

Richmond Journal of Law and Technology

Volume 18 | Issue 2

Article 1

2012

Introduction: contains Cover, Table of Contents, Letter from the Editor, and Masthead

Ian Lambeets
University of Richmond

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/jolt>

 Part of the [Intellectual Property Law Commons](#), and the [Internet Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ian Lambeets, *Introduction: contains Cover, Table of Contents, Letter from the Editor, and Masthead*, 18 Rich. J.L. & Tech (2012).
Available at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/jolt/vol18/iss2/1>

This Introduction is brought to you for free and open access by UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Richmond Journal of Law and Technology by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

RICHMOND JOURNAL OF LAW & TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME XVIII, ISSUE 2, WINTER 2012

5. **Virtual or Reality: Prosecutorial Practices in Cyber Child Pornography Ring Cases**
Michal Gilad

 6. **Orphan Works at the Dawn of Digitization**
Kelu Sullivan

 7. **i 4 an i: Why Changing the Standard for Overcoming the Presumption of Patent Validity Will Cause More Harm Than Good**
John Morrisett
-



RICHMOND

Journal of Law & Technology

The first exclusively online law review.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

MASTHEAD

ARTICLES

5. VIRTUAL OR REALITY: PROSECUTORIAL PRACTICES IN CYBER
CHILD PORNOGRAPHY RING CASES

By: Michal Gilad

6. ORPHAN WORKS AT THE DAWN OF DIGITIZATION

By: Kelu Sullivan

7. 14 AN I: WHY CHANGING THE STANDARD FOR OVERCOMING THE
PRESUMPTION OF PATENT VALIDITY WILL CAUSE MORE HARM
THAN GOOD

By: John Morrisett

February 10, 2012

Dear Readers:

The *Richmond Journal of Law and Technology* is proud to present its second issue of the 2011-2012 academic year.

The *Journal* strives to discuss new and emerging issues that fall squarely at the intersection of technology and the law. As we enter the new year, we must remain mindful of the ever-growing role that technology plays in our daily lives. In that vein, the *Journal* believes it is our mission to promote a relevant and timely discussion on technology-related legal issues.

In our first article, “Virtual or Reality: Prosecutorial Practices in Cyber Child Pornography Ring Cases,” Michal Gilad addresses the need for prosecutors to implement enterprise-oriented strategies when prosecuting cases involving complex and sophisticated child pornography rings. Child pornography rings are responsible for committing crimes in cyberspace and meatspace, therefore, prosecutors must utilize existing criminal conspiracy doctrines to ensure that all members of the ring, whether possessors and distributors or actual physical abusers, are responsible for the harm caused by the group as a whole.

In our second article, “Orphan Works at the Dawn of Digitization,” Kelu Sullivan discusses the legal issues surrounding orphan works in the context of digital books. As a benchmark, Sullivan analyzes the proposed but ultimately rejected Amended Settlement Agreement from *Authors Guild v. Google, Inc* suit filed in the Southern District of New York. Sullivan offers a hybrid approach to solving the orphan works problem by combining elements derived from existing legislation and the Amended Settlement Agreement. These elements require creating an orphan works registry, issuing compulsory license fees, and establishing a private licensing body to assist third-parties in digitizing copyright protected works whose owners cannot be located.

Finally, in his article entitled “i 4 an i: Why Changing the Standard for Overcoming the Presumption of Patent Validity Will Cause More Harm Than Good,” John Morrisett analyzes the practical effects of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P’ship*. Morrisett agrees with the Court’s decision to maintain the clear and convincing standard for disputes regarding patent validity. However, Morrisett acknowledges that maintaining a

heightened standard may lead to substantial unfairness in cases where prior art was never considered by the PTO during the patent approval process, and proposes a legislative solution to address these situations.

On behalf of the entire 2011-2012 *Journal* staff, I extend our sincerest thanks for your continued readership. I would like to recognize the hard work and dedication of our staff who have spent countless hours working to complete this issue. I would especially like to thank our faculty advisors, Professors Melanie Holloway, Chris Cotropia and Jim Gibson for their invaluable guidance. Also, without the support of the University of Richmond School of Law this publication would not be possible.

The *Journal* is sure you will enjoy our second issue. As always, your comments and suggestions are welcome at jolt@richmond.edu.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ian Lambeets', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ian Lambeets
Editor-in-Chief

2011-2012 EDITORIAL BOARD

	Ian Lambeets Editor-in-Chief	
Nikki Najmyar Managing Editor	Lindsey Strachan* Executive Editor	Michele Fanney Senior Manuscripts Editor
Diana Koch-Blackman Notes & Comments Editor	Joel Hermsdorfer Annual Survey & Symposium Editor	Lauren Palmer Copy Editor
Scott Bergeson Articles Editor		Christine Cogbill Articles Editor
	Jessica Smith Technical Editor	

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Airen Adamonis	Andrew Bowman	Laura Cahill
Tyler Cantrell	Mihir Elchuri	PJ Fanning
Caroline Fox	Catherine Gill	Geneva Gnam
Brett Saunders	Nicholas Surace	Samantha Wessel

SENIOR STAFF

Connelle Armentrout	Katherine Dacheille
James Driggs	Beth Gould
Will Hollerith	Anthony Holman
Luke Mitchell	Tyler Rhodes
Mandy Rovelli	Jim Tartaglia
Jacob Tingen	Angela Wilborn

FACULTY ADVISORS

Professor Chris Cotropia	Professor Jim Gibson	Professor Melanie Holloway
--------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

* DENOTES PUBLICATION WITH THE *JOURNAL*.