**Special 301 Recommendation:** IIPA recommends that Mexico be retained on the Watch List in 2015.¹

**Executive Summary:** In 2014, there were some notable enforcement actions undertaken against hard goods piracy (including at the Tepito marketplace, notorious for its illegal stalls and warehouses), which resulted in the seizure of large quantities of illegal goods. This continues a longstanding pattern, where the Mexican federal authorities continue to engage in copyright enforcement efforts in good cooperation with rights holders against hard copy piracy, but efforts against digital piracy remain weak. In addition, state and municipal government anti-piracy efforts continue to be weak overall, with few local entities working on combating illegal trade and piracy.

Expanding the legitimate digital marketplace continues to be a priority for the copyright industries, especially now that nearly half of the Mexican population is online. Unfortunately, the Government of Mexico has been very slow to promote cooperation between rights holders and Internet Service Providers (ISPs) to combat online copyright infringement, which would allow the legal market to flourish. Any meaningful reform of the Copyright Law (especially digital enforcement reform) has stalled, awaiting the conclusion of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP). It is hoped that the TPP will enhance copyright and enforcement standards in Mexico and other countries in the region, building upon those agreed to by current FTA partners, and found in the more recent in-force agreement with Korea, to improve the digital marketplace.

In short, the Mexican legal regime for dealing with online infringement remains deeply deficient. Draft amendments circulated in 2013 failed to address third party (ISP) liability at all, and provided very weak notice and notice (instead of notice and takedown) provisions. A much more effective approach is available. Over six years ago, 37 civil organizations representing copyright industries, other rights holders and collecting societies formally established the Coalition for the Legal Access to Culture (CLAC) to promote and defend copyrights and related rights threatened by physical and online piracy, working with different government entities and federal authorities. The CLAC also focused on legislative reforms, including addressing private copy issues and promoting cooperation between rights holders and ISPs to address piracy in the online environment. The CLAC initiative provides a sound framework for needed improvements, including inter alia: (1) effective notice and takedown procedures; (2) rules that clarify the illegality of providing services intended to promote the infringement of copyright and related rights; and (3) injunctive relief and a duty on ISPs to provide information to law enforcement agencies.

Other key recommended legal reforms in Mexico include: full implementation of the WIPO Internet treaties, with proper protection for technological protection measures (an imperative for many copyright industries), including criminalizing the trafficking in circumvention devices; clarifying the making available right; criminalizing camcording; raising penalties to deterrent levels; and creating an effective warning system for online users and cooperation with ISPs.

Even with the large-scale enforcement actions in 2014, hard copy piracy persists, including CD-R and DVD-R burned discs of music, audiovisual and video games (as well as circumvention devices), all widely available in numerous street markets. In addition, major problems persist including the unauthorized camcording of films in theaters – over 24 American feature films were sourced from illicit camcords in Mexico in 2014, as well as the unauthorized photocopying of books at universities.

¹For more details on Mexico’s Special 301 history, see previous years’ reports at [http://www.iipa.com/countryreports.html](http://www.iipa.com/countryreports.html). For the history of Mexico’s Special 301 placement, see [http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2015SPEC301HISTORICALCHART.pdf](http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2015SPEC301HISTORICALCHART.pdf).
The copyright industries recommend several enforcement measures (criminal, administrative and prosecutorial) as well as the legal reforms noted above, in order for the Government of Mexico to improve its IPR regime, led by the development and enactment of a high-level national anti-piracy plan to adopt a broad strategy against major targets, and to coordinate federal, state and municipal enforcement activities.

**PRIORITY ACTIONS REQUESTED IN 2015**

The copyright industries recommend that the Government of Mexico work with them to promote better cooperation in the fight against Internet piracy. This includes adopting needed legislative reforms and best practices in accordance with Memoranda of Understandings (MOUs) with relevant stakeholders, as well as taking the following priority legal reform and enforcement measures:

**Criminal Actions, Raids and Prosecutions**

- Implement a national *ex officio* anti-piracy campaign with a consistent year-round focus on major targets (e.g., online sources of infringing content, suppliers, traffickers and distribution chains), emphasizing coordination of the police and prosecutorial resources, and a strategic approach, with a prominent role for the Specialized Unit on Investigation of Crimes Committed Against Industrial Property and Copyright (UEIDDAPI) within the Attorney General’s Office (PGR).

