LAW

The Creative Destruction of Copyright: Napster and the New Economics of Digital Technology

Vinay Kumar[1], Ruchika Sharma[2]

[1]LL.M. Student, University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh University, Mohali, Punjab, India
[2]Assistant Professor, University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh University, Mohali, Punjab, India

Published November 2026

Abstract

The arrival of Napster in 1999 exposed a basic tension in copyright law. Digital networks made music inexpensive to copy and easy to distribute, while copyright continued to allocate exclusive rights through rules developed for a world of physical records and controlled channels of distribution. Napster did not simply introduce a new copying device. It organised users into a searchable, networked system and made the exchange of sound recordings a mass activity. The litigation that followed tested the limits of secondary copyright liability and the capacity of injunctions to regulate a technology whose users and files were dispersed across the internet. This paper studies Napster as both a legal dispute and an episode of economic change. It analyses the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit's decision in A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc., with particular attention to contributory and vicarious liability, fair use, and the distinction between a technology's capability and the operator's knowledge and conduct. It then considers the competing empirical accounts of file-sharing's effect on recorded-music sales and explains why the economics of digital distribution cannot be reduced to a single measure of lost sales. The paper also examines the Indian position under the Copyright Act, 1957, including the decisions in MySpace Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd. and Tips Industries Ltd. v. Wynk Music Ltd. The central argument is that Napster's legal defeat did not restore the pre-digital music economy. Rather, it accelerated the search for licensed digital models and exposed the limits of treating technological change solely as an enforcement problem. Copyright must protect the economic interests of creators and right holders, but its application to digital intermediaries should remain sensitive to actual knowledge, control, legitimate uses, market structure, and the public interest in access.

Keywords: Napster; copyright; peer-to-peer networks; digital music; creative destruction; intermediary liability; fair use; India

1 Introduction

Copyright law has always had to respond to changes in the means by which creative works are produced, copied and circulated. The printing press, sound recording, radio, photocopying and video recording each altered the practical reach of copyright. Digital networks changed the scale and cost of copying more sharply. A sound recording could be reproduced without perceptible loss of quality and sent across national borders at a negligible marginal cost. The same network that allowed an independent musician to reach listeners without a record label also enabled users to circulate commercial recordings without permission.

Napster became the most visible early example of this change. Launched in 1999, it offered a central index through which users could locate music files stored on one another's computers. The files themselves generally travelled between users, rather than being stored in a single Napster archive. This arrangement made the service appear decentralised, but its search index, server infrastructure

and user-management functions gave the company a substantial operational role. The recording industry challenged the service, arguing that its users infringed copyright and that Napster was responsible for facilitating that infringement [1].

The Ninth Circuit's 2001 decision is often remembered as a defeat for peer-to-peer music sharing. Its significance is more specific. The court recognised that a technology should not be condemned merely because it can be used to infringe, but held that a service operator may be liable where it has knowledge of specific infringement and materially assists it, or where it has the right and ability to supervise infringement and a direct financial interest in it [2]. The distinction between technological capacity and the operator's conduct remains central to intermediary liability.The phrase 'creative destruction' provides a useful, though not complete, account of the episode. Schumpeter used it to describe the process by which new forms of production and organisation displace older ones. In the music business, digital distribution weakened the value of physical distribution networks and the control once exercised by record labels and retailers. Yet the destruction was not limited to established businesses. It also unsettled the income arrangements through which performers, composers, publishers and recording companies were paid. The legal question was therefore not simply whether old business models deserved protection, but how the law should preserve legitimate creative incentives while allowing more efficient forms of distribution [3].

This paper argues that Napster's enduring lesson is not that copyright must yield to every technological innovation, nor that unauthorised copying is an acceptable substitute for a functioning market. It is that copyright enforcement and market adaptation must be considered together. An effective legal response should distinguish deliberate infringement from neutral technical infrastructure, and should encourage licensing models that reflect the economics of digital access.

2 Research questions, objectives and methodology

2.1 Research questions

The paper addresses four questions: (i) how did the Ninth Circuit allocate responsibility between Napster's users and the platform; (ii) what does the economic evidence establish, and what remains contested, about the effect of file sharing on music sales; (iii) in what sense did Napster produce creative destruction rather than merely facilitate piracy; and (iv) what lessons can Indian copyright and intermediary law draw from the episode?

