journals.unizik.edu.ng/jcpl/index ISSN: 2736-0342
NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA
JOURNAL OF COMMERCIAL AND PROPERTY LAW Vol. 12(3), July, 2025

COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT ON SOCIAL MEDIA: LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND CHALLENGES

Daniel P. Saredau*
Solomon Salvation**
Emmanuel Christopher Diah***

Abstract
The proliferation of social media has transformed the way content is created, shared, and consumed, and concomitantly raised significant concerns about copyright infringement. This paper examines the legal framework governing copyright infringement on social media platforms and the challenges that arise in enforcing these laws. Beginning with an examination of the fundamentals of copyright law and social media, the paper explores the legal protections afforded to creative works in the digital age. Through a review of illustrative cases, it highlights the complexities and nuances of copyright infringement on social media platforms. The paper explores key challenges in enforcing copyright on social media, including the ease of content sharing, jurisdictional issues, and the tension between protecting creative works and preserving freedom of expression. Building on these findings, the paper recommends practical strategies for addressing the wrongful exploitation of creative works on social media, and aimed at promoting a more balanced and effective approach to copyright enforcement in the digital environment. By exploring the complexities of copyright infringement on social media, this paper contributes to ongoing efforts to protect creative works while fostering innovation and freedom of expression online. The result is a more balanced digital ecosystem.

Keywords: social media, copyright infringement, creative works

1. Introduction

Intellectual property law protects innovations and creations that originates from the ingenuity of the human mind.[1] Copyright as a branch of intellectual property law, allows these innovators and creators to control how their work is used, shared, or reproduced by others.[2] This protection is available to many innovators or creators of original works like authors, performers, composers, publishers, architects, designers, and producers of both traditional and digital media content.

The advent of the internet and the explosive growth of social media have significantly altered how works are shared and consumed. The internet is now teeming with personal websites, social platforms, and content-sharing tools that make it easy for users to become publishers in their own right. However, many do so without considering, or even understanding the legal protections that copyright affords.[3] The

***Daniel P. Saredau,** LL. B (University of Abuja), BL (Lagos), LL.M, Ph.D. (University of Ibadan). Head, Department of Public, Taraba State University, Jalingo. dansaredau@yahoo.com
****Solomon Salvation** LL.B (Taraba State University), Candidate for call to the Nigerian Bar. salvationsolomon220@gmail.com
*****Emmanuel Christopher Diah**, LL.B (Taraba State University), Candidate for Call to the Nigerian Bar, Department of Public Law, Taraba State University, Jalingo.

[1] Bhagyamma G, 'Protection of Intellectual Property Rights: An Examination of International Legal Frameworks.' *ILE Intellectual Property and Corporate Law Review* (2023) <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Bhagyamma-G-3/publication/376073638_PROTECTION_OF_INTELLECTUAL_PROPERTY_RIGHTS_AN_EXAMINATION_OF_INTERNATIONAL_LEGAL_FRAMEWORKS/links/6568becfb86a1d521b1cbb42/PROTECTION-OF-INTELLECTUAL-PROPERTY-RIGHTS-AN-EXAMINATION-OF-INTERNATIONAL-LEGAL-FRAMEWORKS.pdf> Accessed June 19, 2025; WIPO, 'Understanding Copyright and Related Rights'(2O16) WIPO Publication No. 909E <www.wipo.int > accessed 19 June 2025

[2] D Jay, and S McJohn, 'Intellectual Property Law: Commercial, Creative and Industrial Property'. *Law Journal Press,* 2025. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=-gLuY2rBU9oC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Intellectual+property+law+governs+creations+made+from+the+human+mind.&ots=qVdRw-8exn&sig=vJzotaKKferEmLP51otRitUqmXA> accessed 19 June 2025

[3] V A Nevey, 'Enforcement of Law of Copyright Infringement and Forgery with the Rise of the Digital Music Industry.' *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure* (2021) <1713-7383-2-PB.pdf> accessed 19 June 2025

borderless nature of the social media has complicated the enforcement of copyright, thereby leaving creators of original works vulnerable to unlawful exploitation of their works.[4]

Moreover, because many copyright statutes predate the rise of social media, they were never designed with the social media in mind. Accordingly, they have struggled to adapt to the ambiguous and borderless nature of content sharing on social media in contemporary times. Some jurisdictions like the United States and Nigeria have attempted to fill this vacuum through legal reform such as the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) and the Copyright Act 2022, respectively. Notwithstanding, these laws have not fully bridged the gap between regulation and enforcement. This is evident in incidents like the disputes between *Epidemic Sound v Meta*, *Mike Ejeagha v Brain Jotter*, and other case scenarios that will be discussed in this paper. These scenarios highlight the complexity and loopholes still embedded in copyright laws and enforcement in contemporary times, especially within social media spaces.

This paper starts by examining the basics of copyright law and social media. We shall thereafter examine illustrative cases of copyright infringement on social media, before exploring the challenges of copyright enforcement on social media. The paper shall conclude with recommendations on how to address the wrongful exploitation of creative works on social media.

2. Basics of Copyright Law

The concept of copyright emerged in England in the 15th and 16th centuries.[5] Before this, books were copied by hand. This made it nearly impossible for authors to control or protect their works. But when printing became widespread, books could be reproduced quickly, and authors, publishers, and authorities could not prevent unauthorized printing and distribution. This led to the Licensing of the Press Act of 1662.[6] The Licensing of the Press Act was enacted in England in 1662 as a means for the government to control the publication of books, pamphlets, and other printed materials.[7] At the time, printing had become a powerful tool for spreading ideas, criticism, and religious or political dissent. To prevent the spread of seditious or heretical material, the government introduced this Act. The Act instated pre-publication censorship, requiring authors and printers to obtain a license before printing any work. It also limited the number of printings presses and authorizes only certain persons and stations to operate them, and it granted authorities the right to search, seize, and destroy unlicensed printed materials.[8]