- Provide UEIDDAPI with adequate resources, including support from other enforcement agencies, to undertake raids and seizures at major markets. “Pirate free” areas around legal vendors at markets should be maintained and expanded, in particular, in Mexico City, Guadalajara and Monterrey. Criminal actions should be taken against market owners for illicit activities.

- Provide Customs with adequate resources and *ex officio* authority to independently conduct seizures of infringing goods and components.

- Ensure timely destruction of illegal goods seized in criminal and administrative actions to prevent their reentry into the market.

**Administrative Enforcement**

- Provide the Institute of Industrial Property (IMPI) with additional resources, encourage it to issue decisions more expeditiously, and allow IMPI regional officers to conduct local raids. In 2014, IMPI was able to use its administrative authority to take down an infringing website (*ba-k.com*), the first such action in Mexico; this should set a precedent for future infringement actions.

- Provide INDAUTOR (the author’s rights institute) with more resources to conduct *ex officio* inspections related to copyright infringements, as well as the facilities to increase and strengthen its mediation capabilities.

**Prosecutions, Judges and Courts**

- Encourage prosecutors to take *ex officio* actions against piracy (especially online piracy), to focus on prosecuting individuals arrested in such actions, and to seek deterrent sentences, including jail time; in addition, increase IPR case training for prosecutors.

- Adopt mandatory sentencing regulations or guidelines to promote deterrent sentencing in piracy cases, and increase IPR judicial training, with an emphasis on technology, so that prosecutors seek, and judges impose, deterrent criminal penalties.

- Implement *ex parte* remedies, especially injunctive relief, for civil IPR infringement cases in order to fulfill Mexico’s WTO TRIPS Agreement obligations.
• Encourage PGR to reverse its current refusal to investigate and prosecute IPR infringement cases absent proof of actual lost profits, rather than based on the harm to rights holders.

Legal Reforms

• Fully implement the WIPO Internet treaties – in the Copyright, Industrial Property, Criminal and Criminal Procedure Codes.

• Enact legislation to create incentives for ISPs to cooperate with right holders to combat infringement taking place over their networks or platforms (following the Coalition for the Legal Access to Culture (CLAC) initiative).

• Enact legislation to impose criminal penalties for the unauthorized camcording of films in theaters.

• Amend the Criminal Code and the Copyright Law to authorize criminal sanctions for the distribution and importation of devices used for the unauthorized circumvention of technological protection measures (TPMs).

• Amend the Copyright Act or Industrial Property Law to remove the proof-of-profit standards (and onerous authorization standards) for infringements of the making available right.

• Amend the Copyright Act or Industrial Property Law to criminalize copyright infringement on a commercial scale, regardless of whether the activity was undertaken for profit-making purposes.

• Amend the Forfeiture Law to cover copyright infringements undertaken by organized crime syndicates.

COPYRIGHT PIRACY IN MEXICO

Internet piracy: There are now an estimated 59.2 million Internet users in Mexico, representing over 49% of the population, up from 2.7% in 2000 (as of June 2014, per www.internetworldstats.com). Internet piracy, in the absence of effective enforcement, has grown rapidly in Mexico, including unauthorized downloads and illegal streaming. The copyright industries report a three-fold increase in digital piracy since 2010 (according to studies conducted by CLAC and the research firm IPSOS). The most prevalent digital platforms are peer-to-peer (P2P) file sharing services, and sites dedicated to providing links to infringing hosted content, illegal distribution hubs (also known as cyberlockers), forums and social networks, BitTorrent index sites and blogs. Many sites are hosted in the U.S. and Europe, but administered in Mexico. Even though many sites and services are not hosted in Mexico, the Mexican authorities can use effective remedies and regulations against large-scale infringers, and can do so without unintended collateral consequences, in addition to adopting notice and takedown and other more effective measures for local sites. The BitTorrent tracker demonoid.me was taken down by the authorities in 2012, and remains down (although a new domain hosts a similar site at demonoid.pw). A criminal investigation is ongoing, and no criminal proceeding has yet commenced. One Spanish language website that is very popular in Mexico is seriesyonkis.com. This site provides illegal linking and streaming of motion pictures and television programs, and was designated by the U.S. Government as a “Notorious Market” in February 2014 (at the conclusion of the 2013 out-of-cycle review).

