

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
BUSINESS AND PROPERTY COURTS OF ENGLAND AND WALES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LIST (ChD)
Intellectual Property

Claim No. IL-2021-000092



MR JUSTICE MELLOR

3rd FEBRUARY 2022

B E T W E E N:

IL-2021-000092

- (1) COLUMBIA PICTURES INDUSTRIES, INC.
- (2) DISNEY ENTERPRISES, INC.
- (3) NETFLIX STUDIOS, LLC
- (4) PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION
- (5) SKY UK LIMITED
- (6) UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS PRODUCTIONS LLLP
- (7) WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT INC.

(suing on their own behalf and on behalf of all other companies that are controlled by them, controlling of them or under their common control (the “Group Companies”) that are the owners, or exclusive licensees, of the copyright in motion pictures and television programmes)

Applicants

-and-

- (1) BRITISH TELECOMMUNICATIONS PLC
- (2) EE LIMITED
- (3) PLUSNET PLC
- (4) SKY UK LIMITED
- (5) TALKTALK TELECOM LIMITED
- (6) VIRGIN MEDIA LIMITED

Respondents

ORDER

UPON THE APPLICATION of the above-named Applicants by Application Notice dated 22 December 2021 (the “**Application**”)

AND UPON reading the Bundle of documents filed, including in particular the witness statement of Rachel Alexander and the Expert Report of Michael Walsh

AND UPON the Respondents neither consenting to nor opposing the application but considering that it is appropriate for the Court to determine the proportionality of relief

AND UPON the Court being satisfied on the evidence before the Court that each of the Respondents is a service provider within the meaning of s. 97A(1) of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

("CDPA") whose services are used by the operators and/or users of the Target Websites (as defined in Schedule 1 to this Order) to infringe the copyrights of the Applicants in the United Kingdom

AND UPON the Court recording that, for the purposes of this Application, no allegations of copyright infringement have been made against the Respondents

AND UPON the Applicants accepting, for the purposes of this Application, that the Respondents' services would, in any event, satisfy the conditions of regulation 17 of the Electronic Commerce (EC Directive) Regulations 2002 such that the Respondents have the benefit of the protections conferred by that provision

AND UPON the Applicants undertaking to each of the Respondents and the Court that if the Court later finds that this Order has caused loss to the Respondents or any of them, and decides that the Respondents or any of them should be compensated for that loss, the Applicants will comply with any order the Court may make

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. That, within 10 working days of the date of notification, the Respondents shall block or attempt to block access to the Target Websites, their domains and sub-domains and any other IP address or URL notified to them by the Applicants or their agents whose sole or predominant purpose is to enable or facilitate access to a Target Website.
2. For the avoidance of any doubt:
 - a. paragraph 1 is complied with if a Respondent uses the technical means set out in Schedule 2 to this Order or any alternative and equivalent (including replacement) technical means to those set out in Schedule 2 to this Order provided that the Respondent gives notice to the Applicants of the change, and in respect of the customers set out in Schedule 2 to this Order;
 - b. a Respondent who adopts IP address blocking measures shall only be required to block IP addresses in respect of which the Applicants or their agents notify the Respondents that the server with the notified IP address does not also host a site that is not part of a Target Website (whether as defined in this Order or in any earlier order of the court made pursuant to an Application under section 97A of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988);
 - c. the Respondents are wholly reliant on the Applicants accurately identifying the IP addresses and/or URLs which should be blocked under the terms of this Order. The Respondents have no obligation to verify whether the Applicants' or their agents' determination is correct;
 - d. the caveat set out in Confidential Schedule 3 applies to this Order.
3. The Applicants or their agents must notify the Respondents should:
 - a. any IP address and/or URL which has already been notified to the Respondents under the terms of this Order cease to be a location whose sole or predominant purpose is to enable or facilitate access to a Target Website. In this case the Respondents shall no longer be obliged to block that IP address and/or URL;
 - b. any Target Website move to an IP address where the server at that IP address hosts a site or sites that are not part of a Target Website, or should a server hosting a Target Website commence hosting a site or sites that are not part of a Target Website;
 - c. any Target Website where the server with the notified IP address hosts a site or sites that are not part of a Target Website and one or more of the site or sites that are not part of a Target Website ceases to carry out unlawful activity. In this case the Respondents shall not be required to block that IP address.

