



ISSN: 2583-7753

LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 4 | Issue 1

2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v04.78>

© 2026 LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

Follow this and additional research works at: www.lijdlr.com

Under the Platform of LawFoyer – www.lawfoyer.in

After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.

In case of any suggestions or complaints, kindly contact (info.lijdlr@gmail.com)

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research, To submit your Manuscript [Click here](#)

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION IN THE MUSIC INDUSTRY: A LEGAL ANALYSIS OF RIGHTS CHALLENGES AND ENFORCEMENT IN THE DIGITAL ERA

Kanisha Sharma¹

I. ABSTRACT

The rapid digitisation of the music industry has fundamentally altered the nature of creation, distribution, and consumption of musical works, raising complex questions regarding the adequacy of existing copyright frameworks. This paper undertakes a critical examination of copyright protection in the Indian music industry, with particular emphasis on the challenges posed by digital platforms, streaming economies, and evolving ownership structures. While the Copyright Act, 1957 provides a comprehensive statutory framework governing musical works, sound recordings, and performers' rights, its application in the contemporary digital environment reveals significant gaps. Issues such as digital piracy, opaque royalty distribution systems, and unequal bargaining power between artists and intermediaries continue to undermine the intended objectives of copyright law. Through a doctrinal and analytical approach, this paper evaluates legislative provisions, judicial interpretations, and industry practices. It further undertakes a comparative assessment of international frameworks to identify best practices. The study argues that although India has made progressive reforms, particularly through the 2012 amendment, enforcement inefficiencies and structural imbalances persist. The paper concludes by proposing targeted reforms aimed at strengthening institutional mechanisms, ensuring fair compensation, and aligning copyright law with technological realities.

II. KEYWORDS

Copyright, Music Industry, Digital Piracy, Streaming Platforms, Intellectual Property.

III. INTRODUCTION

¹ Final semester student pursuing LLM (IPR) at Amity Law School, Noida, Uttar Pradesh (India). Email: kanishasharma99@gmail.com

The music industry represents one of the most dynamic intersections of creativity and commerce, where artistic expression is intrinsically linked to economic value. Copyright law, as a branch of intellectual property, seeks to protect this relationship by granting creators exclusive rights over their works while simultaneously promoting public access to culture and knowledge.

In India, the transformation of the music industry from analogue formats like vinyl records and cassettes to digital streaming platforms has been swift and revolutionary. The rise of services such as Spotify, Apple Music, and YouTube has made music access more democratic, allowing artists to connect with worldwide audiences like never before. Nonetheless, this change has also upset conventional revenue structures, leading to new types of legal and economic difficulties.

A key conflict in this altered environment is the power disparity between creators and intermediaries. Although digital platforms and record labels typically govern distribution pathways and monetization strategies, individual artists, especially composers and lyricists-often do not possess the bargaining strength needed to obtain fair compensation. This has resulted in ongoing conflicts over ownership, licensing, and the distribution of royalties.

Moreover, the digital environment has significantly amplified the problem of copyright infringement. Unlike physical piracy, which required tangible reproduction and distribution, digital piracy operates on a scale and speed that makes enforcement exceedingly difficult. Unauthorized uploads, file-sharing networks, and streaming leaks have collectively eroded the economic rights of copyright holders, raising questions about the effectiveness of existing legal remedies. This paper seeks to address these concerns by analyzing the legal framework governing copyright in the Indian music industry and evaluating its effectiveness in the digital age. It aims to answer three key questions:

1. Whether the current legal framework adequately protects the rights of creators in the music industry.

2. How digital technologies have reshaped copyright challenges and
3. What reforms are necessary to ensure a more balanced and effective system.

By situating the discussion within both domestic and international contexts, the paper attempts to provide a comprehensive understanding of the evolving relationship between law, technology, and creative industries.

A. Research Methodology

This study adopts a primarily doctrinal research methodology, focusing on the analysis of statutory provisions, judicial decisions, and secondary legal literature. The doctrinal approach is particularly suited to the subject matter, as it enables a detailed examination of the legal principles governing copyright protection and their interpretation by courts.