2.2 Objectives

The objectives are to explain the technological structure of Napster; examine the legal principles governing direct and secondary infringement; assess the competing economic accounts of digital copying; analyse relevant Indian statutory provisions and judicial decisions; and propose a balanced approach to platform responsibility and lawful digital access.

2.3 Research methodology

The study adopts a doctrinal and analytical method. It relies on statutes, judicial decisions, academic books and peer-reviewed economic research. The United States decisions are examined as the legal setting in which Napster operated, while Indian statutes and decisions are used to assess the relevance of the case to Indian law. The paper does not claim to provide a new empirical measure-

ment of piracy or streaming markets. Economic findings are presented with their stated limits, including differences in data, period and research design.

3 Copyright and creative destruction in the digital economy

3.1 The economic function of copyright

Copyright gives authors and other right holders a limited set of exclusive rights over protected expression. In the United States, the relevant rights include reproduction and distribution; Indian law similarly defines copyright through a bundle of exclusive rights, including reproduction, issuing copies and communication to the public, depending on the category of work [4]. These rights are not ends in themselves. They are legal instruments intended to support the production and dissemination of creative works by allowing creators and rights holders to control specified uses and obtain economic returns.

Digital music complicates this model because the cost of making an additional copy approaches zero, while the cost of producing the first recording may remain substantial. A conventional market can charge for each physical copy because manufacturing, inventory and distribution impose costs. A networked file can be copied and transmitted without those costs. If consumers can obtain a substitute without paying, the price-based mechanism through which a recording company recovers investment may weaken. At the same time, the internet lowers distribution barriers and permits new artists to reach audiences who would previously have depended on label selection and retail shelf space.

3.2 Schumpeterian change and the limits of the analogy

Creative destruction describes the replacement of established arrangements by innovations that alter the organisation of an industry. Napster challenged the record business at several points in its value chain: distribution, retail access, discovery and control over the circulation of recordings. It reduced the practical scarcity of recorded music and made a vast catalogue searchable. That was disruptive even where a particular download was unlawful.

The analogy must be used carefully. Schumpeter's concept does not imply that every disruptive practice is socially beneficial or legally permissible. An innovation can reduce costs for consumers while transferring costs to creators. Nor does the loss of an incumbent's market position prove that the incumbent was inefficient in every respect. The relevant inquiry is whether the new arrangement creates durable value, whether it supports the creation of future works, and how gains and losses are distributed.

3.3 Digital copying and the public interest

Copyright has to balance incentives with access. A system that gives right holders no meaningful control may weaken investment in professional production. A system that treats every technical act of copying as equivalent to commercial exploitation may suppress research, criticism, preservation, private uses and new services. The fair-use doctrine in United States law and the enumerated fair-dealing and other exceptions in Indian law express this balancing function in different legal forms [5].

The challenge is particularly acute for intermediaries. A search engine, cloud host or file-sharing service may handle enormous volumes of user activity. Requiring prior review of every file can be technically unrealistic and may encourage over-removal. On the other hand, a platform that actively

organises access to infringing material, receives specific notices and deliberately leaves that material available cannot rely on the mere fact that users perform the final act of copying.

4 Napster: Technology, business model and litigation

4.1 How the system worked

Napster's original architecture combined peer-to-peer transfer with centralised coordination. Users installed software and made selected music files available from their computers. Napster's servers maintained a directory of file names and user information, allowing a person searching for a track to find another user who had it. The actual music file was ordinarily transferred directly between users. The central index was therefore a practical gateway to the network, even though the company did not host every song on its own servers.

This design mattered in court. Napster argued that it was a technology provider and that its users, not the company, made the copies. The plaintiffs responded that the service's central index and support functions made the exchange possible at scale. The court did not treat the location of the music files as decisive. It examined the assistance Napster supplied and the knowledge and control it exercised.

4.2 Direct infringement and fair use

The Ninth Circuit accepted the finding that users who uploaded and downloaded copyrighted recordings infringed the rights of reproduction and distribution. The record before the court indicated that a substantial majority of the files being exchanged were copyrighted recordings. The court rejected Napster's broad fair-use arguments based on sampling, space-shifting and permissive distribution. It distinguished personal copying for one's own use from making a recording available to a large network of other users [6].