4. Notification under paragraphs 1 and 3 above must:
 - a. be sent as soon as reasonably practicable from the date on which the Applicants or their agents become aware of the change in status of the Target Website or server, as the case may be;
 - b. be sent electronically according to a schedule and in a machine-readable digital format to be agreed with each of the Respondents;
 - c. be provided no more frequently than once per week;
 - d. be sent to all Respondents on the same date; and
 - e. be implemented by the Respondents within 10 working days of receipt of a notification in the format agreed pursuant to paragraph 4(b) of this Order.
5. Where access to a Target Website is blocked by a Respondent pursuant to paragraph 1 above, that Respondent must take reasonable steps to make available the following information to customers whose access is impeded:
 - a. that access to the website has been blocked by court order;
 - b. the identity of the parties who obtained this Order; and
 - c. a statement that affected users have the right to apply to the Court to discharge or vary the Order.
6. For the avoidance of doubt, the information published to a customer pursuant to paragraph 5 may direct the customer to another URL through which the information set out at paragraph 5 is accessible.
7. A Respondent will not be in breach of this Order if it temporarily ceases to take the steps ordered in paragraph 1 (either in whole or in part) upon forming the reasonable view that suspension is necessary:
 - a. in order to:
 - i. correct or investigate over-blocking of material which is, or is reasonably suspected to be, caused by the steps taken pursuant to paragraph 1;
 - ii. ensure the reliable operation of its Internet Watch Foundation blocking system, if it reasonably considers that such operation is otherwise likely to be impaired;
 - iii. maintain the integrity of its internet service or the functioning of its blocking system;
 - iv. upgrade, troubleshoot or maintain its blocking system; or
 - v. avert or respond to an imminent security threat to its networks or systems;
 - b. and provided that:
 - i. it notifies the Applicants or their agents of such suspension and the reasons for the same as soon as reasonably practicable; and
 - ii. such suspension lasts no longer than is reasonably necessary.
8. For the avoidance of doubt, where this Order refers to a “**URL**” that is a reference to a uniform resource locator for a specific internet resource which comprises at least a fully qualified domain

name, and optionally a specified resource within that domain name. Where a URL does not refer to a specified resource, the URL will be deemed to include all sub-pages of the URL.

9. Where the operator of a Target Website has provided a contact email address which appears to be intended to receive communications about the operation of that site, the Applicants shall give notice of this Order to the operator by sending a copy of it, together with a copy of the skeleton argument submitted to the court, to the email address provided.
10. The proceedings shall be stayed, save for the purposes of any application to give effect to the terms of this Order and save that the parties have permission to apply on notice in the event of any material change of circumstances including, for the avoidance of doubt but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, in respect of the costs, consequences for the parties and effectiveness of the aforesaid technical means from time to time.
11. The operators of the Target Websites (as defined in Schedule 1 to this Order) and the operators of any other website who claim to be affected by this Order and any customer of the Respondents, are to have permission to apply on notice to vary or discharge this Order insofar as it affects such an applicant, any such application to be on 10 days' notice to all the parties and to be supported by materials setting out and justifying the grounds for the application, including (supported by evidence) clear indication of the status of the applicant.
12. The Applicants shall pay each Respondent its marginal costs of the initial implementation of the Order and its costs of complying with this Order during its lifetime, including in response to notifications sent by the Applicants or their agents under paragraphs 1 or 3 of this Order, to the extent that such costs are reasonable.
13. Within 30 days of being served with a written statement of the costs referred to in paragraph 12 above by any Respondent, the Applicants shall pay to that Respondent those costs in full, unless within that period an application is made concerning the reasonableness of the costs claimed. The parties have liberty to apply in the event of any dispute concerning the reasonableness of any costs claimed pursuant to this paragraph.
14. The costs of the Application are reserved.

Service of the Order

The court has provided a sealed copy of this Order to the serving party:

Wiggin LLP at 10th Floor, Met Building, 22 Percy Street, London W1T 2BU (Ref: RA/OA/ER)

SCHEDULE 1

Target Websites

The target websites that are currently accessible at:

- mixdrop.co; and
- mixdrop.me,

and include any name and URL changes to these websites notified in writing to the Respondents by the Applicants from time to time (together the “**Target Websites**” and each a “**Target Website**”).

SCHEDULE 2

Technical Means

In relation to British Telecommunications Plc (the “First Respondent”)

1. In respect of its customers to whose internet service the system known as Cleanfeed is applied whether optionally or otherwise, the technical means are:
 - (i) IP blocking in respect of each and every IP address notified to the First Respondent for IP blocking in accordance with this Order; and
 - (ii) IP address re-routing in respect of each and every IP address notified to the First Respondent for re-routing in accordance with this Order; and
 - (iii) DPI-based URL blocking utilising at least summary analysis in respect of each and every URL notified to the First Respondent in accordance with this Order.
2. In respect of its customers who use the First Respondent’s Domain Name System (“DNS”) servers, the technical means is DNS blocking in respect of each and every domain name or sub-domain notified to the First Respondent in accordance with this Order.
3. For the avoidance of doubt, paragraph 1 of the Order is complied with if the First Respondent uses the systems known as Cleanfeed (for the avoidance of doubt, this does not require the First Respondent to adopt DPI-based URL blocking utilising detailed analysis) and Nominum Vantio Cacheserv or any subsequent system that has equivalent relevant functionality.