Further development came with the enactment of the Statute of Anne in 1710.[9] The Statute is recognized as the first formal legislation on copyright. The statute did not protect the right of authors in full, but it acknowledged that authors ought to be the primary beneficiaries of copyright law.[10] The Act introduced the concept of limited duration, then set at 28 years, after which works which are protected by copyright would enter the public domain.[11]

---

[4] Ibid

[5] Lyman Ray Patterson, 'Copyright in Historical Perspective' (Vanderbilt University Press, 1968) <preview-9780826501967_A40479012.pdf > Accessed 19 June 2025

[6] Nipps Karen, 'Cum Privilegio: Licensing of the Press Act of 1662.' *The Library Quarterly* (2014) <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=5b54d339117715bcede0f28c588221beef2515daede7c88f6a863b45ebde824eJmltdHM9MTc1MDI5MTIwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=Nipps%2c+Karen.+%22Cum+privilegio%3a+Licensing+of+the+Press+Act+of+1662.%22+The+Library+Quarterly+84%2c+no.+4+(2014)%3a+494-500.&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuYWNhZGVtaWEuZWR1LzQ4NTM0NjM3L0N1bV9wcml2aWxlZ2lvX0xpY2Vuc2luZ19vZl90aGVfUHJlc3NfQWN0X29mXzE2NjI&ntb=1> Accessed 19 June 2025

[7] Ibid

[8] Ibid

[9] Lyman R. Patterson, *'Copyright in Historical Perspective'* (Vanderbilt University Press, 1968) <preview-9780826501967_A40479012.pdf > Accessed June 19, 2025

[10] William W. Fisher, 'Copyright" *Britanica* (2025) <Copyright | Definition, Examples, & Facts | Britannica> accessed June 19, 2025

[11] Ibid

Today, copyright is a well-defined term used to describe the bundle of exclusive rights which creators hold over their works. The work can be expressed in numerous mediums ranging from books, music, paintings, and films, to modern outputs like computer programs, databases, technical drawings, and advertisements. Essentially, copyright serves as a shield that protects creators from the unauthorized exploitation of their work. These protections extend to acts such as reproducing the work in any material form, publishing, public performance, broadcasting, filming, or making derivatives.[12]

When a person holds copyright over a work, they exclusively determine who may copy or use it. In this sense, copyright is the right to reproduce a work in which the copyright subsists. It bestows exclusive rights to copy, distribute, display, perform, and adapt a creative work for a defined period.[13] Importantly, copyright protects the original expression of an idea, not the idea itself.[14]

a. Works Protected by Copyrights

Copyright law generally, protects literary and artistic works. The term "literary and artistic works" includes every original work of authorship, irrespective of its literary or artistic merits. Thus, copyright is granted for the protection of creators of original works of authorship.[15] In Nigerian, copyright covers literary works, musical works, artistic works, audio-visual works, sound recordings, and broadcasts[16]. The specifics of protected works may differ from one jurisdiction to another.

The three fundamental requirements that literary, musical or artistic works, must satisfy to qualify for copyright protection in Nigeria are authorship, originality, and fixation or tangibility.[17] Authorship means the work must be connected with Nigeria in the sense that it was authored or first published in Nigeria, or the creator of the work is a Nigerian or is otherwise connected with Nigeria. Originality is the hallmark of copyright, and it means that the work must have its origin in the author. The standard of what may be termed original are relatively modest globally, but they are not without threshold. In the United Kingdom, the work must reflect some "skill, labor, and judgment."[18] In Nigeria, it is required that sufficient effort should have been expended to give it an original identity.[19] Even trivial or hackneyed creations can be protected, so long as they are not copied from another source and demonstrate a spark of creativity. To meet the fixation requirement, a work must be set in a definite medium of expression.[20] This is crucial because it ensures the work can be perceived, reproduced, or communicated either directly or with the help of a device. Without fixation, enforcement becomes practically impossible.

---

[12] WIPO, 'Understanding Copyright and Related Rights.' *WIPO Publication No. 909E* (2O16) <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=2cd7d8a8d7167c684855d0b91c3e6d04a4f75ae900643cc94062091cecaeab3eJmltdHM9MTc1MDI5MTIwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=WIPO+Copyright+law+pdf&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cud2lwby5pbnQvZWRvY3MvcHViZG9jcy9lbi93aXBvX3B1Yl85MDlfMjAxNi5wZGY&ntb=1> Accessed 19 June 2025

[13] Ibid

[14] Harish Khan, **'**What is Idea-Expression dichotomy under copyright law?' *Legal Wires* <What is Idea-Expression dichotomy under copyright law?> accessed June 25

[15] GN Okeke and Kenneth Uzor, 'An Appraisal of the Protection of Copyright under International Law' *Journal of Law and Conflict Resolution* (2014) <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=c59ad0e7da0221e39755774fa0cec9aca98b0afa78754042ac6031f5be0c7624JmltdHM9MTc1MDM3NzYwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=GN+Okeke+%26+K+Uzor%2c+%e2%80%98An+Appraisal+of+the+Protection+of+Copyright+under+International+Law%e2%80%99+(2014)+6+(1)+JL%26CR+11&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9hY2FkZW1pY2pvdXJuYWxzLm9yZy9hcHAvd2Vicm9vdC9hcnRpY2xlL2FydGljbGUxMzk2MzYzOTkzX09rZWtlJTIwYW5kJTIwVXpvci5wZGY&ntb=1 > accessed June 20 2025

[16] Section 2(1) (a-f) Copyright Act, 2022; Berne Convention 1986, Article 1(1)

[17] J O Asein, *Nigerian Copyright Law & Practice* (Books and Gavel Limited, 2012)

[18] *Express Newspaper Plc v News (UK) Plc*, F.S.R. 36 (1991)

[19] Section 2(2) (a), Copyright Act, 2022

[20] Section 2(2) (b), Nigeria Copyright Act, 2022

b. Rights Protected by Copyright

Copyright protects two categories of rights: economic and moral rights. Economic rights empower the copyright holder to financially benefit from the use of their work.[21] These include the right to reproduce the work in different forms, distribute copies to the public, perform the work publicly, broadcast or otherwise communicate it, translate the work into other languages, and adapt the work into different forms. Moral rights are more personal and non-transferable in many jurisdictions. They connect an author to their work beyond economic benefit. These rights are often retained even if the economic rights are sold or transferred.[22] They include the right of attribution, which lets the author be identified as the work's creator, and the right of integrity, which allows the author to object to any modification or distortion that harms their honor or reputation. Moral rights reflect the connection between an author and their creation and are fundamental in upholding the dignity and artistic vision of the creator.

