

LAWDM0070: Information Technology Law (PG)

[View Online](#)

1

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

2

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. Information technology law. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

3

Edwards L, editor. Law, policy, and the Internet. Oxford, UK: : Hart Publishing 2019.

4

Reed C. Making laws for cyberspace. 1st ed. Oxford, U.K.: : Oxford University Press 2012.

5

Nissenbaum HF. Privacy in context: technology, policy, and the integrity of social life. Stanford, Calif: : Stanford Law Books 2010.

6

Cohen JE. Configuring the networked self: law, code, and the play of everyday practice. New Haven [Conn.]: : Yale University Press

7

A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace | Electronic Frontier Foundation.
<https://www.eff.org/cyberspace-independence>

8

Johnson DR, Post D. Law and Borders: The Rise of Law in Cyberspace. Stanford Law Review 1996;**48**. doi:10.2307/1229390

9

Lawrence L. Code Version 2.0. <http://codev2.cc/download+remix/Lessig-Codev2.pdf>

10

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

11

Vranaki, A. A. Regulating Social Networking Sites: Facebook, Online Behavioral Advertising, Data Protection Laws and Powe. Rutgers Computer and Technology Law Journal, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/rutcomt43&iid=1>

12

Rowland D, et al., editors. Information Technology Law. Fifth edition. Abingdon: : Routledge 2017. doi:10.4324/9780203798522

13

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

14

Vranaki, A. A. Regulating Social Networking Sites: Facebook, Online Behavioral Advertising, Data Protection Laws and Powe. Rutgers Computer and Technology Law Journal, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/rutcomt43&id=1>

15

Lawrence L. Code Version 2.0. <http://codev2.cc/download+remix/Lessig-Codev2.pdf>

16

Post DG. What Larry Doesn't Get: Code, Law, and Liberty in Cyberspace. Stanford Law Review 2000;**52**. doi:10.2307/1229518

17

Reidenberg, J. R. Lex Informatica: The Formulation of Information Policy Rules through Technology. Texas Law Review, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/tlr76&id=571>

18

Mayer-Schonberger, V. Demystifying Lessig. Wisconsin Law Review , <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/wlr2008&id=725>

19

Brown I, Marsden CT. Regulating code: good governance and better regulation in the information age. Cambridge, Mass: : The MIT Press

20

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. Information technology law. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

21

Edwards L, editor. Law, policy, and the Internet. Oxford, UK: : Hart Publishing 2019.

22

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

23

The EU-US Privacy Shield.

https://iapp.org/media/pdf/resource_center/eu_us_privacy_shield_full_text.pdf.pdf

24

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

25

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. Information technology law. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

26

Lynskey O. The foundations of EU data protection law. First edition. Oxford, United Kingdom: : Oxford University Press 2015.

27

Poullet Y. Is the general data protection regulation the solution? Computer Law & Security Review 2018;**34**:773–8. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2018.05.021

28

Centre for Information Policy Leadership, 'The Central Role of Organisational Accountability in Data Protection'.

https://www.informationpolicycentre.com/uploads/5/7/1/0/57104281/cipl_accountability_paper_1_-_the_case_for_accountability_-_how_it_enables_effective_data_protection_and_trust_in_the_digital_society.pdf

29

Ferretti, Federico. Data protection and the legitimate interest of data controllers: Much ado about nothing or the winter of rights? *Common Market Law Review*; **51**:843–68. <http://www.kluwerlawonline.com/abstract.php?area=Journals&id=COLA2014063>

30

Powles, J. The Case That Won't Be Forgotten. *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal*, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/lucjlj47&id=1>

31

Veale M, Binns R, Ausloos J. When data protection by design and data subject rights clash. *International Data Privacy Law* 2018;**8**:105–23. doi:10.1093/idpl/ipy002

32

Kuner C. Reality and Illusion in EU Data Transfer Regulation Post. *German Law Journal* 2017;**18**:881–918. doi:10.1017/S2071832200022197

33

Vranaki, A. A. Learning Lessons from Cloud Investigations in Europe: Bargaining Enforcement and Multiple Centers of Regulation in Data Protection. *University of Illinois Journal of Law, Technology & Policy*, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/jltp2016&id=1>