The most widespread source of music piracy is P2P activity with ARES, Gnutella and BitTorrent dominating, as well as “linked” piracy on blogs and forum sites. Blogspot, a Google service, has been widely used to provide these links. The independent sector of the film and television industry (IFTA) is especially concerned about Internet piracy because of its harm to legitimate online distribution platforms and services that provide the revenue for financing the development of new creative works worldwide. The Entertainment Software Association (ESA) reports that in 2014, Mexico ranked 17th in the world in terms of the number of connections by peers participating in unauthorized file-sharing of select ESA-member titles on public P2P networks. Basic legal reforms and significantly improved enforcement are needed to address these forms of piracy in Mexico.
Hard goods piracy: Although there has been a significant decline in the sale of legitimate hard goods in recent years, hard goods piracy persists both in the manufacturing and distribution networks, and on the street and at markets. In 2012, the U.S. Government named three Mexican markets to its “Notorious Markets” list. Two of those same markets were included on the 2013 list (released in February 2014): (1) San Juan de Dios in Guadalajara, which the U.S. Government described as an “indoor flea market” with over 300 vendors selling pirated first-run movies, music, video games, software and other items; and (2) Tepito in Mexico City, “reportedly the main warehousing and distribution center for pirated and counterfeit products” sold throughout Mexico. In its February 2014 announcement, the U.S. Government said “[b]oth markets are rife with pirated and counterfeit goods, including music CDs, DVDs, video games, other software, clothing, shoes and electronics, are known throughout Mexico and the region as centers of counterfeiting and piracy, and exemplify the type of market that sustains counterfeiting and piracy around the world.” In addition, the U.S. Government cited reports that both markets have links to “transnational and domestic organized crime groups.” Pulga Rio (Las Pulgas) in Monterrey, the third market on the 2012 list, was described as a “major hub for counterfeit and pirated goods” in the state of Nuevo Leon; it was removed from the list in February 2014, after what the U.S. Government described as, “recognition of sustained efforts by Mexican authorities.”

The motion picture industry (the Association for the Protection of Film and Music (APCM)) reports that roughly 90% of film or television DVDs sold in Mexico are pirated. Eight raids in 2014 against Tepito (and nine in San Juan de Dios) were coordinated between APCM and UEIDDAPI, and resulted in significant seizures; but piracy remains strong even at those markets. All of the copyright industries report little overall progress against the other major distribution centers for optical disc piracy (CDs and DVDs) of music, film, and entertainment software in Mexico, which include: Lomas Verdes, La Fayuca, Plaza Meave, Juarez or Central Camionera, Toreo Subway Station (and market), Salto de Agua, La Cuchilla, Pulga Rio, Pulga Guadalupe, Pulga Mitras, El Parjan, Plaza Lido, Zona Rosa, Plaza Degollado, Las Brisas/La Mesa and Carpas Santa Fe. There are over 90 such markets operating across the country, many of which are well organized and continue to be politically protected. Over half of these markets are on public land, increasing the need for action by municipal and state authorities. One state government, Queretaro, is working with APCM to try to establish the first “pirate free” state, working with federal and municipal governments there.

Many of the street markets have discrete distribution chains and often involve organized criminal syndicates. IIPA continues to recommend focusing enforcement on these locales, with a more systematic approach to identifying and prosecuting the criminal organizations operating in these markets. Such efforts should make use of the new forfeiture law, under which landlords aware of criminal activity on property they own must either stop the activity, notify the authorities, or face liability. In addition, labs and warehouses are located in many markets, including many in Mexico City, Monterrey, Guadalajara, Puebla, Veracruz, Toluca and Tijuana. One positive note in 2014: for the first time, enforcement authorities targeted labs and warehouses connected to some of the major markets, instead of only focusing on vendors.

APCM reported the following regarding raids and seizures in 2014: there were over 6.4 million CDs and DVDs seized, and over 8,590 burners seized, with over 1,506 actions taken in Mexico City alone. Almost all of the pirated disc product in Mexican markets is locally manufactured, so controlling blank optical media imports is very important. Mexico imports much of its blank media from Taiwan and China; the main ports of entrance are Manzanillo, Lazaro Cardenas, Matamoros, Reynosa, and Laredo.