Copyright infringement refers to the unauthorized use or reproduction of material protected under copyright law without the express permission of the copyright holder. It involves the breach of the exclusive rights granted to the copyright owner such as the right to reproduce, publish, distribute, or adapt the work by a third party. When someone exploits these protected rights without consent, they commit an act of infringement. For example, "A" is a painter who creates a unique masterpiece and shows it to his friend "B." However, "B," also a painter, copies the same idea, produces an identical artwork, and earns revenue from it. What "B" has done constitutes an infringement on the copyright of "A," as it unlawfully violates the exclusive rights belonging to the original creator.

c. Limitations to the Rights Protected by Copyright

Copyright protections are not absolute. Several exceptions exist, primarily to balance public interest with private rights. The most popular exception is fair dealing. Fair use provisions allow the public to use copyrighted material without seeking the permission of the author or paying royalties. For example, copyrighted materials may be quoted for educational or scholarly purposes provided attribution is given. It can be used for illustrations for teaching, used in news reporting, and so on. These uses are governed by principles such as fair practice and minimal usage.[23] Many jurisdictions adopt the fair dealing doctrines. Also, the law permits the use of copyrighted works without the creator's consent, but with mandatory compensation in some cases. These are referred to as non-voluntary or compulsory licenses.[24] Such licenses are justified where public access to innovation (especially in the face of new technology) would otherwise be obstructed by copyright holders. Legislators may allow these uses to prevent copyright from stifling technological progress or public welfare.

3. Basics of Social Media

Social media refers to interactive, computer-mediated technologies that facilitate the creation, sharing, and exchange of information, ideas, and various forms of expression through virtual communities and online networks.[25] Individuals use social media to express themselves, explore interests, maintain personal connections, promote businesses, and enhance career opportunities.

---

[21] WIPO, 'Understanding Copyright and Related Rights'(2O16) WIPO Publication No. 909E <www.wipo.int > accessed June 20, 2025

[22] Ibid.

[23] I Sambhar, 'Concept Of Fair Use And Fair Dealing In Copyright' *Mondaq* < https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=30a91b35140787144d1d12b2649794e1da98015fa803034aace6a0f40e93d282JmltdHM9MTc1MDU1MDQwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=fair+dealing+copyright&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cubW9uZGFxLmNvbS9pbmRpYS9jb3B5cmlnaHQvOTMwNTU2L2NvbmNlcHQtb2YtZmFpci11c2UtYW5kLWZhaXItZGVhbGluZy1pbi1jb3B5cmlnaHQ&ntb=1 > Accessed 19 June 2025

[24] WIPO, 'Understanding Copyright and Related Rights'(2O16) WIPO Publication No. 909E <www.wipo.int > Accessed June 27, 2025

[25] Canadian Intellectual Property Office 'Social Media and Intellectual Property' (2021) < https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=3d05e1e7ed0c27ac3bf26d57513b2c4aa7b12172724e2c07941132afb6d6e7a1JmltdHM9MTc1MDU1MDQwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=Canadian+Intellectual+Property+Office+%e2%80%98Social+Media+and+Intellectual+Property%e2%80%99+(2021).&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9jYXJsZXRvbi5jYS9pcHMvd3AtY29udGVudC91cGxvYWRzLzIwMjEtMDItMjMtQ2FybGV0b24tSVAtYW5kLXNvY2lhbC1tZWRpYS5wZGY&ntb=1> Accessed 23 June 2025

Social media platforms offer many opportunities for content sharing and engagement. This opportunity poses a risk to copyright protection. The nature of each category of social media, based on its features and user behavior, amplifies different dimensions of copyright infringement:

a. Social Networks

These platforms are primarily designed for person-to-person communication, social interaction, and sharing of knowledge.[26] Social networks like Facebook, Twitter (X), Instagram, WhatsApp, LinkedIn, and TikTok allow users to share many media content like text, images, audio, and video. This environment increases the likelihood of uploading copyrighted material without authorization. Users of social networks most times repost or re-share content such as music, images, and video clips without credit or license. Moreover, the virality of posts on these platforms enables unauthorized content to spread rapidly before rights holders can intervene.

b. Image Sharing Networks

Image sharing networks allow users to upload and share photographs and visual content.[27] They make images appear more appealing and encourage social interaction around them. Platforms such as Flickr, Instagram, and Photobucket specialize in sharing visual content. Photographers and graphic designers are particularly vulnerable here. Users may download, repost, or repurpose copyrighted images without the consent or attribution of the right owners. These acts infringe both the economic rights (such as reproduction and distribution) and moral rights (attribution and integrity) of the creators. Even watermarked images can be cropped or edited. This makes it difficult for authors to assert ownership over their work.

c. Bookmarking and Content Curation Networks

These platforms help users store, organize, and share interesting online content for future use.[28] Users often compile lists of useful articles, videos, or posts and engage in community discussions around trending topics and resources. Example of these networks include Feedly, Flipboard, Pocket, StumbleUpon, Pinterest. Although they do not host original content, they often link to or embed copyrighted materials such as articles, videos, or infographics without proper licensing. These platforms enable mass sharing and organization of work of copyrighted works. Sometimes they bypass paywalls or licensing restrictions. The act of publicly curating copyrighted content may amount to unauthorized distribution or communication to the public.

d. Blogging and Publishing Networks

Blogging and publishing platforms empower users to write, share, and publish their ideas, stories, and expert insights.[29] Users benefit from the ability to publish content without the technical burden of hosting their own websites. Platforms like WordPress, Medium, Facebook, and Tumblr empower users to create and distribute long written content. However, they also facilitate plagiarism and unauthorized reproduction of existing works—articles, academic papers, photographs, poems, or even parts of books. Because many bloggers are unaware of the limits of copyright, they may copy and publish entire works without attribution to the original creator of the work. Furthermore, embedded media such as copyrighted videos or songs may be used in blog posts without necessary clearance. This leads to compound infringement.