Primary sources include the Copyright Act, 1957 and its subsequent amendments, as well as relevant international instruments such as the Berne Convention² for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the TRIPS Agreement.³ Judicial decisions of the Supreme Court and High Courts have also been analyzed to understand the evolution of legal doctrines relating to musical works and sound recordings.

In addition to doctrinal analysis, the study incorporates a comparative approach by examining copyright frameworks in jurisdictions such as the United States and the European Union. This comparative perspective facilitates the identification of best practices and highlights areas where Indian law may benefit from reform.

The research further relies on secondary sources, including academic articles, industry reports, and policy papers, to contextualise legal developments within broader economic and technological trends. While the study is primarily qualitative in nature, it engages critically with existing literature to identify gaps and propose solutions.

B. Research Objectives

² Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, 1886

³ Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 1994

The present study is guided by the following research objectives:

1. To evaluate the adequacy of the Copyright Act, 1957, particularly in light of the 2012 amendment, in addressing challenges arising in the digital music ecosystem.
2. To analyse the impact of digital technologies, including streaming platforms and online distribution systems, on traditional copyright principles and enforcement mechanisms.
3. To examine the extent of platform accountability and the limitations of existing safe harbour provisions in the context of copyright infringement.
4. To identify structural gaps in the current legal and institutional framework and propose reforms aimed at ensuring fair compensation, transparency, and effective enforcement.

C. Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. Whether the current legal framework adequately protects the rights of creators in the music industry.
2. How digital technologies have reshaped copyright challenges.
3. What reforms are necessary to ensure a more balanced and effective copyright system.

D. Literature Review

Scholarly discourse on copyright in the music sector reflects an increasing awareness of the challenges posed by digital technologies. Researchers have extensively examined the adequacy of conventional copyright frameworks in addressing issues such as digital piracy, platform responsibility, and fair compensation for creators.

One branch of literature highlights the structural disparity between creators and intermediaries. It contends that even with legal protections, contractual norms in the

music industry typically prioritize producers and record labels, thus sidelining the rights of authors and composers. This criticism became especially notable in India after conflicts involving copyright organizations like the Indian Performing Right Society, which have been examined for their involvement in distributing royalties.

Another area of research examines the influence of digital platforms on the enforcement of copyright laws. Researchers have highlighted that the internet's global and decentral structure complicates effective regulation of infringement. The emergence of user-generated content platforms has further complicated the regulatory landscape, as these platforms typically rely on safe harbour provisions to limit their liability.

Moreover, comparative research has showcased the preemptive strategies implemented in other regions. For example, the United States has established a notice-and-takedown system under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, whereas the European Union has enacted more stringent obligations for online platforms under its Copyright Directive. These developments have sparked debates regarding the balance between innovation and regulation.

Despite the breadth of existing literature, there remains a need for a comprehensive analysis that integrates legal, technological, and economic perspectives within the Indian context. This paper seeks to fill that gap by offering a holistic examination of copyright protection in the music industry.

IV. LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING COPYRIGHT IN INDIA

The legal foundation of copyright protection in India is primarily governed by the Copyright Act, 1957, which provides an extensive framework for the protection of literary, artistic, musical works, and sound recordings. Over time, the Act has been amended to accommodate technological developments and align domestic law with international obligations.

A critical feature of the Act is its recognition of distinct categories of rights within the music industry. Musical works, literary works (lyrics), and sound recordings are treated

as separate subject matters, each capable of independent ownership. This layered protection, while conceptually sound, often leads to complex legal relationships between multiple stakeholders involved in the creation and commercialization of a single piece of music.

The 2012 amendment to the Act⁴ marked a significant shift in legislative intent by attempting to correct historical imbalances in the industry. It introduced provisions ensuring that authors of literary and musical works retain the right to receive royalties even after assigning their copyright to producers or music labels. This was a response to longstanding concerns that composers and lyricists were often deprived of fair compensation once their works were commercially exploited.