Hard goods piracy remains very damaging for the entertainment software industry, as evidenced by the enormous quantities of burned optical discs and counterfeit cartridges (and memory cards loaded with hundreds of video games downloaded from the Internet) found in many of the major markets cited above, particularly Tepito, San Juan de Dios, La Fayuca, Plaza Meave and Bazar Pericoapa. Industry enforcement efforts have uncovered multiple burning labs in Tepito capable of producing hundreds of thousands of pirated video games. The widespread availability of circumvention devices and technologies in many markets, and, increasingly, from online auction and e-commerce sites, underpins and facilitates the growing problem of online piracy of entertainment software in Mexico.
Circumvention is accomplished by the installation of “modification chips” in consoles, which bypass the technological protections embedded in the hardware and enable the play of pirated video games, or by modifying the video game platform’s operating system to facilitate the play of pirated video games (so-called “soft modding”). Circumvention devices are typically manufactured overseas and shipped in component pieces which are then assembled in Mexico. Vendors, and online marketplaces such as Mercado Libre, sell circumvention devices for approximately 350 to 500 Pesos (US$24 to US$34), often with memory cards containing up to 400 unauthorized copies of video games as part of the sale. Enforcement against distributors of circumvention devices is unavailable, because Mexican criminal law prohibits only the domestic manufacture of such devices, but not their distribution or sale.

Camcord piracy: Incidents of illegal recording of films in Mexican theaters increased significantly in 2014, with at least 24 stolen films being detected from Mexican theaters. In recent years there have been a few convictions in several highly-publicized cases, but only because prosecutors were able to prove not only camcording, but an array of other crimes. In Mexico, successful enforcement against camcord piracy requires evidence of intent to distribute, that is, proof of a profit motive, which is very difficult to obtain. In order to do this, investigators have to watch the thieves actually camcord the movie, walk out of the theater, hand a copy to the people who hired them, and then wait for the film to be widely distributed; by that time, grievous harm has resulted. By comparison, in the U.S. or Canada, the laws recognize the act of unauthorized camcording in a cinema as a crime by itself. Mexico’s anti-camcording law must be strengthened to allow for enforcement without proof of a profit motive, to prevent further harm to the Mexican box office, as well to the other distribution channels for films in Mexico. Rights holders have been working with exhibitors to deter and combat camcording by conducting training programs for theater employees. In addition, investigators have identified suspects in the state of Puebla and are focusing on how recordings flow to release groups throughout Latin America, to try to crack the distribution chain.

COPYRIGHT ENFORCEMENT IN MEXICO

Three federal agencies take the lead in copyright enforcement in Mexico. The Attorney General’s Office (the PGR) is responsible for federal criminal enforcement. The Mexican Institute of Industrial Property (IMPI) takes administrative actions under the Industrial Property and Copyright Law. INDAUTOR (the author’s rights institute) is responsible for registering copyrights, as well as enforcement. The Scientific Police of the Secretaria de Seguridad Publica have also assisted rights holders by providing information on illegal software websites, although following recent changes in leadership, the quantity of collaboration has somewhat declined.

Criminal Enforcement

While cooperation between rights holders and the PGR is very solid, IPR prosecution is being hampered by insufficient resources, inadequate training to new agents (despite many programs), and the lack of deterrent sentences. The number of cases is still far below what is needed to have any significant effect on the marketplace. Additionally, some of copyright industries reported excellent cooperation with IMPI against hard goods piracy in inspection visits and ex officio raids in 2014. Lack of coordination between the government agencies (PGR, the specialized IP unit, and local police forces) has continued to stymie enforcement against the distributors of infringing entertainment software. On many occasions in 2014, the Specialized IP Unit obtained search warrants to raid premises known to harbor commercial-scale piratical operations but warrants were not executed (or were delayed) because police officers were not assigned to assist with raids. The entertainment software industry, along with the other copyright industries, recommends that prosecutors continue to focus their efforts on major sellers and repeat offenders, rather than on street vendors (further recommending that street vendor raids be used to investigate supply chains to target large-scale distributors, with follow-up criminal prosecutions).

Structural reforms and jurisdictional issues: IIPA continues to recommend several “structural” reforms or agency actions to improve criminal enforcement. An overarching recommendation is to implement a national ex officio anti-piracy campaign. Such an effort would seek to coordinate the various police agencies (including the Federal Police (PF), the Ministry of the Interior (Gobernación), and the Mexican Tax Administration (SAT), as well as
state and local police) that need to be involved in identifying and targeting individuals responsible for large-scale distribution and importation of pirated goods, including the major organized crime syndicates engaged in these operations. The campaign could also focus on well-known street markets, labs and distribution centers responsible for the sale of large quantities of pirated goods. In 2013, a national IPR enforcement plan was publicly released, and meetings were held with stakeholders in 2014, but the plan has never been implemented; it is a step in the right direction even if it does not have all of the recommended components for an effective plan. That said, joint implementation and monitoring of an IPR enforcement plan among PGR, SAT, IMPI, PROFECO and the Federal Police is required. Last year, SAT engaged with PGR to support enforcement actions related to audiovisual piracy, especially in cases where money laundering or tax evasion was suspected. The 2013 actions were focused in Mexico City. There were no reports of any additional such cases in 2014.