4. Legal Framework Governing Copyright Online

a. Berne Convention

The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works is one of the most important international treaties on copyright. It was adopted in 1886, long before the rise of the internet but its

[26] Michael Ray, 'Social Networking' *Britanica* < https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=cde6b463399b4abf73da97ed60fb10fbc3b23dc115641a466b50fa57470fec32JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=social+networks&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuYnJpdGFubmljYS5jb20vdGVjaG5vbG9neS9zb2NpYWwtbmV0d29yaw&ntb=1> accessed June 27 2025

[27] Indeed Editorial Team, 'What are the different types of social media? 10 Key Types' < https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=f686cb8173227167b1cb414b9a7cf1402f0488f9d99c63e01b8dd597576cd612JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=image+sharing+network&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuaW5kZWVkLmNvbS9jYXJlZXItYWR2aWNlL2NhcmVlci1kZXZlbG9wbWVudC90eXBlcy1vZi1zb2NpYWwtbWVkaWE&ntb=1> Accessed June 27, 2025

[28] Ibid

[29] Ibid

provisions can still be applied to copyright on the internet. Article 2(1) of the Convention provides that copyright protects literary and artistic works regardless of the mode or form of expression. This means that books, music, videos, and artwork that are shared online are protected by copyright just like the traditional works. Also, Article 5(2) of the Berne Convention states that authors of copyrighted materials enjoy copyright automatically, and they do not need to register their works before enjoying this right. These provisions make it clear that creators on the internet have the same rights as those who publish offline.

b. WIPO Internet Treaties

The rise of the internet and digital technology made traditional copyright laws impotent to address emerging copyright challenges, such as online piracy, unauthorized downloads, digital copying, and the sharing of creative content across borders. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) introduced two treaties in 1996 to surmount these challenges. The WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT), collectively referred to as the WIPO Internet Treaties. The WCT builds on the Berne Convention.[30] Article 6 WCT gives authors the exclusive right to control the distribution of their work online. Article 8 WCT provides authors with the right to control how their work is made available to the public through the internet, such as through streaming or downloads. These laws protect creators from copyright infringement. For example, if someone uploads a musician's song to a social media platform without permission, it is a violation of the artist's rights under both the Berne Convention and the WCT. On the other hand, the WPPT focuses on protecting the rights of performers and producers of sound recordings, whose work is frequently exploited online. Article 10 WPPT establishes the right of making available. This right empowers rights holders to control how their performances or recordings are accessed or distributed on-demand over digital networks. Both the WCT and the WPPT include strong provisions on the protection of Technological Protection Measures (TPMs) and Rights Management Information (RMI), through Articles 11 and 12 WCT and Articles 18 and 19 WPPT. TPMs refer to tools such as encryption, passwords, and access controls used to prevent unauthorized access or copying. RMIs refer to information such as the name of the author, copyright owner, or licensing terms that are attached to digital files. These provisions require member states to make it unlawful to circumvent protective technologies or tamper with copyright information, both of which are common in cases of online infringement.

c. The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA)

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) was enacted in the United States in 1998. The DMCA was introduced to implement the obligations of the WCT and WPPT into U.S. law. It represents a model for how national legislation can adapt to protect copyright in the fast-evolving world of the internet. The DMCA has two major objectives: to strengthen copyright protection online, and to encourage the growth of internet platforms by limiting their liability for user-generated content, provided they act responsibly. One of the core features of the DMCA is the "notice and takedown" system under Title II (Online Copyright Infringement Liability Limitation Act). This system allows copyright owners to send formal notices to online service providers such as YouTube, Facebook, or Google when their content is uploaded or shared without permission. The platform must act quickly to remove the infringing material to avoid liability. If they fail to do so, they can be held directly responsible for copyright infringement. To balance the interests of users, the DMCA also allows for counter-notices. If a user believes their content was wrongly removed, they can submit a response explaining why the content is lawful. Another important part of the DMCA is its anti-circumvention provisions (under Title I), which make it illegal to bypass technological protection measures (TPMs) like encryption or digital locks that control access to copyrighted works. This reflects Article 11 WCT and helps prevent digital piracy and unauthorized copying. Many countries have adopted similar frameworks as the DMCA, especially the safe harbor provisions that protect internet platforms from liability so long as they respond appropriately to infringement notices.

[30] Article 1(4) WCT

d. The Nigerian Copyright Act 2022

Nigeria enacted a new Copyright Act in 2022. The Act defines a "copy" to encompass reproductions of works in any form, including digital.[31] Thus, the Act expands copyright protection to include not only traditional creative works, but also digital formats. The Act gives authors and producers the exclusive right over their works. Specifically, it provides that authors of literary and musical works have the exclusive rights to reproduce, publish, perform, broadcast, distribute, adapt, translate, and make their works publicly available.[32] Authors of artistic works control reproduction, publishing, inclusion in audiovisual works, communication to the public, adaptations, and making the work available digitally. However, functional aspects of 3D artistic works and reconstructed buildings are excluded.[33] Authors of audiovisual works have rights over reproducing the audiovisual work, public performance, broadcasting, making copies of its soundtrack, making it available digitally, distributing it commercially, translating, and creating adaptations.[34] Producers of sound recordings have exclusive rights to reproduce, broadcast, communicate, make digitally accessible, and distribute sound recordings for commercial purposes.[35] Broadcasters control rebroadcasting, public communication, making broadcasts accessible on-demand, fixation and reproduction of broadcasts, and adaptation and commercial distribution of such fixed broadcasts. Cable operators simply retransmitting broadcasts do not hold these rights.[36]