Despite these progressive changes, the implementation of these provisions has been inconsistent. Contractual practices in the industry frequently dilute the intended protections, and enforcement mechanisms have struggled to keep pace with the scale of digital exploitation. As a result, the statutory framework, though robust on paper, continues to face challenges in practical application.

V. NATURE OF COPYRIGHT IN MUSICAL WORKS AND SOUND RECORDINGS

Understanding copyright in the music industry requires an appreciation of its multi-layered structure, which distinguishes between different elements of a musical creation.

Fundamentally, a musical work refers to the composition itself, including the melody and structural elements developed by the composer. When lyrics are included, they form a distinct literary creation. Ultimately, the performance is captured in a sound recording, which is usually owned by the producer.

This differentiation is not only technical; it carries significant legal and economic consequences. Every category comes with its own set of rights, encompassing

⁴ Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012

reproduction, distribution, public communication, and adaptation. As a result, utilizing one song might necessitate obtaining several licenses from various rights owners.

The intricacy of this setup frequently results in conflicts, especially regarding digital streaming. For example, when a track is streamed on a digital platform, inquiries emerge about how earnings ought to be allocated among writers, lyricists, artists, and producers. The lack of clear and consistent systems for distribution has continually caused disputes in the industry.

Moreover, the rise of remixes, covers, and derivative works in the digital space has further blurred the boundaries between original and secondary creations. This has necessitated a more nuanced interpretation of copyright principles, particularly in relation to originality and transformative use.

VI. OWNERSHIP AND AUTHORSHIP: PERSISTENT LEGAL TENSIONS

One of the most contentious aspects of copyright law in the music industry concerns the distinction between authorship and ownership. While the law recognizes the creator of a work as its author, ownership may be transferred through contractual arrangements, often resulting in a divergence between the two.

Historically, music producers and film studios have exercised significant control over copyright ownership through assignment agreements. Composers and lyricists, particularly in the film industry, were frequently required to assign their rights in exchange for a lump-sum payment, thereby forfeiting any future claim to royalties.

This practice led to widespread criticism and ultimately prompted legislative intervention through the 2012 amendment. The amendment sought to ensure that authors retain an inalienable right to royalties, thereby limiting the extent to which contractual arrangements could override statutory protections.

However, the effectiveness of this reform has been limited by the realities of the industry. Many artists, especially newcomers, continue to operate in environments characterised

by unequal bargaining power. Contracts are often drafted in favour of producers and labels, leaving little room for negotiation. As a result, the theoretical protections offered by the law do not always translate into practical benefits.

The issue is further complicated in the digital context, where global platforms and cross-border licensing arrangements add additional layers of complexity. Determining ownership and entitlement to revenue in such scenarios often requires navigating a web of contractual and statutory provisions.

VII. CASE LAW ANALYSIS: JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF MUSIC COPYRIGHT

Judicial interpretation has played a crucial role in shaping the contours of copyright law in the Indian music industry. Courts have been called upon to resolve disputes relating to ownership, licensing, and the scope of rights, thereby clarifying ambiguities within the statutory framework.

A landmark decision in this context is *Indian Performing Right Society Ltd v Eastern India Motion Pictures Association* AIR 1977 SC 1443. In this case, the Supreme Court held that where a composer created musical works for valuable consideration at the instance of a film producer, the producer became the first owner of the copyright in the cinematograph film, including the soundtrack, unless there was a contract to the contrary. However, the Court also clarified that the composer retained the right to perform the work independently in public, otherwise than as a part of the cinematograph film. This position has since been significantly altered by subsequent legislative and judicial developments.

This judgment had far-reaching implications, as it reinforced the dominance of producers in the industry and limited the independent economic rights of authors under the pre-amendment framework. However, the Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 was specifically enacted to correct this legal position and to address concerns, including those identified within the 1977 judgment itself, by recognising the inalienable right of authors

to receive royalties. This legislative intent has been authoritatively affirmed by the Bombay High Court in *Indian Performing Right Society Ltd. v Music Broadcast Ltd. & Rajasthan Patrika Pvt. Ltd.* (Commercial IP Suit No 84 of 2022, decided on 28 April 2023), which held that the 2012 amendment effectively overturns the earlier position and restores independent royalty rights for authors of underlying works in sound recordings and cinematograph films.