A second and related recommendation is to coordinate municipal, state, and federal government criminal enforcement actions. In Mexico’s 32 states there are 2,400 municipal governments, 190 of which have populations of over 100,000. Each one of these municipalities has regulations related to commercial establishments, markets and street vendors; but even so, few local anti-piracy actions have been taken. Only five of Mexico’s 32 state governments currently cooperate on IPR enforcement – the State of Mexico, the Federal District, Jalisco, Queretaro and Puebla. Besides improving cooperation in these states, coordinating federal-local efforts in Nuevo Leon, Morelos, Baja California Norte, Veracruz and Michoacán should be priorities.

A third recommendation is to significantly improve the PGR’s criminal enforcement actions, especially outside of the main cities. Since 2010, the PGR has had the authority to take ex officio actions against copyright infringement. In 2013, a change in administration brought a change in the PGR’s strategy that continued into 2014, which prioritized street raids instead of raids at laboratories and warehouses, resulting in a decrease in the overall number of actions.

Organized crime syndicates continue to predominate in hard goods piracy, and increasingly, in digital piracy. The PGR has a special piracy unit, the “Subprocuraduría” Specialized in Investigation of Federal Crimes (SEIDF), which has worked effectively with industries and achieved significant results in some key markets (including in digital piracy cases). However, this unit is under-resourced to effectively dismantle organized crime networks. There is also a PGR Organized Crime Investigative Division (PGR-SIEDO) with excellent investigators and attorneys and resources that the other divisions do not have, including paid informants, wire-tapping authority and witness protection programs. IIPA members recommend better coordination between PGR-SIEDO and PGR-SEIDF, as well as additional resources and training.

Fourth, enforcement agencies should adopt clear and consistent policies for the expeditious destruction of seized infringing goods. The copyright industries have successfully applied the “Ley Federal de Extinción de Dominio” (Federal Law for Property Forfeiture) in piracy cases; but materials seized in the PGR enforcement raids continue to find their way back into the black market. Some rights holders continue to report problems, although there were a few instances in 2014 where rights holders were notified, and did cooperate in the destruction of confiscated goods. Article 75 of the Federal Law for the Administration and Alienation of Public Sector Goods requires a final court order to destroy goods, unless they are abandoned, and prosecutors need to wait 90 days to declare goods “abandoned” in order to destroy them. IIPA recommends both clarity in the law, and more cooperation with rights holders to ensure that illegal materials are not returned into the stream of commerce.

Fifth, the Federal Bureau of Consumer Interests (PROFECO) should use its ex officio powers for consumer protection to stop street market piracy. Unfortunately, PROFECO lacks the human and financial resources to properly conduct raids, and needs police assistance to protect its personnel during raids. There have been ongoing training programs with different agencies undertaken by industry, but PROFECO still needs to be properly resourced to undertake action against street markets. Multiple changes in the leadership in PROFECO have complicated efforts to develop sustained and effective enforcement improvements.
A continuing weak spot in Mexican IPR enforcement is the judiciary – the need for training to improve IPR expertise by judges (especially training on technology, including circumvention devices, digital distribution, and online piracy); the lack of specialized IP judges and courts; the non-deterrent sentencing in many or most cases (criminal sentences are rare, given the number of raids and cases commenced); and persistent problems with civil litigation. IIPA recommends that Mexico consider the adoption of mandatory sentencing regulations for criminal copyright cases, and/or that the Supreme Court issue its own recommended guidelines to assist judges with the imposition of deterrent sentences and the award of damages (reparación del daño). That court should also issue an advisory to criminal judges nationwide to act expeditiously on applications for search warrants. Judges should also be encouraged to treat copyright treaty obligations as self-executing (in accordance with 2010 constitutional amendments and Supreme Court decisions). Finally, Mexico should provide sufficient resources for the IP magistrates within the Tax Court, and consider creating specialized IP administrative circuit courts.

Civil Enforcement

Mexico’s three-tiered civil procedure system makes civil litigation too complicated, time consuming, and costly for rights holders. There have been some recent improvements: for example, the Copyright Law was amended in 2013 to allow rights holders to seek damages in civil courts even before an administrative infringement decision is issued or becomes final. Mexican law now grants full validity to electronic documents and discovery, although some judges are still not familiar with these rules. The Civil Code was amended (in 2011) to provide ex parte measures to avoid the destruction of evidence; however, those provisions have still not been implemented. There were no reports of such closures in 2014, although IIPA members have reported in prior years that IMPI’s business closures, for those opposing inspection visits, have been effective.