In relation to EE Limited (the “Second Respondent”)

4. In respect of its customers to whose internet service the system known as Cleanfeed is applied whether optionally or otherwise, the technical means are:
 - (i) IP blocking in respect of each and every IP address notified to the Second Respondent for IP blocking in accordance with this Order; and
 - (ii) IP address re-routing in respect of each and every IP address notified to the Second Respondent for re-routing in accordance with this Order; and
 - (iii) DPI-based URL blocking utilising at least summary analysis in respect of each and every URL notified to the Second Respondent in accordance with this Order.
5. For the avoidance of doubt, paragraph 1 of the Order is complied with if the Second Respondent uses the system known as Cleanfeed (for the avoidance of doubt, this does not require the Second Respondent to adopt DPI-based URL blocking utilising detailed analysis) or any subsequent system that has equivalent relevant functionality.

In relation to Plusnet Plc (the “Third Respondent”)

6. In respect of its customers to whose internet service the system known as Cleanfeed is applied whether optionally or otherwise, the technical means are:
 - (i) IP blocking in respect of each and every IP address notified to the Third Respondent for IP blocking in accordance with this Order; and

- (ii) IP address re-routing in respect of each and every IP address notified to the Third Respondent for re-routing in accordance with this Order; and
 - (iii) DPI-based URL blocking utilising at least summary analysis in respect of each and every URL notified to the Third Respondent in accordance with this Order.
7. In respect of its customers who use the Third Respondent's Domain Name System ("DNS") servers, the technical means is DNS blocking in respect of each and every domain name or sub-domain notified to the Third Respondent in accordance with this Order.
8. For the avoidance of doubt, paragraph 1 of the Order is complied with if the Third Respondent uses the systems known as Cleanfeed (for the avoidance of doubt, this does not require the Third Respondent to adopt DPI-based URL blocking utilising detailed analysis) and Nominum Vantio Cacheserv or any subsequent system that has equivalent relevant functionality.

In relation to Sky UK Limited (the "Fourth Respondent")

9. In respect of its residential fixed line broadband customers to whose service the system known as Hawkeye is applied, whether optionally or otherwise, the technical means are:
- (i) IP blocking in respect of each and every IP address notified to the Fourth Respondent for IP blocking in accordance with this Order; and
 - (ii) IP address re-routing in respect of each and every IP address notified to the Fourth Respondent for re-routing in accordance with this Order; and
 - (iii) URL blocking in respect of each and every URL notified to the Fourth Respondent in accordance with this Order.
10. For the avoidance of doubt, paragraph 1 of the Order is complied with if the Fourth Respondent uses the system known as Hawkeye or any subsequent system that has equivalent relevant functionality.

In relation to TalkTalk Telecom Limited (the "Fifth Respondent")

11. In respect of its customers to whose internet access service the system known as StreamShield is applied, whether optionally or otherwise, the technical means is URL blocking in respect of each and every URL notified to the Fifth Respondent in accordance with this Order.
12. In respect of its customers to whose internet access service the measure known as blackholing is applied, whether optionally or otherwise, the technical means is IP blocking in respect of each and every IP address notified to the Fifth Respondent for IP blocking in accordance with this Order, using the measure known as blackholing.
13. For the avoidance of doubt, paragraph 1 of the Order is complied with if the Fifth Respondent uses the systems known as StreamShield and blackholing or any subsequent system that has equivalent relevant functionality.

In relation to Virgin Media Limited (the "Sixth Respondent")

14. In respect of its fixed-line residential and business retail broadband customers to whose internet access service the system known as Web Blocker 3 is applied, the technical means are:

- (i) IP blocking in respect of each and every IP address notified to the Sixth Respondent for IP blocking in accordance with this Order; and
 - (ii) URL blocking in respect of each and every URL notified to the Sixth Respondent for URL blocking in accordance with this Order.
15. For the avoidance of doubt, paragraph 1 of the Order is complied with if the Sixth Respondent uses the system known as Web Blocker 3 or any subsequent system that has equivalent relevant functionality.

CONFIDENTIAL SCHEDULE 3

Where URLs are notified, a Respondent will not be required to block if information on which the block is based is encrypted.