Subsequent cases have actively rebalanced this equation by recognising the strengthened statutory rights of authors and performers, while also addressing the implications of digital distribution. Courts have increasingly interpreted copyright law in light of the 2012 amendment and the digital economy.

For instance, in *Tips Industries Ltd v Wynk Music Ltd and Anr* (2019 SCC OnLine Bom 13087), affirmed by a Division Bench of the Bombay High Court on 2 October 2023, the Court held that internet-based music streaming services do not qualify as “broadcasting organisations” under Section 31D of the Copyright Act, 1957, and therefore cannot avail statutory licences. Consequently, streaming platforms are required to enter into voluntary licensing agreements with copyright owners. This decision has had a significant impact on the digital music ecosystem, as it clarifies the licensing framework applicable to streaming services and reinforces the bargaining position of rights holders.

Disputes involving copyright societies have further brought attention to issues of royalty distribution and transparency. The functioning of organisations such as the Indian Performing Right Society has been subject to judicial scrutiny, culminating in recent rulings that emphasise accountability, fair distribution practices, and the statutory entitlement of authors to royalties under the amended framework.

Despite these developments, judicial intervention remains reactive rather than proactive. While courts have provided important clarifications, the pace of technological change often outstrips the ability of the legal system to respond effectively.

VIII. EMERGING ISSUES IN DIGITAL MUSIC CONSUMPTION

The shift to digital platforms has transformed the economic structure of the music industry and introduced new legal challenges. Streaming platforms, algorithm-based suggestions, and user-created content have established a framework that questions conventional ideas of copyright protection and ownership.

In particular, the question of how value is created and distributed in the digital landscape has emerged as a central concern. Although platforms offer unmatched reach and accessibility, they also centralize control over distribution and monetization, which raises issues regarding fairness and sustainability.

The next section will explore these matters more thoroughly, concentrating on the effects of streaming services, online piracy, and platform responsibility

IX. DIGITAL PLATFORMS AND THE STREAMING ECONOMY

The emergence of digital streaming platforms has fundamentally restructured the economic architecture of the music industry. Platforms such as Spotify, Apple Music, and YouTube have replaced traditional models of music consumption, shifting the industry from ownership-based systems (purchase of CDs or downloads) to access-based models driven by subscriptions and ad revenue.

At first glance, streaming appears to democratise the music industry by lowering barriers to entry and enabling independent artists to distribute their work globally. However, a closer examination reveals a highly centralised ecosystem in which platforms exercise significant control over visibility, monetisation, and audience reach.

The revenue model of streaming platforms is particularly critical to understanding the imbalance within the industry. Revenue generated through subscriptions and advertisements is pooled and distributed based on the proportion of total streams. This “pro-rata” system disproportionately favours highly streamed artists and major record labels, often leaving independent creators with minimal earnings despite substantial listener engagement. In this context, judicial developments such as *Tips Industries Ltd v Wynk Music Ltd* have clarified that streaming platforms cannot rely on statutory licensing

and must negotiate private licences, thereby directly influencing the structure of revenue flows and bargaining dynamics within the streaming economy.

Moreover, the contractual relationships between platforms and record labels further complicate the distribution of revenue. Labels typically negotiate licensing agreements on behalf of artists, retaining a significant share of the revenue before passing on a fraction to creators. As a result, even though digital platforms generate substantial income, the financial benefits accruing to individual artists remain limited.

Another concern is algorithmic control. Streaming platforms rely on recommendation algorithms to curate content, thereby influencing what users listen to. While this enhances user experience, it also creates a form of gatekeeping, where visibility is determined not solely by artistic merit but by platform-driven metrics. This raises important questions regarding fairness, transparency, and the concentration of power within the digital music ecosystem.

X. DIGITAL PIRACY AND THE LIMITS OF ENFORCEMENT

Despite advancements in technology and legal frameworks, digital piracy continues to pose one of the most significant threats to copyright protection in the music industry. Unlike traditional forms of infringement, digital piracy operates on a scale that is both global and instantaneous, making it extremely difficult to regulate effectively.