Section 44 of the Act establishes serious penalties for infringing copyright. It criminalizes the making, importing, selling, hiring, distributing, or possessing infringing copies of copyright-protected works for trade or business. The law also punishes unauthorized sharing or making a work available to the public by wire or wireless means for commercial purposes. This provision specifically criminalizes copyright infringement using the social media. Sections 54 to 56 of the Act establish a notice-and-takedown process for infringing content on the internet. Once a copyright owner or their authorised agent notifies a service provider in writing, the service provider must promptly inform the alleged infringer and swiftly take down or disable access to the content. Where the service provider fails to comply, it shall be liable for such failure as a breach of statutory duty and for infringement of the content to the same extent as the person responsible for placing the content on the system or network.[37]

However, the Copyright Act exempts service providers from monetary liabilities for infringement of copyright arising from the storage of material on its systems or networks by users. This exemption is effective where the service provider does not have knowledge that the material is infringing copyright; or upon obtaining such knowledge or awareness, the service provider acts expeditiously to remove or disable access to the infringing material; and the service provider does not receive a financial benefit directly attributable to the infringing activity in circumstances where it has the right and ability to control such activity.[38] Again, service providers are not be liable for infringement arising from referring or linking users to an online location containing infringing material or activity.[39] The Act also strengthens protection of Technological Protection Measures (TPMs) and Rights Management Information (RMI), criminalizing the manufacture, sale, import, or distribution of devices meant to bypass digital locks.[40] The Act introduces an open fair dealing provision and adopts the U.S. four-factor test (purpose, nature, amount used, and effect on market value) as guidelines.[41]

[31] Section 108, Copyright Act, 2022
[32] Ibid. Section 9.
[33] Ibid. Section 10.
[34] Ibid. Section 11.
[35] Ibid. Section 12.
[36] Ibid. Section 13.
[37] Ibid. Section 55 (6).
[38] Ibid. Section 58 (6).
[39] Ibid. Section 59.
[40] Ibid. Section 50.
[41] Ibid. Section 20.

5. Illustrative Cases

a. *Robert Barbera v Ariana Grande and Grandari* [42]

The legal issue in this matter was whether Ariana Grande's posting of copyrighted photographs on her Instagram account without the photographer's permission constituted copyright infringement under U.S. law. The Plaintiff, Robert Barbera is a New York-based photographer. He alleged that Ariana Grande and her company, Grandari, infringed his copyright by posting two of his photographs on Instagram without authorization. The images showed Grande holding a bag bearing the word "Sweetener." She used it to promote the release of her music album. Barbera claimed sole ownership of the copyright in these photographs and sought statutory damages of $25,000 per photo or the profits earned from their use. The lawsuit was settled out of court. Terms of the settlement were not disclosed. Pursuant to the settlement, the court dismissed the case on July 18, ordering that all claims were "settled in principle" and discontinuing the action without costs to either party. Grande had previously removed the infringing images from her Instagram account after the lawsuit was filed.

b. *Epidemic Sound AB v Meta Platforms, Inc.* [43]

The legal issue in this matter was whether Meta Platforms, Inc. directly and actively infringed Epidemic Sound's copyrighted music by storing, curating, and distributing the works on Facebook and Instagram without authorization or license under U.S. copyright law. The Plaintiff, Epidemic Sound, a Sweden-based production music company, alleged that Meta engaged in large-scale willful copyright infringement by offering its catalog of over 38,000 music works through Meta's platforms without permission. It stated that Meta ignored repeated notices of infringement and refused to license Epidemic's catalog despite licensing other rights holders; stored, curated, reproduced, and distributed Epidemic's music without authorization through its music library, making it freely available to users to download, stream, or incorporate into video content; designed platform features (e.g., "Original Audio" and "Reels Remix" on Instagram) that facilitate and encourage infringement by enabling users to extract and reuse Epidemic's music without permission; derived substantial financial benefits via advertising revenues and increased user engagement linked to the infringing use of Epidemic's works.

---

[42] David Matthew 'Ariana Grande sued for copyright infringement over Instagram post.' *New York Daily Times* <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=b35baf9b33271438d4910e79062b159fe6677d52e247e0d59a6eb87ceeb8776fJmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=What+is+the+copyright+suit+between+Barbara+and+Arianna+Grande&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cubnlkYWlseW5ld3MuY29tLzIwMTkvMDUvMTQvYXJpYW5hLWdyYW5kZS1zdWVkLWZvci1jb3B5cmlnaHQtaW5mcmluZ2VtZW50LW92ZXItaW5zdGFncmFtLXBvc3Qv&ntb=1> Accessed June 27, 2025; Layla Ilchi 'Ariana Grande Settles Lawsuit Over Instagram Photos' *Women Wear Daily* <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=3d7bdbf96a4d7b2d49e9e5361c17f1a04d477c48072ae25eb73c289ed660a6a1JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=was+the+suit+between+Ariana+and+Barbara+settled%3a&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d2QuY29tL2Zhc2hpb24tbmV3cy9mYXNoaW9uLXNjb29wcy9hcmlhbmEtZ3JhbmRlLXNldHRsZXMtaW5zdGFncmFtLWxhd3N1aXQtMTIwMzIzMDQ1OS8&ntb=1> accessed June 27 2025

