

## SUMMARIES

### MOBILE APPLICATION AND WHAT BEHIND IS – IP RIGHTS RELATED TO THE APPLICATIONS – PART I

*Evelin Erzsébet Béres*

In recent years, mobile applications or mobile apps have become an integral part of our everyday lives. The mobile apps market is fast-growing, as thousands of new mobile apps are released every month, enhancing the existing millions of mobile apps that are available on the App Store and on Google Play. The mobile app industry is one of the most competitive industries; however, a unique idea is not enough to make an app visible. This publication is intended to give an overview of how to shine out with a conscious intellectual property (IP) strategy. The first part of the publication covers the copyright perspective: in the context of mobile apps the software, graphical user interface (GUI), images, fonts, menus, figures could be protected by copyright. Interesting topic, which also worth examining is the sui generis database protection of mobile apps.

### BUT WHO GUARDS THE GUARDS? THE FILTERING MECHANISM OF THE CDSM DIRECTIVE AND THE FREEDOM OF OPINION

*Dr Róbert Baranyi*

Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market and amending Directives 96/9/EC and 2001/29/EC (hereinafter: CDSM directive) have disrupted the liability regime for content sharing providers in several respects. Article 17 of the CDSM Directive has also proved to be such a contradictory provision, in relation to which the study analyzes how the automated filtering tools introduced as a result of the direct liability of content sharing providers in the absence of user licences restricts freedom of expression. The study extensively examines EU case law, the liability regime of content sharing service providers, and provides an in-depth analysis of automated content recognition tools and their limitations.

THE LATEST ISSUE OF COMMUNICATION WORKS TO THE PUBLIC IN LIGHT  
OF THE JUDGEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE IN THE CASE VG  
BILD-KUNST VERSUS STIFTUNG PREUSSISCHER KULTURBESITZ

*Zsigmond Ferge*

Where the copyright holder has adopted or imposed measures to restrict framing, the embedding of a work in a website page of a third party, by means of that technique, constitutes making available that work to a new public. That communication to the public must, consequently, be authorized by the copyright holder. A copyright holder may not limit his or her consent to framing by means other than effective technological measures. In the absence of such measures, it might prove difficult to ascertain whether that right holder intended to oppose the framing of his or her works.