

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON LAW REGULATING CYBERSQUATTING IN THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND MALAYSIA**

By

Muhammad Farid bin Omar (2011489878)

Muhammad Fuad bin Abd Rahman (2011290304)

Nadia Ezzati binti Mohd Zainal (2011829882)

Nurul Hanani binti Ismail (2011277436)

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Bachelor in Legal Studies (Hons)

**Universiti Teknologi MARA**

**Faculty of Law**

December 2013

The students/authors confirm that the work submitted is their own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the works of theirs

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

It would have been impossible to write this research paper without the help and support of the kind people around us, to only some of whom it is possible to give particular mention here.

This research paper has been carried out by a team which consists of four members. The members are Muhammad Fuad Bin Abd Rahman, Muhammad Farid Bin Omar, Nadia Ezzati binti Mohd Zainal and Nurul Hanani binti Ismail. Discussion had took place between us, throughout the semester to finish the research paper.

This thesis would not have been possible without the help, support and patience of our principal supervisor, Puan Wan Rosalili binti Wan Rosli, not to mention her advice and unsurpassed knowledge of international law. The good advice and support has been invaluable on both an academic and a personal level, for which we are extremely grateful.

Above all, we would like to thank our parents and friends, who have given us their unequivocal support throughout, as always, for which our mere expression of thanks likewise does not suffice.

## ABSTRACT

Cybersquatting was already an alarming issue throughout the whole world in these millennia. However through our observations in general, we see and discover that some regional minds especially for our scope, which is the proud and loving country of Malaysia have no significance stress on this issue as the heat of this offence either in the eye of the public as well as the Malaysian law itself, shows no inducement of seriousness in the aftermath of such offence. It may be fair to say that maybe the urge for development in this issue had not reach its peak in climax for an evolution and imposition for a much more perfected operation of law instead of only a functional one, but do we really need to actually wait for this issue to reach an alarming height where only then that we should take this offence seriously?. Due to this, we had decided to compare the United States of America's development of law against cybersquatting and make it our guideline of prevention in contrast with our country. Thus in this research, we had humbly highlighted the history of development of both the offence of cybersquatting as well as the stages in development of the Act that had emerged in governing them in both USA and Malaysia. With the degree of comparison with Malaysia, we had thus concluded that the same implementation that the USA had done in their cybersquatting Act should be done to Malaysian Act to improve its certain shortcomings.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract	iii
Contents	iv
List of Cases	vii

### CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Background	2
1.2	Research Questions	4
1.3	Research Objectives	4
1.4	Significance of the Research	5
1.5	Scope and Limitations of the Research	7
1.6	Research Methodology	8
1.7	Literature Review	11
1.8	Research Plan	18

### CHAPTER TWO: INTRODUCTION TO CYBERSQUATTING

2.0	Introduction	19
2.1	Cybersquatting and Its Safeguard	20
2.2	Development of Cybersquatting Law in Other Countries	23
	2.2.1 Development in Hong Kong	24
	2.2.2 Development in India	26
	2.2.3 Development in Singapore	27
	2.2.4 Development in United Kingdom	28
	2.2.5 Development in Australia	28
	2.2.6 Development in the United States of America	30
2.3	Conclusion	32

### **CHAPTER THREE: MALAYSIA’S POSITION ON CYBERSQUATTING**

3.0	Introduction	34
3.1	Trademark Infringement and Passing-Off under the Trade Marks Act 1976	34
3.2	Regulatory Body of Cybersquatting	35
3.3	The Complaint	35
3.4	Rights and Legitimate Interests in the Domain Name	36
3.5	Panel	37
3.6	Limitation on Liability	38
3.7	Remedies	38
3.8	Availability of Court Proceedings or Any Alternative Dispute Resolution Process	38
3.9	Cases on Cybersquatting in Malaysia	39
	3.9.1 Case decided in Court	40
	3.9.2 Cases decided by the KLRCA	40
3.10	Conclusion	43

### **CHAPTER FOUR: US POSITION ON SPECIFIC LEGISLATION ON CYBERSQUATTING**

4.0	Introduction	45
4.1	History of Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act 1999	45
4.2	The purpose and policies of Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA)	50
4.3	Link between ACPA with ICANN and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP)	51
4.4	Role of Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA) 1999	52
4.5	Remedies Offered by Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA) 1999	52
4.6	Conclusion	55