

<<美国知识产权法-第2版-英文版>>

图书基本信息

书名：<<美国知识产权法-第2版-英文版>>

13位ISBN编号：9787566304582

10位ISBN编号：7566304585

出版时间：2012-9

出版时间：陈剑玲 对外经贸大学出版社 (2012-09出版)

作者：陈剑玲

页数：317

版权说明：本站所提供下载的PDF图书仅提供预览和简介，请支持正版图书。

更多资源请访问：<http://www.tushu007.com>

<<美国知识产权法-第2版-英文版>>

内容概要

《英美法案例精选丛书（英文版）：美国知识产权法（第2版）》是对外经济贸易大学法学院国家重点学科建设项目英美法案例精选丛书（英文版）中的一辑，选录了美国版权法、专利法、商标法三个领域中的一些经典案例，旨在通过研究原汁原味的案例，介绍美国知识产权法框架体系中的一些基本原则。

由于篇幅所限，《英美法案例精选丛书（英文版）：美国知识产权法（第2版）》难以对三大部门法中的相关经典案例作一个非常全面的介绍，因此，《英美法案例精选丛书（英文版）：美国知识产权法（第2版）》的重点主要是在版权法上。

读者在阅读案例时，可以跟随美国法官的思路，理解其如何在综合考虑多方因素的基础上，尽量维护多种利益的平衡，并得出最终的判决。

案例后面附有思考题，以帮助读者更快地理解每个案件的焦点问题。

书籍目录

第一编美国版权法 第一章版权保护的条件的条件 第一节表达和思想观念 案例1 Baker v.Selden 案例2 Nichols v.Universal Pictures Corporation 案例3 Morrissey v.Procter&Gamble 第二节作品的原创性 案例4 Feist v.Rural 案例5 Gracen v.Bradford Exchange 第三节作品的固定 案例6 White Smith Music Pub Co.v.Appollo Co. 案例7 National Football League v.McBee&Bruno's , Inc. 第四节版权标记 案例8 Hasbro Bradley , Inc.v.Sparkle Toys , Inc. 第五节版权保护的消极条件 案例9 Mitchell Bros.v.Cinema Adult Theater 第二章作品的类型 第一节一般形式 案例10 Andrew Leicester v.Warner Brothers 第二节特殊形式 案例11 G.Ricordi & Co.v.Paramount Pictures , Inc. 案例12 New York Times Co.v.Tasini 第三章版权的保护期限 案例13 Eric Eldred v.John D.Ashcroft 第四章版权的内容 第一节作者的权利 案例14 Columbia Pictures Industries v.Redd Horne 案例15 Quality King Distributors , Inc.v.L'Anza ResearchInt'l , Inc. 第二节合理使用 案例16 Harper & Row Publishers v.Nation Enterprises 案例17 Campbell v.Acuff-Rose Music Inc. 第五章版权的侵权和救济 第一节侵权 案例18 Sony Co.v.Universal City Studios , Inc. 案例19 Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc.v. Grokster.Ltd. 第二节救济 案例20 Feltner v.Columbia Pictures Television , Inc. 案例21 Boisson V.Banian Inc. 第六章版权法和其他知识产权法的关联 第一节版权和专利 案例22 MaZer v.Stein 第二节版权和商标 案例23 Dastar Corp.v.Twentieth Century Foxfilm Corp. 第七章和计算机软件有关的版权问题 第一节保护的范范围 案例24 Computer Associates International , Inc. , v. Altai.Inc. 第二节保护的限限制 案例25 Sega Enterprises Ltd.v.Assolade , Inc. 第八章版权滥用及其规则 案例26 Lasercomb America v.Reynolds 案例27 Practice Management Information Corp.v.AMA 第二编美国专利法 第九章专利保护的象对象 案例28 Diamond v.Chakrabarty 第十章获得专利权的条件 案例29 Graham v.John Deere Co. of Kansas City 案例30 Bremner v.Manson 案例31TP Laboratories , Inc.v.Professional Positioners , Inc. 第十一章专利权的内容 案例32 Paper Converting Machine Company , Appellee , v. Magna-Graphics Corporation , Appellant 第十二章侵权 案例33 Festo Corp.v.Shoketsu Kinzoku KogyokabushikiCo. 第十三章专利滥用 案例34 Morton Salt Co.V.G.S. Suppiger Co. 第三编美国商标法 第十四章保护的条条件 案例35 In Re Sun Oil Co. 案例36 In Re Budge Manufacturing Co. , Inc. 案例37 In Re N.A.D. INC. , also trading as North American Drager 第十五章商标种类 案例38 In Re Advertising & Marketing Development 案例39 Midwest Plastic Fabricators , Inc.v.Underwriters Laboratories Inc.

章节摘录

版权页： Leicester further maintains that the streetwall towers are a sculptural work which is "conceptually separate" from the building and thus independently entitled to copyright protection. Again, the district court found otherwise and we cannot say its finding lacks support. The streetwall towers were designed to extend the building visually, which they do along both Figueroa and Eighth. The Eighth Street smoke towers are equally integrated and serve the same purpose on Eighth as the Figueroa Street smoke towers do on Figueroa. This is powerful evidence that they (together with the additional two lantern towers on Figueroa) are part of the functional and architectural vocabulary of the building. Because the streetwall towers are part of the architectural work, 120 (a) applies. It allows the public the right to photograph public buildings including, in this case, the streetwall smoke and lantern towers unless, as Leicester contends, the 1990 amendments specifically provide for the continued separate protection of sculptural works attached to buildings. Leicester's position is that the Berne Convention did not require taking away copyright protection for PGS works, and Congress did not do so when it passed the AWPCA implementing the Convention. He relies in particular upon passages in the legislative history indicating that certain works of authorship which may separately qualify for protection as PGS works may be permanently embodied in architectural works, and that in such cases the author (if the same for both works) may elect whether to seek a remedy under 102 (a) (5) or 102 (a) (8). Whether or not Leicester may have some other claim for a different infringement of his copyright in the Zanja Madre towers as a sculptural work, we believe he has none for a pictorial representation of the 801 Tower and its streetwall embodying a protected architectural work. Otherwise, 120 (a)'s exemption for pictorial representations of buildings would make no sense. When copyright owners in architectural works were given protection for the first time in 1990, the right was limited by 120 (a) so that publicly visible buildings could freely be photographed. This reflected a shift from the prior regime of relying on "ad hoc determinations" of fair use. Having done this, it would be counterintuitive to suppose that Congress meant to restrict pictorial copying to some, but not all of, a unitary architectural work.

编辑推荐

版权说明

本站所提供下载的PDF图书仅提供预览和简介，请支持正版图书。

更多资源请访问:<http://www.tushu007.com>