[43] Unicourt. US Districts Court. Epidemic Sound, AB v. Meta Platforms, Inc. https://unicourt.com/case/pc-db5-epidemic-sound-ab-v-meta-platforms-inc-1244379#:~:text=On%20July%2020%2C%202022%2C%20Epidemic%20Sound%2C%20AB%20%28%E2%80%9CEpidemic%E2%80%9D,injunctive%20relief%20with%20damages%20for%20alleged%20copyright%20infringement; M Stasen 'Epidemic Sound hits Meta with $142m lawsuit for 'rampant infringement' of its music on Facebook and Instagram' *Music Business Worldwide* <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=863a4a81d4c2e3ec87fcdfb1a75606bc4c7e600f08849a3fc3262ae313085739JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=what+is+the+matter+between+Epidemic+sound+and+Facebook+&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cubXVzaWNidXNpbmVzc3dvcmxkd2lkZS5jb20vZXBpZGVtaWMtc291bmQtaGl0cy1tZXRhLXdpdGgtMTQybS1sYXdzdWl0LWZvci1yYW1wYW50LWluZnJpbmdlbWVudC1vZi1pdHMtbXVzaWMtb24tZmFjZWJvb2stYW5kLWluc3RhZ3JhbS8&ntb=1 > Accessed June 27, 2025; Dylan Smith 'Court Sets 2024 Trial Date In Epidemic Sound's Copyright Infringement Battle Against Meta' *Digital Music News* < https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=3544fa3cc4610702eaec84812f986e67f1c44096dfcd98f8cb1651631a5c641dJmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=facebook+settled+copyright+suit+with+epidemic+sound&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZGlnaXRhbG11c2ljbmV3cy5jb20vMjAyMy8wMS8xNi9lcGlkZW1pYy1zb3VuZC1tZXRhLWNvcHlyaWdodC1sYXdzdWl0LXRyaWFsLWRhdGUvIzp-OnRleHQ9SW4lMjBOb3ZlbWJlciUyQyUyMGElMjBmZWRlcmFsJTIwanVkZ2UlMjByZWplY3RlZCUyMEZhY2Vib29rJTIwcGFyZW50LHRvJTIwaGVhZCUyMHRvJTIwdHJpYWwlMjBpbiUyMFNlcHRlbWJlciUyMG9mJTIwMjAyNC4&ntb=1> accessed June 27 2025

Epidemic claims approximately 94% of its music used on Meta's platforms is unlicensed and seeks statutory damages of $150,000 per infringed work, totaling no less than $142 million for roughly 1,800 recordings and compositions. Meta filed a motion to dismiss arguing that Epidemic's allegations were too abstract to plausibly state a claim. In November 2022, the federal court denied Meta's motion to dismiss, finding the complaint adequately pleaded direct infringement by Meta. Epidemic Sound is required to provide technological demonstrations and representative evidence of alleged infringement at upcoming hearings. The dispute remains ongoing, with the outcome to be determined at trial.

c. *Beyoncé Knowles v Yemi Osinbajo*[44]

The legal issue in this matter was whether Yemi Osinbajo's tweet containing Beyoncé's copyrighted song without attribution or license constituted copyright infringement under the DMCA. The copyright owner, Beyoncé Knowles, through a DMCA complaint, alleged unauthorized use of her song *Run the World* in a video posted by then Nigeria's Vice President, Yemi Osinbajo. The specific infringement involved embedding Beyoncé's music in a March 8 video commemorating International Women's Day without obtaining a license or providing attribution. Twitter's copyright policy, aligned with the DMCA, prohibits such unauthorized use of copyrighted materials in user content on its platform. Following receipt of the copyright complaint, Twitter investigated and determined that the tweet violated its copyright policy. Twitter then removed ("withheld") the tweet in compliance with the DMCA. Twitter confirmed that the removal was in response to a notification from the copyright holder. No further legal proceedings or damages claims have been reported. The matter was resolved through the platform's standard notice-and-takedown procedure.

d. *Mike Ejeagha v Brain Jotter*[45]

The legal issue in this matter was whether Brain Jotter's unauthorised use of the song *Ka Esi Le Onye Isi Oche* in his viral social media video constitutes copyright infringement under Nigeria's Copyright Act 2022, or whether it qualifies as fair use. Gentleman Mike Ejeagha, a renowned Nigerian highlife musician, is the copyright owner of *Ka Esi Le Onye Isi Oche*, a song recorded in 1983. Brain Jotter, a popular Nigerian skit maker, used the song without permission in a viral Instagram video posted on July 5, 2024, synchronising the original recording into his skit rather than using a licensed version from Instagram's music library. The copyright owner did not file any lawsuit against Brain Jotter. Instead, Brain Jotter offered ₦2 million to Ejeagha in goodwill, and both parties appeared publicly cordial. Mike Ejeagha died on 6th June 2025.[46]

6. Challenges of Copyright Enforcement on Social Media

a. Ease of Infringement and Virality

One of the most profound challenges to enforcing copyright on social media is the ease with which infringement occurs and the speed with which infringing content can spread. Social media platforms are designed to facilitate rapid sharing and dissemination of user-generated content. Features such as "share" buttons, hashtags, tagging, and automated recommendations ensure that content travels far beyond its initial audience in seconds. Consider the example of Brain Jotter's use of Gentleman Mike Ejeagha's song *Ka Esi Le Onye Isi Oche*. The skit maker posted a short video synchronising the copyrighted song

---

[44] The Guardian 'Twitter Removes Osinbajo's Post for Copyright Violation of Beyonce's Song" <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=6d5a913594c073a461b99b974d601b0799ca13957a2c0ef14436acc20143c8d2JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=what+was+the+copyright+issue+between+Yemi+Osinbajo+and+Beyonce&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9ndWFyZGlhbi5uZy9saWZlL3R3aXR0ZXItcmVtb3Zlcy1vc2luYmFqb3MtcG9zdC1mb3ItY29weXJpZ2h0LXZpb2xhdGlvbi1vZi1iZXlvbmNlcy1zb25nLw&ntb=1> accessed 27 June 2025

[45] A Adebiyi 'Brain Jotter's usage of Gentleman Mike Ejeagha's song: Is he guilty of copyright infringement?' <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=2cb5caccc6b6c8a8289364fc638a83a88a3304f124e64e16290b6907cfba73e9JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=mike+and+brain+jotter+case&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cucHVsc2UubmcvYXJ0aWNsZXMvZW50ZXJ0YWlubWVudC9tdXNpYy9kaWQtYnJhaW4tam90dGVyLWluZnJpbmdlLW9uLXRoZS1jb3B5cmlnaHQtb2YtZ2VudGxlbWFuLW1pa2UtZWplYWdoYS0yMDI0MDcyNzA4MDgyMzExNjk5&ntb=1> accessed 27 June 2025

[46] Channels TV 'Gwo Gwo Gwo Ngwo' Singer, Mike Ejeagha Dies At 95 https://www.channelstv.com/2025/06/07/gwo-gwo-gwo-ngwo-singer-mike-ejeagha-dies-at-95/

without permission, and it quickly went viral. Within days, the video had been viewed over 29 million times on Instagram and nearly 20 million times on TikTok.[47] Thousands of other users replicated the trend, creating their own videos with the song. This massive, rapid spread meant that even if the original post had been taken down promptly, the infringement would have already become entrenched and difficult to contain.

