acknowledged the growing threat posed by “stream-ripping” technologies and granted interim injunctions to protect digital music rights. Further, Indian authorities intensified anti-piracy enforcement through cybercrime investigations in cases involving illegal circulation of films such as *Patriot* and *Jana Nayagan*, where multiple arrests were made for cloud-sharing and online distribution of pirated copies.

Internationally, copyright law witnessed major debates regarding Artificial Intelligence and copyrighted training data. In 2025–2026, U.S. courts in cases such as *Kadrey v. Meta* and *Bartz v. Anthropic* examined whether AI training on copyrighted works constitutes fair use. Courts generally accepted transformative AI training under limited circumstances while simultaneously emphasizing that pirated acquisition of copyrighted data may still amount to infringement. These developments indicate that copyright law is rapidly evolving to address challenges arising from digital piracy, AI technologies, and online content dissemination.

Suggestions and Reforms

In order to strengthen DRM protection and enhance remedies available to exclusive licensees under Indian copyright law, several legal and institutional reforms are necessary. One of the primary requirements is the establishment of stronger anti-piracy enforcement mechanisms capable of addressing modern forms of digital infringement. Existing enforcement systems often suffer from delays, lack of technological expertise, and inadequate coordination between agencies. Therefore, effective anti-piracy infrastructure is essential for combating unauthorized streaming, illegal downloads, and digital reproduction of copyrighted works.

The establishment of specialized cyber copyright enforcement units is also necessary to deal with technologically advanced copyright crimes. Since digital piracy frequently involves encrypted networks, anonymous operators, foreign servers, and online platforms, specialized investigative agencies equipped with technical expertise can significantly improve enforcement efficiency. Such units may assist in identifying infringers, tracing illegal digital networks, and coordinating with internet intermediaries.

Further, faster judicial remedies are essential for effective copyright protection in the digital age. Digital piracy spreads rapidly through online platforms, and delays in judicial intervention often render legal remedies ineffective. Courts should therefore adopt expedited procedures for copyright disputes involving online infringement, website blocking, and digital piracy. The use of dynamic injunctions and technology-oriented remedies should also be expanded.

Greater international cooperation is another important requirement because digital piracy frequently operates across national boundaries. India must strengthen cooperation with foreign governments, international organizations, and digital platforms for effective cross-border enforcement of copyright laws. International collaboration can assist in identifying foreign piracy operators and ensuring enforcement of judicial orders.

The law must also provide clearer intermediary liability standards. Internet service providers, online marketplaces, social media platforms, and digital intermediaries play a central role in online dissemination of content. Therefore, clearer obligations regarding notice-and-takedown mechanisms, monitoring responsibilities, and accountability standards are essential to prevent misuse of digital platforms for copyright infringement.

Additionally, there is a need to promote advanced DRM technologies and encourage their adoption within the entertainment and media industries. Technological safeguards such as encryption systems, digital watermarking, authentication mechanisms, and access-control systems can significantly reduce unauthorized copying and distribution of digital content.

Public awareness regarding digital copyright compliance is equally important. Many internet users remain unaware of the legal and ethical implications of digital piracy. Awareness campaigns, educational programmes, and industry initiatives can help promote respect for intellectual property rights and discourage online infringement.

Finally, improved coordination between internet service providers, copyright owners, digital platforms, and enforcement agencies is necessary for effective digital copyright governance. A collaborative and technologically responsive legal framework is essential to address evolving challenges posed by digital technology and internet-based communication.

India must therefore continue to modernize its copyright regime by adopting technologically adaptive legal frameworks capable of balancing copyright protection, innovation, consumer interests, and digital access in the contemporary era.

Conclusion

Copyright protection in the digital age requires a comprehensive and technologically adaptive legal framework. Exclusive licensees play a crucial role in the commercial exploitation and distribution of copyrighted works, particularly in the film, music, and entertainment industries. Indian copyright law recognizes the rights of exclusive licensees and provides substantial civil and criminal remedies against infringement.

The introduction of DRM-related provisions through the Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 marked an important step toward addressing digital piracy and unauthorized access. Sections 65A and 65B provide legal recognition and protection to technological measures and rights management information.