The decision should not be read as holding that every digital transfer is infringement. The court was concerned with the factual pattern before it: users were making and distributing complete commercial recordings without authorisation. A lawful transfer, a licensed service, a work placed in the public domain, or a use falling within an applicable exception would require a different analysis.

4.3 Contributory liability

Contributory infringement generally requires knowledge of direct infringement and material contribution to it. The Ninth Circuit held that Napster had actual and constructive knowledge of infringing activity. Rights holders had identified infringing files; Napster could use its system to locate and block access to files or users; and it failed to take effective steps in response. Its search index and support services materially assisted users in finding and exchanging recordings [7].

At the same time, the court treated the Supreme Court's decision in Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc. [19] as an important limit. A distributor of a product capable of substantial non-infringing uses should not be held liable merely because some customers use it unlawfully. The Ninth Circuit criticised the district court for focusing too narrowly on the proportion of current infringing uses rather than the system's capacity for commercially significant lawful uses. But it concluded that Sony did not protect Napster from liability on the evidence of its specific knowledge and assistance.

4.4 Vicarious liability and the injunction

Vicarious liability requires the right and ability to supervise the infringing activity and a direct financial interest in it. The court considered Napster's ability to police its index and its commercial interest in maintaining a large user base. The service's popularity increased its attractiveness to users and potential commercial partners. This combination supported the finding that the plaintiffs were likely to establish vicarious liability [8].

The appellate court nevertheless narrowed the injunction. Rights holders had to identify specific infringing files with sufficient detail; Napster then had to prevent access to those files within the limits of its system. The court rejected an order that placed an unqualified burden on Napster to ensure that no infringement occurred. This part of the judgment is significant because it recognises both the platform's capacity to act and the practical limits of the technology.

4.5 The legal outcome and the commercial outcome

Napster ceased operating its original service in July 2001 after it could not satisfy the injunction while continuing the network in its existing form. The company later entered bankruptcy proceedings. The end of the original Napster service did not end peer-to-peer exchange. Other decentralised networks emerged, and digital music distribution continued to develop through licensed downloads and subscription streaming. The Ninth Circuit's later account of the litigation records the shutdown and bankruptcy, while also noting that Napster's ultimate liability was not finally adjudicated in the ordinary sense before the bankruptcy outcome [9].

The distinction between legal victory and market transformation is important. The record companies obtained substantial relief against the service, but they could not restore the technical and consumer conditions that had made Napster popular. The dispute helped demonstrate the demand for convenient, searchable and low-friction digital access. It also showed that litigation alone could not create a viable alternative product.

5 The economics of file sharing: Displacement, discovery and new markets

5.1 The sales-displacement argument

The strongest argument for the recording industry was that unauthorised downloads displaced purchases. If a user downloaded an album instead of buying it, the right holder lost a sale. This mechanism is plausible, especially where a consumer obtains a complete substitute for a product that would otherwise have been purchased. Stan Liebowitz's study argued that file sharing was closely associated with changes in record sales and rejected explanations that, in his view, had little empirical support [10].

The displacement account is important, but it cannot be assumed that every download represents a lost sale. Some users download music they would never have bought; some use downloads to sample unfamiliar artists; some obtain recordings that are unavailable in their local market; and some downloads may lead to later purchases, concert attendance or other forms of support. The economic effect depends on consumer behaviour, the type of recording, the availability of lawful substitutes and the period being studied.

5.2 Evidence of a smaller or uncertain effect

Oberholzer-Gee and Strumpf matched data on actual file downloads with album sales and used international school holidays as an instrument to address the difficulty of separating the effect of downloading from differences in musical taste and internet use. They found that the estimated effect of file sharing on sales was statistically indistinguishable from zero in their study, and concluded that file sharing did not explain the primary share of the decline in sales during the period they examined [11].

Rob and Waldfogel reached a different estimate using a sample of United States college students. They found that each downloaded album reduced purchases by about 0.2 albums in their sample, while also estimating that downloading increased consumer surplus. Their findings suggest that file sharing could reduce expenditure while still producing consumer benefits, although the sample and method limit generalisation to the entire music market [12].

These studies do not establish that piracy has no effect, nor do they prove that it caused the full decline in recorded-music sales. They show that the relationship is contested and sensitive to research design. A careful legal argument should avoid presenting a single empirical result as settled fact.

