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This article discusses the Dutch Supreme Court decision in the case of website blocking of The Pirate Bay by internet service providers. In line with the CJEU Telekabel Wien judgment, the Supreme Court held that the Court of Appeal had used an incorrect criterion of effectiveness. It also referred questions to the CJEU concerning indirect infringement by the operators of TPB. With this referral the Netherlands remains one of the few European countries in which right holders have tried, but not (yet) succeeded in obtaining such an injunction.
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The ITV v TV CatchUp case is about the legality of re-broadcasting content over the internet. It has wide-reaching implications not just for broadcasters but also for anyone who re-uses content online. However, as it has been running for more than five years and has the distinction of having been referred to the CJEU not once, but twice, those who can’t quite remember where it has got to are forgiven. With the second CJEU decision hotly anticipated, this article summarises the various courts’ decisions to date and analyses the practical implications these will have on broadcasters and content users.