This ease of infringement is not limited to music. The case of *Robert Barbera v. Ariana Grande* similarly illustrates how a single unauthorized post on Instagram can instantly reach millions. Grande's post featuring Barbera's photographs received over 3 million likes before she took it down following the lawsuit.[48] Once such content is online, it is often copied, archived, or reshared. This makes any enforcement efforts reactive rather than preventative. The virality of social media thus presents a structural barrier to effective copyright enforcement. It challenges the traditional model of enforcement, which assumes infringement can be detected and stopped before it becomes widespread. On social media, even short-lived or quickly deleted infringements can result in extensive, lasting harm to rights holders by undermining their control over distribution. Moreover, the cultural expectation of instant, free access to content reinforces this challenge. Many users do not see reposting, remixing, or embedding copyrighted content as theft but as participation in shared culture. This mindset complicates enforcement by normalizing infringing practices and making rights holders appear adversarial when they seek to protect their interests.

b. Scale and Volume of Infringing Content

A second major challenge lies in the sheer scale and volume of potentially infringing material posted on social media platforms daily. Platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, Twitter, and YouTube host billions of users generating large amounts of content. Even if a small fraction of that content infringes copyright, the absolute numbers are staggering. Epidemic Sound AB's lawsuit against Meta Platforms, Inc. offers a compelling case study. Epidemic Sound alleged that Meta's platforms were responsible for over 80,000 new instances of unauthorized use of its music works every day. The company estimated that 94% of the uses of its music on Facebook and Instagram were unlicensed. These numbers underscore the impossibility of manual policing by rights holders alone. Platforms have similarly struggled to deploy technological solutions at scale. Automated content identification systems, such as YouTube's Content ID or Facebook's Rights Manager, attempt to flag and manage infringing content, but they are imperfect. They generate false positives, miss nuanced cases (such as fair use), and often fail to keep pace with the creative tactics users adopt to evade detection, such as altering pitch, speed, or format.[49]

Moreover, the scale problem is compounded by social media's design for engagement and content proliferation. As seen in the Brain Jotter case, once a single video went viral, thousands of derivative videos emerged in a matter of days. Even if enforcement succeeded in taking down the original video,

---

[47] Rachel Ayodele 'I didn't make any profit from Gwo Gwo Ngwo challenge' <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=052ff0e8e5594628d9c9c8f2273601fd517a5308391848f202cf50d1c51a30e2JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=brain+jotter+Within+days%2c+the+video+had+been+viewed+over+29+million+times+on+Instagram+and+nearly+20+million+times+on+TikTok&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9kYWlseXBvc3QubmcvMjAyNC8wNy8yNC9pLWRpZG50LW1ha2UtYW55LXByb2ZpdC1mcm9tLWd3by1nd28tbmd3by1jaGFsbGVuZ2UtYnJhaW4tam90dGVyLw&ntb=1> accessed 27 June 2025

[48] Sean Morrison 'Ariana Grande embroiled in copyright battle over Instagram posts of herself' < https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=ce1dcef34ebf3d1da0d7cafb25da3d416a2479f2a7b09b61feafd9db6d1d6a78JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=Grande%e2%80%99s+post+featuring+Barbera%e2%80%99s+photographs+received+over+3+million+likes+before+she+took+it+down+following+the+lawsuit.&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuc3RhbmRhcmQuY28udWsvc2hvd2Jpei9jZWxlYnJpdHktbmV3cy9hcmlhbmEtZ3JhbmRlLXN1ZWQtZm9yLXVzaW5nLXBpY3R1cmVzLW9mLWhlcnNlbGYtc2hlLXBvc3RlZC1vbi1pbnN0YWdyYW0tYTQxNDIzNzEuaHRtbA&ntb=1> accessed 27 June 2025

[49] C C Ugorji and O C Okeke , 'Exploring the Limitations, Challenges, and Regulatory Strategies of AI-Based Content Filtering Systems' *International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research* (2024) <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=2ab55d29b414c6ee90bb7f6c73d0e8e84b04f3ad8039cf6fe9d54dcde9910425JmltdHM9MTc1MDg5NjAwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=09c3881b-a443-6876-2ccf-9d6ca58169c3&psq=criticism+of+Automated+content+identification+systems&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9pamNhdC5jb20vYXJjaGlldmUvdm9sdW1lMTMvaXNzdWUxMi9pamNhdHIxMzEyMTAwMi5wZGY&ntb=1> accessed 27 June 2025

it would do little to address the hundreds or thousands of copies and remixes already circulating. This scale problem demands a rethinking of enforcement strategies. It suggests that relying solely on individual takedown requests is inadequate, as rights holders cannot possibly monitor and report every instance of infringement.

c. Platform Features that Facilitate Infringement

Beyond the general architecture that promotes sharing, certain features built into social media platforms actively facilitate infringement. This challenge is especially clear in the *Epidemic Sound v. Meta Platforms* case. Epidemic Sound alleged that Meta's platforms included tools like "Original Audio" and "Reels Remix" that were specifically designed to enable users to extract copyrighted music from existing videos and reuse it in their own content without authorization. Such features effectively automate infringement by lowering the technical barrier to copying and synchronizing copyrighted works. Instead of users needing to download, edit, or re-upload content manually, these platform tools allow infringement to happen with a single click. The alleged design of these tools to encourage user engagement demonstrates the tension between platforms' business incentives and copyright enforcement goals. Platforms benefit financially from increased user activity, advertising revenues, and time spent on site even when that activity is driven by unlicensed use of copyrighted materials. This conflict of interest complicates enforcement. While platforms may comply with takedown requests to avoid liability under safe harbour provisions, they have little incentive to proactively prevent infringement if doing so would reduce user engagement. Rights holders like Epidemic Sound argue that this creates a system in which platforms profit from infringement while pushing the burden of enforcement onto creators. Brain Jotter's initial use of Mike Ejeagha's song without using the licensed version available in Instagram's music library further illustrates this point. Social media platforms often provide licensed music libraries to encourage legal use, but these options are sometimes hidden, underused, or less appealing than simply uploading unlicensed tracks. The platform design itself can make infringing use the path of least resistance for creators seeking viral success.