However, despite legislative progress, significant challenges remain in the areas of enforcement, intermediary liability, technological circumvention, and cross-border piracy. Effective copyright protection therefore requires stronger digital enforcement infrastructure, judicial responsiveness, international cooperation, and balanced regulatory reforms.

The future of copyright law in India depends upon its ability to adapt to emerging technologies while simultaneously preserving innovation, consumer rights, and public access to knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. Ahuja, V.K., *Law Relating to Intellectual Property Rights*, LexisNexis Butterworths

- Wadhwa, Nagpur, 2017.
2. Agarwal, N., *Indian Copyright Law and Practice*, Central Law Publications, Allahabad, 2019.
 3. Bainbridge, David, *Intellectual Property*, Pearson Education, London, 2018.
 4. Bently, Lionel & Sherman, Brad, *Intellectual Property Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014.
 5. Cornish, W.R., Llewelyn, D. & Aplin, T., *Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyright, Trade Marks and Allied Rights*, Sweet & Maxwell, London, 2019.
 6. Copinger, Walter Arthur, *Copinger and Skone James on Copyright*, Sweet & Maxwell, London, 2016.
 7. Gopalakrishnan, N.S. & Agitha, T.G., *Principles of Intellectual Property*, Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, 2014.
 8. Goldstein, Paul, *Goldstein on Copyright*, Aspen Publishers, New York, 2019.
 9. Lessig, Lawrence, *Free Culture*, Penguin Press, New York, 2004.
 10. Litman, Jessica, *Digital Copyright*, Prometheus Books, New York, 2006.
 11. Narayanan, P., *Copyright and Industrial Designs*, Eastern Law House, Kolkata, 2017.
 12. Nimmer, Melville B. & Nimmer, David, *Nimmer on Copyright*, LexisNexis, New York, 2021.
 13. Patterson, L. Ray & Lindberg, Stanley W., *The Nature of Copyright: A Law of Users' Rights*, University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1991.
 14. Reddy, G.B., *Intellectual Property Rights and the Law*, Gogia Law Agency, Hyderabad, 2015.
 15. Sterling, J.A.L., *World Copyright Law*, Sweet & Maxwell, London, 2008.
 16. WIPO, *Understanding Copyright and Related Rights*, World Intellectual Property Organization, Geneva, 2020.
 17. Watal, Jayashree, *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2001.
 18. Basheer, Shammad, "India's Tryst with TRIPS: Copyright and Digital Challenges", *Indian Journal of Law and Technology*, Vol. 5, 2010.
 19. Ginsburg, Jane C., "Copyright and Control over Digital Technologies", *Columbia Law Review*, Vol. 101, 2001.
 20. Samuelson, Pamela, "Digital Media and Copyright Law", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 44, No. 2, 2001.
 21. Singh, Sandeep, "Digital Piracy and Copyright Enforcement in India", *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, Vol. 21, 2016.
 22. Bansal, Ashwani Kumar, "Copyright Protection in the Digital Era", *Supreme Court Cases Journal*, 2018.
 23. The Copyright Act, 1957 (India).
 24. The Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 (India).
 25. The Information Technology Act, 2000 (India).

26. The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), 1998 (United States).
27. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, 1886.
28. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 1994.
29. WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT), 1996.
30. WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT), 1996.
31. European Union Information Society Directive, 2001/29/EC.
32. *Super Cassettes Industries Ltd. v. Myspace Inc.*, 2011 (48) PTC 49 (Del).
33. *Star India Pvt. Ltd. v. Rogue Websites*, Delhi High Court, 2025.
34. *JioStar v. Rogue Websites*, Delhi High Court, 2025.
35. *Saregama India Ltd. v. Illegal Stream-Ripping Websites*, Delhi High Court, 2025.
36. *Warner Bros. Discovery v. Rogue Streaming Platforms*, Delhi High Court, 2026.
37. Reuters, “Copyright Law 2025: Courts Begin Drawing Lines Around AI Training and Piracy”, Reuters Legal News, 2026.
38. LiveLaw, “Delhi High Court Restrains Illegal Music Download Platforms in Saregama Case”, 2025.
39. SCC Online Blog, “Delhi High Court Issues Dynamic Injunction Against IPL 2025 Piracy”, 2025.
40. Times of India, “Cyber Crime Police Probe Online Film Piracy Networks”, 2025.