5.3 Discovery, complements and changes in revenue

Music is not consumed only through the purchase of a recording. Live performances, merchandise, fan communities, licensing, sponsorship and other services can complement recorded music. File sharing may increase awareness of an artist and stimulate demand for concerts, although this benefit is unevenly distributed and cannot be assumed for every creator. Oberholzer-Gee and Strumpf argue that the impact of file sharing may be moderated by modest sales cannibalisation, demand for complementary goods such as concerts, and the fact that monetary incentives are not the only reason people create [13].

This does not mean that concerts can replace recording revenue for all musicians. Established performers with touring capacity may benefit more than emerging artists, session musicians or composers whose income depends on royalties. Nor does promotional exposure pay studio costs automatically. The economic lesson is that the music market contains several revenue streams, and the effect of unauthorised copying should be assessed across the market rather than by looking only at unit sales.

5.4 The response: From ownership of copies to access

The commercial response to Napster was not simply stronger enforcement. Digital retailers and subscription services developed models based on authorised access, searchable catalogues, portable libraries and recurring payments. The move from physical ownership to licensed access changed the consumer's relationship with music. It also shifted bargaining power towards platforms that control discovery, recommendation, user data and subscription relationships.

The new model solves some problems created by file sharing but creates others. Subscription revenue must be allocated among platforms, labels, publishers, performers and composers under complex licensing arrangements. A service may provide broad access while paying small amounts per stream to individual creators. Platform concentration can also recreate gatekeeping in a new form. Creative destruction therefore does not end when an old intermediary disappears; it may replace one set of intermediaries with another.

5.5 Was Napster creative destruction or destruction alone?

The evidence supports a qualified answer. Napster was destructive of the old distribution model because it exposed the weakness of physical scarcity and the inefficiency of fragmented catalogues. It was creative because it demonstrated a user-centred form of network distribution and forced the industry to take digital access seriously. But the original service did not establish a stable lawful method of compensating rights holders. Its model externalised much of the cost of acquiring and distributing recordings onto creators and copyright owners.

Liebowitz's title, 'Creative Destruction or Just Plain Destruction?', captures the disagreement in the literature. The best assessment is not to select one label for every effect. Napster's technology and consumer insight were innovative; its unlicensed exchange of protected recordings created serious legal and economic problems; and the licensed services that followed converted part of the innovation into a sustainable market. The lasting change was the recognition that consumers valued convenience, breadth and immediate access more than the physical format through which music had traditionally been sold.

6 Lessons for Indian copyright law

6.1 Statutory rights and exceptions

The Copyright Act, 1957 grants different exclusive rights according to the category of work. Section 14(e), for sound recordings, includes rights relating to making another sound recording embodying it, selling or giving commercial rental of copies, and communicating the recording to the public. Section 51 identifies circumstances in which copyright is infringed, while section 52 lists acts that do not constitute infringement. Fair dealing for private or personal use, including research, criticism or review, and reporting current events is recognised in section 52(1)(a) [14].

The Indian framework differs from the United States fair-use model. Section 52 contains enumerated exceptions, and the statutory language must be applied to the particular act and purpose. The existence of a digital copy does not itself answer whether the use is lawful. A court must identify the right implicated, the person responsible, the nature of the platform's conduct and any applicable exception.

6.2 MySpace and intermediary safe harbour

In MySpace Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd., the Delhi High Court considered copyright claims against a user-generated content platform. The Division Bench harmonised section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 with the Copyright Act. It held that an intermediary's safe-harbour defence was not automatically excluded by the proviso to section 81 of the Information Technology Act. For intermediary liability under section 51(a)(ii), the court required actual knowledge rather than general awareness, and emphasised that interim relief should identify the specific infringing content. The decision also required rights holders to provide sufficiently specific information to enable the platform to locate the material [15].

The decision has practical importance for services that host or transmit user material. It avoids a rule under which a platform becomes liable merely because infringement is possible somewhere on its service. At the same time, safe harbour is conditional. The intermediary must satisfy the statutory requirements and respond in accordance with the applicable legal framework. Section 79 is not a licence to promote infringement or disregard specific, actionable information.

Section 79 of the Information Technology Act provides a conditional exemption for intermediaries in relation to third-party information, subject to statutory conditions and due diligence. The statutory definition of intermediary is broad enough to include entities that receive, store or transmit electronic records on behalf of another person [16]. The MySpace approach is consistent with the broader principle in Napster that responsibility should depend on knowledge, contribution and control, rather than on the mere existence of a technical facility.