d. Notice-and-Takedown Limitations

A key mechanism for copyright enforcement on social media is the notice-and-takedown system. Under laws such as the DMCA and Nigeria's Copyright Act 2022, rights holders can send formal notices to platforms requesting the removal of infringing content. Platforms that comply promptly gain safe harbour from liability for their users' infringements. However, this system has significant limitations. First, it is inherently reactive. Content is often available to the public, and potentially goes viral before a takedown can be issued and processed. In the *Beyoncé v. Yemi Osinbajo* matter, Twitter removed the offending tweet only after receiving a DMCA notice. By then, the post had already circulated widely, drawing public attention and backlash. Even swift compliance cannot undo the damage of initial exposure. Second, notice-and-takedown imposes a heavy burden on rights holders. They must continually monitor platforms for infringements, identify specific infringing content, and issue individualized notices. This burden is especially acute for rights holders with large catalogs or whose works are frequently used in popular culture. As seen in Epidemic Sound's case, trying to manage 80,000 instances of infringement daily is practically impossible without sophisticated and expensive monitoring tools. Third, the system can be easily evaded. Users can re-upload removed content, slightly modify it to defeat automated filters, or post it across multiple accounts and platforms. The iterative cat-and-mouse dynamic means that even vigilant rights holders struggle to achieve lasting enforcement. Lastly, notice-and-takedown regimes often fail to account for systemic or platform-facilitated infringement. Epidemic Sound's claims against Meta argue that the problem was not simply individual users posting infringing content, but Meta's own design and curation of a music library that stored, distributed, and promoted unlicensed works. Notice-and-takedown processes are ill-suited to address this kind of structural infringement.

e. Jurisdictional Challenge

Another critical challenge is the jurisdictional complexity of enforcing copyright on global social media platforms. Copyright is territorial. It is defined and enforced according to national laws, which differ in scope, exceptions, procedures, and remedies. Social media platforms, by contrast, operate internationally, enabling instantaneous sharing across borders. Consider the varied legal contexts of the cases discussed. Robert Barbera's claim against Ariana Grande was governed by U.S. copyright law, including statutory damages provisions that made enforcement financially viable. Epidemic Sound's suit against Meta also proceeded under U.S. law, invoking DMCA safe harbour and notice-and-

takedown obligations. Meanwhile, Brain Jotter's use of Mike Ejeagha's music would be judged under Nigeria's Copyright Act 2022, which has different provisions for infringement, fair use, and licensing. Such variation creates legal uncertainty for rights holders and users alike. What is considered fair use in one jurisdiction might be infringement in another. Enforcement actions that are straightforward in one country may be unavailable or ineffective elsewhere. Rights holders may struggle to secure remedies across multiple legal systems, each with its own evidentiary requirements, court procedures, and enforcement mechanisms. This complexity also creates opportunities for platforms to exploit gaps and inconsistencies in legal frameworks. Large technology companies can locate operations in jurisdictions with favourable liability regimes, resist enforcement efforts in others, or adopt global policies that undercut local legal protections. Moreover, the cross-border nature of social media makes enforcement of judgments difficult. Even if a rights holder secures a court order in one country, enforcing it against an overseas platform or user may require separate, complex legal action.

7. Conclusion

Enforcing copyright on social media remains one of the most pressing legal and policy challenges of the digital age. The rapid expansion of online platforms has created unprecedented opportunities for creativity, expression, and cultural exchange. Yet, it has also enabled the widespread and often uncontrolled dissemination of copyrighted works without authorization. Legal frameworks such as the Nigeria's Copyright Act 2022 and the United States' Digital Millennium Copyright Act demonstrate that lawmakers are adapting to these realities. However, enforcement in practice continues to fall short of the protection many creators need. The case studies examined in this work highlight recurring patterns of infringement. These include the habitual use of creative content without permission, the practical difficulty of monitoring billions of uploads, and the tensions between individual rights and platform responsibilities. Small creators often lack the resources or technical capacity to pursue infringers. At the same time, large social media companies frequently resist regulatory measures that impose more rigorous obligations.

Addressing these challenges demands more than incremental reform. A balanced approach must respect the legitimate interests of authors, performers, and producers while also acknowledging the rights of users and the value of free expression. Based on the findings in this study, several recommendations emerge as priorities for policy and practice:

1. Governments and regulatory bodies should invest in modern tools for detecting infringement and train specialized personnel capable of handling the scale and complexity of digital content disputes. Greater international cooperation is also essential, as much infringing activity crosses national borders and requires coordinated legal responses.
2. Public awareness and education must be improved. Many users are unaware that sharing or reposting copyrighted material without authorization may violate the law. Educational campaigns and clear guidance can help prevent unintentional infringement and encourage respect for intellectual property rights.
3. Social media companies should be encouraged to simplify and standardize notice-and-takedown procedures. Systems for reporting and removing infringing content should be transparent, accessible, and efficient, while also providing safeguards to protect users against false claims and overreach.
4. There is value in promoting licensing arrangements and partnerships between platforms and rights holders. Broader licensing agreements can help ensure that creators are fairly compensated and that content is lawfully available to users without constant conflict or uncertainty.
5. Legal frameworks must be updated continually to respond to changes in technology and online behavior. Policymakers should engage widely with stakeholders—including creators, platforms, and civil society—to craft regulations that are fair, proportionate, and capable of addressing emerging challenges.