34

Vranaki AAI. Cloud investigations by European data protection authorities: an empirical account. In: Rothchild JA, ed. *Research handbook on electronic commerce law*. 2016. <https://www.elgaronline.com/view/edcoll/9781783479917/9781783479917.00045.xml>

35

Koops B-J. The trouble with European data protection law. *International Data Privacy Law* 2014;**4**:250–61. doi:10.1093/idpl/ipu023

36

Raab C, Szekely I. Data protection authorities and information technology. *Computer Law & Security Review* 2017;**33**:421–33. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2017.05.002

37

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. *Information technology law*. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

38

UK ICO, 'Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Data Protection' (2017). <https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/2013559/big-data-ai-ml-and-data-protection.pdf>

39

Polonetsky, J.; Tene, O. Privacy and Big Data: Making Ends Meet. *Stanford Law Review Online*, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/slro66&id=25>

40

Lane J, Stodden V, Bender S, et al. *Privacy, big data, and the public good: frameworks for engagement*. Cambridge: : Cambridge University Press 2014.

41

Rubinstein IS. Big Data: The End of Privacy or a New Beginning? *International Data Privacy Law* 2013;**3**:74–87. doi:10.1093/idpl/ips036

42

UK ICO, 'Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Data Protection' (2017).
<https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/2013559/big-data-ai-ml-and-data-protection.pdf>

43

Nissenbaum HF. Privacy in context: technology, policy, and the integrity of social life. Stanford, Calif: : Stanford Law Books 2010.

44

van der Sloot, B.; van Schendel, S. Ten Questions for Future Regulation of Big Data: A Comparative and Empirical Legal Study. Journal of Intellectual Property, Information Technology and Electronic Commerce Law,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/jipitec7&id=116>

45

Mayer-Scho

..
nberger V, Cukier K. Big data: a revolution that will transform how we live, work and think. London: : John Murray 2013.

46

Mayer-Schonberger, V.; Padova, Y. Regime Change: Enabling Big Data through Europe's New Data Protection Regulation. Columbia Science and Technology Law Review,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/cstlr17&id=1>

47

Mantelero A. The future of consumer data protection in the E.U. Re-thinking the "notice and consent" paradigm in the new era of predictive analytics. Computer Law & Security Review 2014;**30**:643–60. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2014.09.004

48

Cate FH, Mayer-Schonberger V. Notice and consent in a world of Big Data. *International Data Privacy Law* 2013;**3**:67–73. doi:10.1093/idpl/ipt005

49

Wachter, S.; Mittelstadt, B. A Right to Reasonable Inferences: Re-Thinking Data Protection Law in the Age of Big Data and AI. *Columbia Business Law Review*, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/colb2019&id=1>

50

Murray A. *Information technology law: the law & society*. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

51

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. *Information technology law*. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

52

A multi-dimensional approach to disinformation : report of the independent High level Group on fake news and online disinformation.
<https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/6ef4df8b-4cea-11e8-be1d-01aa75ed71a1>

53

Code of Practice on Disinformation.
<https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/code-practice-disinformation>

54

Napoli, P. M. What If More Speech Is No Longer the Solution: First Amendment Theory Meets Fake News and the Filter Bubble. *Federal Communications Law Journal*, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/fedcom70&id=67>

55

Chesney, R.; Citron, D. Deepfakes and the New Disinformation War: The Coming Age of Post-Truth Geopolitics. *Foreign Affairs*,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/fora98&id=1>

56

Balkin, J. M. Digital Speech and Democratic Culture: A Theory of Freedom of Expression for the Information Society. *New York University Law Review*,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/nylr79&id=15>

57

Laidlaw EB. *Regulating speech in cyberspace: gatekeepers, human rights and corporate responsibility*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: : Cambridge University Press 2015.

58

Barendt EM. *Freedom of speech*. 2nd ed. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2009.