6.3 Tips v. Wynk and digital music licensing

Tips Industries Ltd. v. Wynk Music Ltd. concerned online music services, including streaming and download features. The Bombay High Court considered whether the defendants could rely on section 31-D, which provides a statutory licence for broadcasting organisations, and whether their activities fell within the statutory scheme. The single judge held that the statutory licence did not extend to the defendants' download and purchase features and rejected the attempt to treat those activities as covered by the broadcasting provision [17].

The Division Bench's 2022 decision in the appeal [20] addressed the interpretation of section 31-D and the scope of the statutory licensing framework. The litigation demonstrates that streaming, temporary caching, permanent downloads and sale of digital copies may raise distinct questions. The legal character of a service cannot be determined merely by describing it as 'online music'. The rights exercised and the statutory route relied upon must be examined separately.

In August 2024, the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade withdrew its 5 September 2016 Office Memorandum that had extended the scope of section 31-D to internet transmissions. The withdrawal followed the Bombay High Court Division Bench decision in Tips Industries. This development is relevant to the current administrative position and should be considered alongside the statute and binding judicial interpretation [18].

6.4 Applying the Napster lessons in India

The Indian cases suggest three points. First, rights holders should identify the specific work and location of the allegedly infringing content with enough precision for a platform to act. General complaints about a platform's catalogue are less useful than actionable notices. Second, platforms that exercise editorial control, promote particular infringing uses or ignore specific knowledge may face a different liability analysis from passive conduits. Third, courts should avoid orders that require indiscriminate monitoring of all user activity when narrower measures can address identified infringement.

Indian law must also account for the structure of the music industry. Rights may be divided among composers, lyricists, performers, producers, labels and publishers. A platform may obtain a licence from one right holder without having cleared every relevant right. The statutory framework should therefore encourage transparent licensing and accurate identification of rights, rather than making the end user or intermediary bear the full cost of fragmented ownership.

6.5 Access, exceptions and the public interest

A strict approach to copyright does not require ignoring lawful access. Section 52 protects specified uses, including fair dealing for private or personal use and research, criticism and review. It also contains provisions dealing with transient or incidental storage in defined circumstances. The scope

of each exception must be respected, but exceptions should not be treated as drafting errors. They are part of the legislative balance between private rights and public access.

The challenge is to ensure that enforcement does not chill lawful speech, research, education or the use of public-domain material. A notice-and-takedown process should be accurate, reviewable and proportionate. Platforms should have procedures for contesting mistaken claims, and rights holders should avoid overbroad demands that sweep in lawful material. The MySpace decision's emphasis on specificity provides a useful starting point.

7 A framework for copyright in networked markets

7.1 Liability should track conduct

A workable framework should distinguish among direct infringers, services that knowingly facilitate specific infringement, and neutral providers whose systems have substantial lawful uses. The distinction in Sony and Napster remains instructive: the possibility of misuse is not enough by itself, but actual knowledge combined with material assistance can justify liability. In the Indian context, this approach must be applied through the language of sections 51 and 79 and the relevant rules, rather than imported as a free-standing test.

7.2 Specific notice and proportionate response

A notice should identify the protected work, the claimant's authority, the precise location of the allegedly infringing material and the basis on which the use is said to be unauthorised. Platforms should respond within the applicable legal time limits and keep records of action taken. Where the same file is repeatedly re-uploaded, reasonable technical measures may be appropriate, but those measures should be designed to avoid blocking lawful versions, licensed copies or public-domain material.

7.3 Licensing should be practical and transparent

Digital markets need licensing arrangements that can operate at scale. Collective management organisations, direct licences and statutory licences can each serve a role, but the applicable route should be clear. Rights holders should maintain reliable repertoires and metadata. Platforms should disclose the basis of their licences and provide understandable reporting. Creators should receive meaningful information about how revenue is calculated and distributed.

7.4 Competition and bargaining power

The replacement of record stores by digital platforms has not eliminated market power. Platforms may control recommendation systems, playlist placement, audience data and the terms on which creators reach listeners. Copyright policy should not assume that a licensed platform necessarily produces a fair market. Competition policy, contract transparency and collective bargaining may be needed to address imbalances that copyright doctrine alone cannot resolve.