Unauthorized distribution of music occurs through various channels, including peer-to-peer file sharing, illegal streaming websites, and unlicensed downloads. Even legitimate platforms can inadvertently facilitate infringement through user-generated content, where copyrighted works are uploaded without proper authorization.

The challenge of enforcement lies not only in identifying infringing content but also in addressing the jurisdictional complexities associated with cross-border digital activity⁵.

⁵ TRIPS Agreement, 1994

A website hosting pirated content may operate from a different country, making it difficult for Indian authorities to take effective action.

Legal resources provided by the Copyright Act of 1957 consist of civil actions like injunctions and damages, along with criminal penalties for intentional infringement. Nonetheless, these solutions tend to be reactive and require significant time, hindering their efficiency in the rapidly evolving digital landscape.

Measures like website blocking orders and dynamic injunctions have been implemented to tackle these challenges. Courts have progressively acknowledged the necessity for adaptable enforcement methods that can respond to the changing landscape of digital piracy. However, these actions raise worries about overstepping boundaries and the possible effect on freedom of speech.

In the end, the ongoing issue of digital piracy highlights the shortcomings of solely legal approaches. Technological solutions, collaboration among industries, and user education are all vital in tackling the issue.

XI. PLATFORM LIABILITY AND THE SAFE HARBOUR DEBATE

One of the most contentious issues in the digital copyright landscape is the question of platform liability. Online intermediaries such as YouTube host vast amounts of user-generated content, much of which may involve copyrighted material. Determining the extent to which these platforms should be held responsible for infringement has been a subject of intense legal and policy debate.

Under Indian law, intermediaries are generally protected by “safe harbour” provisions, which shield them from liability provided they act as neutral platforms and comply with due diligence requirements. This approach is intended to promote innovation and the growth of digital services by preventing excessive liability.

However, critics argue that safe harbour protections⁶ allow platforms to benefit economically from copyrighted content without adequately compensating creators. Platforms often generate revenue through advertisements placed alongside user-uploaded content, raising questions about whether they should bear greater responsibility for ensuring that such content is properly licensed.

Globally, there has been a shift towards imposing stricter obligations on platforms. For example, the European Union has introduced measures requiring platforms to take proactive steps to prevent the availability of infringing content. These developments reflect a broader trend towards rebalancing the relationship between platforms and rights holders.

In the Indian context, the debate remains unresolved. While safe harbour provisions continue to play a crucial role in supporting digital innovation, there is growing recognition of the need to ensure that they do not undermine the rights of creators.

XII. ROYALTY DISTRIBUTION AND STRUCTURAL INEQUALITY

The issue of royalty distribution lies at the heart of many disputes within the music industry. Despite the existence of statutory provisions aimed at ensuring fair compensation, the actual distribution of revenue remains highly unequal.

The 2012 amendment to the Copyright Act, 1957 sought to address this issue by granting authors of literary and musical works an inalienable right to receive royalties. This was a significant step towards recognising the contributions of composers and lyricists, who had historically been marginalised in revenue-sharing arrangements.

However, the practical implementation of these provisions has been fraught with challenges. One of the key issues is the lack of transparency in royalty collection and distribution. Copyright societies, such as the Indian Performing Right Society, play a

⁶ Information Technology Act, 2000 (India)

central role in managing rights and distributing royalties, but their functioning has often been criticised for inefficiency and lack of accountability.

Additionally, the complexity of digital revenue streams further complicates the process. Earnings from streaming platforms are influenced by multiple factors, including subscription models, advertising revenue, and licensing agreements. Determining how these revenues should be fairly distributed among stakeholders is an ongoing challenge.

The persistence of these issues highlights the need for stronger regulatory oversight and more transparent mechanisms. Without such reforms, the promise of equitable compensation under copyright law is unlikely to be fully realised.

XIII. BEGINNING OF CRITICAL ANALYSIS: LAW VS REALITY

A detailed analysis of the existing legal framework reveals a significant gap between law in theory and its application in practice. Despite efforts to enhance creators' rights through legislative reforms, the music industry is still influenced by power disparities, technological changes, and institutional constraints.

