DMCA § 512: How It Works



Section 512 of the DMCA establishes notice-and-takedown process for resolving claims of online copyright infringement. It also includes a safe harbor framework so that Internet platforms which comply with the law's requirements are automatically liable for their users' copyright infringement. This law strikes a valuable balance that is still relevant today.

"The DMCA provides important certainty that our hosting of user generated content will not lead to costly and crippling copyright infringement lawsuits."

- Paul Sieminski, Automattic¹

Each § 512 stakeholder has responsibilities and enjoys benefits, depending on what information and content it controls. The copyright holder kicks off the notice-and-takedown process by identifying potential infringement. Internet platforms have to promptly remove allegedly infringing content when they receive a notice from a rightsholder in order to qualify for DMCA safe harbors. Oftentimes, though, notices are (mis)directed to legitimate content—e.g., a flagged piece of content does not implicate copyrighted content, is not infringing, or is protected by fair use—and it is up to users to file counter-notices to have their lawful content restored.

Copyright Holders	Internet Platforms	Internet Users
 Knows what is copyrighted Knows what is (and is not) infringement Knows facts relevant to fair use 	 Can remove content identified as infringement Cannot identify copyright infringement alone Can communicate with copyright holders & users 	 Allegedly infringing posts are removed from the Internet Must file counter-notices to have lawful content restored
 Gets an automatic injunction against allegations of infringement when it sends a takedown notice 	 Receives safe harbor protections for compliance with DMCA requirements 	 Enjoys use of Internet platforms that are able to exist because of DMCA safe harbors

Imposing new burdens on Internet platforms would harm startups: Despite its age, § 512 has successfully balanced the interests of copyright holders and Internet platforms. Changes that shift that balance would have an outsized and negative impact on startups.

- The high costs of filtering outweigh the benefits. Content filtering technology is very expensive, and even the most costly and sophisticated tools cannot accurately identify all infringement on a platform. Especially for platforms that rarely encounter copyrighted content, the high costs of imperfect technology are difficult to justify.
- Startups have the most to lose. Large companies may be able to afford filtering and bear litigation risks. But startups will not be able—and their investors are likely not willing—to face those costs.



