

WORLD DATA PROTECTION REPORT >>>

News and analysis of data protection developments around the world.
For the latest updates, visit www.bna.com

International Information for International Business

Volume 13, Number 4

April 2013

English Court of Appeal Issues Decision in Key Database Rights Infringement Case

By Sarah Byrt and Mark Prinsley, of Mayer Brown International LLP, London.

The English Court of Appeal has delivered its decision in the long-running case *Football Dataco Ltd & Ors v Stan James Plc & Ors* ([2013] EWCA Civ 27 (February 6, 2013)), which related to rights in data and infringement on the internet. The judgment is good news, not just for those exploiting information about sports matches (which has given rise to several cases already) but also for those with valuable scientific and other databases. It also sheds light on when and where web-based infringements take place.

Background

In brief, Football Dataco spent some £600,000 (U.S.\$918,200) a year collecting data on English Premier League and other UK football matches, using a network of retired football players phoning in information from football grounds. It exploited this content by licensing to the BBC and others. Data which seemed to come from its Football Live database appeared on a betting website operated by Stan James, which in turn sourced that data from the defendants, Sportradar. While some of that data was licensed from Football Dataco's owners, Sportradar could not satisfactorily explain where it had obtained the remainder from.

This latest development in the saga — the English Court of Appeal judgment, issued February 6, 2013 —

follows a decision by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) on the question of where Football Dataco had to sue.

Sportradar's servers were in Germany and Austria, but the CJEU said that Football Dataco could bring the case in England because that was where the punters who used the betting website were based and it was clear that the website targeted those in the United Kingdom (*see analysis at WDP, December 2012, page 19*).

The Court of Appeal gave short shrift to Sportradar's arguments that Football Dataco's database did not qualify for EU database rights.

The criteria for this right are summarised as follows:

When Does an EU Database Right Exist and When is it Infringed?	
There is a "database".	A collection of independent works, data or other materials, arranged in a systematic or methodical way and individually accessible by electronic or other means.
There is the right kind of "investment".	A substantial investment (of financial, human or technical resources) in obtaining, verifying or presenting the contents of the database. But investment in creating data — <i>e.g.</i> , fixture lists — does not count.

There is an infringing act.	Extraction (<i>i.e.</i> , the permanent or temporary transfer of database contents to another medium) or re-utilisation (making database contents available to the public) of all or a substantial part of those contents.
Takes place in an EU country.	Where infringement takes place via a website, the claimant can sue in the country which the website targets and to which it provides the database contents (regardless of where the services are located).

An earlier case relating to horseracing data had established that the only “investment” which counts for the purposes of working out whether there is legal protection is investment in obtaining, verifying or presenting database contents — rather than creating them in the first place. Sportradar tried to argue that Football Dataco was just “creating” match data, which would have meant that this was a wrong kind of investment. That argument failed. As the court said, “only a metaphysicist would say a goal is not scored until the [football analyst says] that it has been scored. The same metaphysicist might also deny a temperature exists unless and until it is recorded, but he would feel hot in a Turkish bath even without a thermometer.”

Scientific and Other Databases

This point is relevant to all kinds of databases. Scientific databases which record pre-existing data (such as temperatures or other measurements) can still be protected by a database right, since that data exists even before it has been recorded. In the horseracing case (*William Hill v. British Horseracing Board*), the primary investment was in actually creating fixture lists, rather than obtaining or verifying them. So there is a fine line between activities which count and those which do not. In the financial sector, this raises interesting issues about rights in databases of prices and other valuable data.

The judgment goes on to declare that it does not matter if the same person is creating the data (investment which does not count) and then obtaining, verifying or presenting it (which does). Finally, it does not matter whether some of the database contents are subjective (*e.g.*, identifying a goal as being worthy of “goal of the year”) — the database right does not protect only objective data.

When are Website Operators Liable for Infringement?

Another interesting aspect of this decision relates to infringement by uploading data which is not then read.

Here, punters using the Stan James website clicked on a pop-up box which automatically uploaded all of the Sportradar “Live Scores” data onto their personal computers. That data was encrypted and so could not be seen until the punter chose to see any part of it using a de-encryption key like a magnifying glass. The Court of Appeal said it was “hopeless” to argue that there was no infringement just because the punter could not see all of the data. As shown in the table, the database right is infringed, amongst other things, by the “temporary transfer of the contents” to another medium — *i.e.*, from the Sportradar database to the punter’s computer. It did not matter that the punter would normally only be interested in just part of the data, just as someone using a dictionary will only ever consult a small proportion of the entire contents.

The appeal against a decision that Sportradar had taken a “substantial part” of Football Dataco’s database also failed, even though Sportradar had reduced the amount taken during the course of the case. The amount taken at that later stage (just goal data) still represented a substantial investment because it still involved having people sitting at every ground and reliably reporting what they had seen.

The CJEU’s 2012 ruling held that Sportradar was liable for infringing activity in its own right because it targeted punters in the United Kingdom. The same applied to Stan James, which the Court of Appeal said was plainly a joint tortfeasor (*i.e.*, was jointly infringing the database right) with Sportradar and with UK punters. The key issue was that, “if A has a website containing infringing material which will inevitably be copied onto the computer of B if he enters that website”, then A is a joint tortfeasor with B. The website provider does not just facilitate infringement, it causes every UK user who accesses the website to infringe.

This part of the decision holds out the possibility that website operators whose sites point to others, from which data is downloaded, will be liable if that data turns out to be infringing. They could protect themselves to some extent by obtaining indemnities from their data suppliers. Here, it seems that Stan James had not obtained an indemnity from Sportradar, so it too was financially at risk.

The text of the Court of Appeal’s judgment can be accessed at <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2013/27.html>.

Sarah Byrt and Mark Prinsley are Partners with Mayer Brown International LLP, London. They may be contacted at sbyrt@mayerbrown.com and mprinsley@mayerbrown.com.