A notable contradiction exists in the presence of robust statutory rights alongside inadequate enforcement mechanisms. In theory, writers and creators have strong safeguards, such as entitlement to royalties and authority over how their creations are utilized. In reality, these rights are frequently weakened by contractual agreements and the influence of intermediaries.

Similarly, while digital platforms have expanded opportunities for artists, they have also created new forms of dependency. Artists are increasingly dependent on platforms for exposure and income but have little control over the conditions of participation. This imbalance of power poses significant inquiries into the future of creative independence in the digital era.

Another area of concern is the reactive nature of legal reform. The law often responds to technological developments only after significant disruption has occurred, resulting in a

persistent lag between innovation and regulation. This lag creates uncertainty and undermines the effectiveness of copyright protection.

XIV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: LESSONS FROM INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

A comparative perspective is essential to understanding the limitations of the Indian copyright framework and identifying potential pathways for reform. Jurisdictions such as the United States and the European Union have adopted more adaptive and technologically responsive approaches to copyright regulation in the digital music industry.

In the United States, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act⁷ introduced a structured notice-and-takedown regime, enabling copyright holders to request the removal of infringing content from online platforms. This mechanism provides a relatively swift response to infringement, although it has been criticised for placing the burden of enforcement on rights holders rather than platforms.

Additionally, the U.S. has implemented licensing reforms through legislation such as the Music Modernization Act, which aims to streamline royalty distribution and improve transparency in digital music licensing.⁸ These reforms reflect a recognition of the need to modernise copyright law in response to the streaming economy.

The European Union, on the other hand, has taken a more interventionist approach. The EU Copyright Directive 2019⁹ imposes greater responsibility on digital platforms by requiring them to take proactive measures to prevent the availability of infringing content. This includes the use of content recognition technologies and stricter licensing obligations.

⁷ Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 1998 (USA)

⁸ Orrin G Hatch-Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act 2018, Pub L No 115-264, 132 Stat 3676 (USA).

⁹ Directive (EU) 2019/790 on Copyright in the Digital Single Market

While these measures have been welcomed by rights holders, they have also raised concerns regarding over-regulation and the potential impact on freedom of expression. Nevertheless, they represent a shift towards holding platforms more accountable for the content they host.

In comparison, India's approach remains relatively conservative. Although safe harbour provisions and judicial innovations such as dynamic injunctions provide some level of protection, there is a lack of comprehensive statutory mechanisms tailored specifically to the digital environment. This suggests that India could benefit from adopting a more balanced approach that combines elements of both the U.S. and EU models.

XV. DEEP CRITICAL ANALYSIS: STRUCTURAL GAPS IN THE INDIAN FRAMEWORK

A more detailed look at the Indian copyright system shows that its issues are not just technical but also structural. These structural problems arise from the convergence of legal frameworks, industry standards, and technological advancements.

Initially, there is a basic disparity in negotiating strength between creators and intermediaries. Although the law officially acknowledges the rights of authors and composers, the industry's practical circumstances frequently force them into disadvantageous agreements. This undermines the core goal of copyright protection, which is to promote creativity by guaranteeing appropriate compensation.

Moreover, the mechanisms for enforcement are insufficient in tackling the extent and intricacy of digital violations. Dependence on conventional legal remedies like injunctions and damages is inadequate for a context where infringement happens instantly and spans multiple jurisdictions. While courts have sought to innovate with approaches such as dynamic injunctions, these initiatives are fundamentally constrained by procedural limitations.

Thirdly, the role of digital platforms introduces a new dimension of regulatory challenge. Platforms function not merely as intermediaries but as powerful economic actors that

shape the distribution and monetisation of content. However, the current legal framework does not fully account for this dual role, resulting in a regulatory gap.

Furthermore, the lack of transparency in royalty distribution systems continues to erode trust within the industry. Artists often have limited visibility of how their works are monetised, leading to disputes and dissatisfaction. This issue is compounded by the complexity of digital revenue models, which are not easily understood or regulated.