7.5 Preserve lawful innovation

A technology-neutral rule should not be confused with a rule that ignores technical differences. A service that stores user files, a service that indexes file names, a streaming platform that selects and transmits recordings, and a cloud backup provider do not perform identical functions. Their

knowledge, control and contribution differ. Legal remedies should be tailored to those differences. Broad injunctions that require continuous surveillance can impose high costs, suppress lawful uses and entrench large platforms that alone can afford compliance.

The object should be to make lawful access easier than infringement. Clear licences, affordable subscription and download options, accessible catalogues, fair payment practices and effective dispute mechanisms are more likely to produce a durable market than enforcement alone. This is the practical lesson that the music industry eventually drew from Napster.

8 Conclusion

Napster exposed the gap between copyright's traditional distribution assumptions and the realities of digital networks. Its central index and user-to-user transfers made recorded music searchable and readily available on a scale that physical distribution could not match. The Ninth Circuit's decision held the company responsible not simply because its technology could be misused, but because the record showed knowledge, material assistance, supervision and financial interest. The injunction was narrowed to require specific identification of infringing files, recognising that enforcement must account for the technical limits of a platform.

The economic record is more complex than either side's simplest claim. Some studies identify measurable sales displacement; others find a small or statistically uncertain effect. File sharing may also increase discovery and demand for complementary goods, while its benefits and costs fall unevenly across different kinds of creators. These findings do not excuse unauthorised copying. They do show why policy should be based on careful evidence rather than an assumption that every download equals a lost sale.

For India, MySpace and Tips v. Wynk offer a framework for addressing platform liability and digital music licensing. Specific knowledge, the intermediary's role, the rights implicated and the availability of statutory exceptions must be assessed with care. The 2024 withdrawal of the 2016 Office Memorandum on section 31-D further demonstrates that digital licensing remains a live area of legal development.

Napster was both disruptive and legally vulnerable. It destroyed part of the old distribution model but did not itself create a stable system for compensating all creators. The licensed services that followed converted some of its central insight—consumers want immediate, convenient access—into commercial products. Copyright's task is not to prevent that kind of change. It is to ensure that the new market continues to support creative production, respects lawful exceptions and does not replace one set of gatekeepers with another.

References

[1] A&M Records, Inc. v. *Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004, 1011–13 (9th Cir*. 2001).

[2] A&M Records, Inc. v. *Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004, 1014–19 (9th Cir*. 2001).

[3] Joseph A. Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy 82–85 (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1942).

[4] 17 U.S.C. §§ 106, 501 (2018).

[5] The Copyright Act, 1957, No. 14 of 1957, § 52(1)(a) (India).

[6] A&M Records, Inc. v. *Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004, 1014–19 (9th Cir*. 2001).

[7] A&M Records, Inc. v. *Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004, 1020–24 (9th Cir*. 2001).

[8] A&M Records, Inc. v. *Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004, 1024–29 (9th Cir*. 2001).

[9] A&M Records, Inc. v. *Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004, 1027–29 (9th Cir*. 2001).

[10] Stan J. Liebowitz, "File Sharing: Creative Destruction or Just Plain Destruction?", 49 Journal of Law and Economics 1, 1–28 (2006).

[11] Felix Oberholzer-Gee & Koleman Strumpf, "The Effect of File Sharing on Record Sales: An Empirical Analysis", 115 Journal of Political Economy 1, 1–42 (2007).

[12] Rafael Rob & Joel Waldfogel, "Piracy on the High C*'s: Music Downloading*, Sales Displacement, and Social Welfare in a Sample of College Students", 49 Journal of Law and Economics 29, 29–62 (2006).

[13] Felix Oberholzer-Gee & Koleman Strumpf, "File Sharing and Copyright", 10 Innovation Policy and the Economy 19 (2010).

[14] The Copyright Act, 1957, No. 14 of 1957, §§ 14, 51, 52 (India).

[15] MySpace Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd., 2016 SCC OnLine Del 6382 (India).

[16] The Information Technology Act, 2000, No. 21 of 2000, §§ 2(1)(w), 79 (India).

[17] Tips Industries Ltd. v. Wynk Music Ltd., AIRONLINE 2019 BOM 1452 (India).

[18] Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade, Government of India, Office Memorandum No. 14-35/2015-CRB/LU (IPR-VII) (Aug. 21, 2024).

[19] Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc., 464 U.S. 417 (1984).

[20] Wynk Ltd. v. Tips Industries Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine Bom 9322 (India).