59

Lazer DMJ. The science of fake news. *Science* 2018;**359**:1094–6.
doi:10.1126/science.aao2998

60

House of Commons Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee, *Disinformation and 'fake news': Final Report HC 1791 Eighth Report of Session 2017–19*.
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcmds/1791/1791.pdf>

61

Goldberg, D. *Responding to Fake News: Is There an Alternative to Law and Regulation*. *Southwestern Law Review*,

<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/swulr47&id=1>

62

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

63

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. Information technology law. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

64

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. Information technology law. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

65

Mills A. The law applicable to cross-border defamation on social media: whose law governs free speech in 'Facebookistan'? Journal of Media Law 2015;**7**:1–35.
doi:10.1080/17577632.2015.1055942

66

□□E Laidlaw and H Young, Internet Intermediary Liability in Defamation: Proposals For Statutory Reform: Defamation Law in the Internet Age (2017).
<http://www.lco-cdo.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/DIA-Commissioned-Paper-Laidlaw-and-Young.pdf>

67

Edwards L, editor. Law, policy, and the Internet. Oxford, UK: : Hart Publishing 2019.

68

Thompson, M. Beyond Gatekeeping: The Normative Responsibility of Internet

Intermediaries. *Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment & Technology Law*, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/vanep18&id=807>

69

Mangan D. Regulating for responsibility: reputation and social media. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* 2015;**29**:16–32. doi:10.1080/13600869.2015.1008960

70

Laidlaw EB. *Regulating Speech in Cyberspace*. Cambridge: : Cambridge University Press 2015. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107278721

71

Polański PP. Rethinking the notion of hosting in the aftermath of Delfi: Shifting from liability to responsibility? *Computer Law & Security Review* 2018;**34**:870–80. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2018.05.034

72

Mangan D, Gillies LE, editors. An unwholesome layer cake: intermediary liability in English defamation and data protection law. In: *The Legal Challenges of Social Media*. 2017. <https://www.elgaronline.com/view/edcoll/9781785364501/9781785364501.00025.xml>

73

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. *Information technology law*. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

74

Murray A. *Information technology law: the law & society*. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

75

Fafinski S. Computer misuse: response, regulation, and the law. Cullompton, Devon: : Willan Pub 2009.

76

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

77

Fafinski S. Computer misuse: response, regulation, and the law. Cullompton, Devon: : Willan Pub 2009.

78

Fafinski S. Computer Misuse: The Implications of the Police and Justice Act 2006. The Journal of Criminal Law 2008;**72**:53–66. doi:10.1350/jcla.2008.72.1.477

79

Gillespie AA. Cybercrime: Key Issues and Debates. 2nd ed. Milton: : Routledge 2019.

80

Clough J. Principles of Cybercrime. Cambridge: : Cambridge University Press 2015. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139540803

81

Walden I. Computer crimes and digital investigations. 2nd edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2016.

82

Calderoni F. The European legal framework on cybercrime: striving for an effective implementation. Crime, Law and Social Change 2010;**54**:339–57. doi:10.1007/s10611-010-9261-6

83

Davies G. Court of Appeal High Court. The Journal of Criminal Law 2018;**82**:296–300.
doi:10.1177/0022018318791670

84

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

85

Richards, Neil M.1 (AUTHOR). THE DANGERS OF SURVEILLANCE. Harvard Law Review 2013;**126**
:1934–65.<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=87598612&site=ehost-live>

86

Addressing the Harm of Total Surveillance: A Reply to Professor Neil Richards - Harvard Law Review.
<https://harvardlawreview.org/2013/06/addressing-the-harm-of-total-surveillance-a-reply-to-professor-neil-richards/>

87

Solove, D. J. I've Got Nothing to Hide and Other Misunderstandings of Privacy. San Diego Law Review,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/sanlr44&id=1>

88

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. Information technology law. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

89

Ni Loideain N. EU Law and Mass Internet Metadata Surveillance in the Post-Snowden Era. Media and Communication 2015;**3**. doi:10.17645/mac.v3i2.297

90

Kouvakas, I. The Watson Case: Another Missed Opportunity for Stricto Sensu Proportionality. Cambridge Law Review, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/cambrilv2&id=181>

91

Cameron, Iain. A. Court of Justice Balancing data protection and law enforcement needs: Tele2 Sverige and Watson. Common Market Law Review;**54**:1467-95.<http://www.kluwerlawonline.com/abstract.php?area=Journals&id=COLA2017119>

92

Edwards L, editor. Law, policy, and the Internet. Oxford, UK: : Hart Publishing 2019.

93

Rowland D, Kohl U, Charlesworth A. Information technology law. Fifth edition. Abingdon, Oxon: : Routledge 2017.