Finally, the pace of technological advancement has outstripped the ability of the legal system to respond effectively. Emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence and automated content generation are likely to further complicate questions of authorship, originality, and ownership, necessitating a more forward-looking approach to copyright law.

XVI. RECOMMENDATIONS AND REFORM PROPOSALS

In light of the challenges identified, this paper proposes a set of targeted reforms aimed at strengthening copyright protection in the music industry while ensuring fairness and adaptability.

- 1. Strengthening Enforcement Mechanisms:** There is an urgent need to modernise enforcement strategies to address digital infringement. This may include the establishment of specialised intellectual property tribunals with expertise in digital copyright issues, as well as the adoption of expedited procedures for handling online infringement cases.
- 2. Enhancing Platform Accountability:** India should consider introducing clearer statutory obligations for digital platforms, requiring them to take proactive steps to prevent infringement while maintaining a balance with innovation and free expression. A calibrated approach, drawing from both U.S. and EU models¹⁰, would be most effective.

¹⁰ EU Copyright Directive, 2019

3. **Ensuring Transparency in Royalty Distribution:** Regulatory oversight of copyright societies should be strengthened to ensure greater transparency and accountability. The use of technology, such as blockchain-based tracking systems, could improve accuracy in royalty allocation and reduce disputes.
4. **Protecting Authors' Rights in Practice:** While the law recognises the rights of authors, additional safeguards are needed to ensure that these rights are not undermined by contractual arrangements. Standardised contract guidelines or minimum royalty guarantees could help address the imbalance of bargaining power.
5. **Promoting Awareness and Capacity Building:** Many creators, particularly emerging artists, lack awareness of their legal rights. Educational initiatives and legal support mechanisms can empower artists to make informed decisions and assert their rights more effectively.
6. **Future-Proofing Copyright Law:** Given the rapid pace of technological change, copyright law must adopt a more anticipatory approach. This includes addressing issues related to artificial intelligence, digital sampling, and emerging forms of content creation before they become widespread sources of dispute.

XVII. CONCLUSION

The shift of the music industry in the digital age brings both benefits and obstacles for copyright legislation. Although technological progress has broadened access to music and facilitated new creative expressions, it has also unsettled conventional structures of ownership, distribution, and compensation.

The Indian copyright system, based on the Copyright Act of 1957, has significantly developed to respond to these transformations. Nevertheless, as this paper has shown, significant deficiencies persist regarding enforcement, transparency, and structural equity.

The main difficulty is finding a balance among conflicting interests—safeguarding creators' rights, fostering innovation, and guaranteeing public access to cultural

materials. This requires not only legal reform but also the strengthening of institutional mechanisms and greater collaboration within the industry.

In the end, the success of copyright law relies on its capacity to evolve with shifting circumstances while staying true to its fundamental aim: promoting creativity by guaranteeing that creators receive proper acknowledgment and compensation. As the music industry develops further, the legal structures that oversee it must also adapt.

XVIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Legislation

1. Copyright Act, 1957 (India)
2. Information Technology Act, 2000 (India)
3. International Instruments
4. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works 1886
5. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) 1994

B. Cases

1. Indian Performing Right Society Ltd v Eastern India Motion Pictures
2. Association AIR 1977 SC 1443
3. Tips Industries Ltd v Wynk Music Ltd (2019) Bombay High Court
4. Indian Performing Right Society Ltd v Music Broadcast Ltd & Rajasthan
5. Patrika Pvt Ltd (2023) Bombay High Court

C. Secondary Sources

1. Dev Gangjee, *Relocating the Law of Geographical Indications* (Cambridge University Press 2012)

2. P Narayanan, *Intellectual Property Law* (Eastern Law House, latest edn)
WIPO, 'Guide on the Licensing of Copyright and Related Rights' (World Intellectual Property Organization)

D. Reports and Policy Documents

1. Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade, Government of India, Copyright Office publications
2. European Union, Directive (EU) 2019/790 on Copyright in the Digital Single Market
3. United States, Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998