94

Klerman, D. Forum Selling and Domain-Name Disputes. Loyola University Chicago Law Journal, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/lucilj48&id=1>

95

Mac Sithigh D. More than words: the introduction of internationalised domain names and the reform of generic top-level domains at ICANN. International Journal of Law and Information Technology 2010;**18**:274-300. doi:10.1093/ijlit/eqq007

96

Arnot, J. A. Navigating Cybersquatting Enforcement in the Expanding Internet. John Marshall Review of Intellectual Property Law,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/johnmars13&id=329>

97

Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Policy - ICANN.
<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/help/dndr/udrp-en>

98

Holstein-Childress, V. Lex Cyberus: The UDRP as a Gatekeeper to Judicial Resolution of Competing Rights to Domain Names. Penn State Law Review,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/dlr109&id=575>

99

Geist, M. Fair.Com: An Examination of the Allegations of Systemic Unfairness in the ICANN UDRP. Brooklyn Journal of International Law,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/bjil27&id=915>

100

Murray A. Information technology law: the law & society. 4th edition. Oxford: : Oxford University Press 2019.

101

Lindsay, D. Website Blocking Injunctions to Prevent Copyright Infringements: Proportionality and Effectiveness. University of New South Wales Law Journal,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/swales40&id=1528>

102

Lodder AR, Puck Polter. ISP blocking and filtering: on the shallow justification in case law regarding effectiveness of measures. *European Journal of Law and Technology* 2017;**8**.
<http://ejlt.org/article/view/517>

103

Geiger, C.; Izyumenko, E. The Role of Human Rights in Copyright Enforcement Online: Elaborating a Legal Framework for Website Blocking. *American University International Law Review*,
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/amuilr32&id=1>

104

Michael W, Rebecca S. 'Searching for the Silver Bullet: How Website Blocking Injunctions are Changing Online IP Enforcement. *Australian Intellectual Property Journal* 2014;**25**.

105

Bernd Justin Jütte*. The beginning of a (happy?) relationship: copyright and freedom of expression in Europe. *European Intellectual Property Review* 2016;**38**:11–22.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=https%3A%2F%2Fidp.bris.ac.uk%2Fshibboleth&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fwestlawuk.thomsonreuters.co.uk%2FBrowse%2FHome%2FWestlawUK%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

106

Synodinou T-E. Intermediaries' liability for online copyright infringement in the EU: Evolutions and confusions. *Computer Law & Security Review* 2015;**31**:57–67.
doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2014.11.010

107

Angelopoulos C. Sketching the outline of a ghost: the fair balance between copyright and fundamental rights in intermediary third party liability. *info* 2015;**17**:72–96.
doi:10.1108/info-05-2015-0028

108

Bryson JJ, Diamantis ME, Grant TD. Of, for, and by the people: the legal lacuna of synthetic

persons. Artificial Intelligence and Law 2017;**25**:273–91. doi:10.1007/s10506-017-9214-9

109

Guihot, M.; Matthew, A. F.; Suzor, N. P. Nudging Robots: Innovative Solutions to Regulate Artificial Intelligence. Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment & Technology Law, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/vanep20&id=1>

110

Reed C. How should we regulate artificial intelligence? Philosophical transactions Series A, Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences 2018;**376**.
<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rsta.2017.0360>

111

Barfield W, Pagallo U, editors. Research handbook on the law of artificial intelligence. Cheltenham, UK: : Edward Elgar Publishing 2018.
<https://www.elgaronline.com/view/edcoll/9781786439048/9781786439048.xml>

112

European Parliament Committee on Legal Affairs, 'Report with Recommendations to the Commission on Civil Law Rules on Robotics' (2015/2103(INL)) A8-0005/27 January 2017.
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2017-0005_EN.html

113

Science and Technology Committee, Robotics and Artificial Intelligence (HC 2016-145).
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmsstech/145/14502.htm>

114

Artificial Intelligence Committee, AI in the UK: Ready, Willing and Able? (HL 2018 - 100).
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldai/100/100.pdf>

115

Ryan Calo. Robotics and the Lessons of Cyberlaw. California Law Review 2015;**103**
[.https://www.jstor.org/stable/24758483?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/24758483?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)

116

Balkin, Jack M. The Path of Robotics Law.
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2586570