Administrative Enforcement

IMPI: Statutory changes that took effect in 2012 increased the penalties IMPI could impose, and established a presumption of infringement in cases where enterprises refuse entry to IMPI inspectors (so-called “door closures”). These changes have borne fruit, with IMPI undertaking actions against businesses, imposing fines, including immediate fines in door closure cases or against businesses who opposed inspection visits. Rights holder groups report significant cooperation and coordination with IMPI on enforcement actions (for example, against commercial establishments using unauthorized music), resulting in more and higher fines, and IIPA members were pleased with IMPI’s (first) administrative takedown of an infringing website in 2014. Many of the copyright industries continue to recommend that investigations be conducted more rapidly (including faster issuance of decisions), and that evidence be preserved immediately upon discovery of a presumptive infringement (including evidence discovered by the authorities during inspections, even if that evidence is not listed on the inspection order). Several copyright industries reported that IMPI inspectors in 2013 did gather more detailed evidence than in prior years, and that this resulted in better outcomes for infringement cases (including higher fines). IMPI needs more resources to carry out its enforcement mission, including recording equipment, personnel and training. IMPI should also be encouraged to waive or lower rights holder’s deposit fees in instances of “obvious” piracy. It is also recommended that IMPI empower its regional offices to conduct raids and seizures.

INDAUTOR: IIPA members continue to recommend additional training for INDAUTOR staff on key copyright matters, and that public awareness initiatives should continue to issue general information about the importance of copyright to the local culture and economy. INDAUTOR should be allocated more resources and facilities to increase and strengthen its mediation capabilities, as well as to conduct ex officio inspections related to copyright infringement. INDAUTOR also is responsible for supervising the collecting societies in Mexico. This includes the authority to issue tariff rates for the broadcasting of sound recordings in TV and radio stations.
Online Enforcement

Several legal deficiencies hamper effective online enforcement. First, there is no specific Mexican legislation establishing liability principles for ISPs in piracy cases. It is assumed that ISPs are subject only to the general liability principles contained in the Civil and Criminal Codes. Without clear legal standards, ISPs claim uncertainty on how to react to Internet piracy and to notice and takedown notifications from the copyright industries. Some IIPA members report cooperation with hosted content takedowns, but more broadly, there is little or no cooperation with many local ISPs. Google Mexico has been blocking links in Blogspot in response to takedown notices sent by rights holders (including, in December 2014, allowing the video game producers to use bulk submissions). But, their takedown procedure has generally proven to be very time consuming for most of the copyright industries, and thus not a very effective remedy.

Second, specific provisions in the Telecommunications Law prohibit ISPs from disclosing a customer’s personal information to rights holders seeking civil recourse against alleged infringers (although Article 189 of the Telecommunications Law, as amended in August 2014, does allow an ISP to cooperate with an order from any judicial authority). Additionally, ISPs have been reluctant to include clauses in their subscriber agreements to permit terminations if subscribers infringe intellectual property rights.

Generally, file sharing committed through P2P networks is not considered a serious legal violation by Mexican courts. Article 424bis of the Criminal Code requires a profit motive as a prerequisite for criminal infringement, and as a result effective prosecutions in P2P cases are unavailable. APCM (the film and music association) reports only a single Internet piracy case (and not a P2P piracy case) filed last year, mainly due to the lack of adequate criminal provisions. For P2P file sharing, ISPs (especially Telmex, which has about 70% of the domestic broadband connections in Mexico) have, to date, been reluctant to take any actions, which is why legal reforms to address these issues are strongly recommended. IMPI has also been working with ISPs and rights holders to consider “cooperative models” for fast and efficient disabling of infringing websites. In the past, proposals were introduced (for example, one in 2013) which would have instituted a weak notification system to infringers; but these were never acted on. As noted, on a positive note, IMPI did use its administrative authority in 2014, for the first time, to disable an infringing site (ba-k.com).

Border Enforcement

There remain formal, onerous requirements to initiate border actions in Mexico. For example, Customs authorities will not seize infringing product entering the country, or detain it for more than a few hours, without an official order from IMPI; this is true even in cases where the product is clearly infringing. Because IMPI does not issue immediate authorizations to seize products which have been identified by Customs as infringing, the suspect merchandise is usually allowed to enter the country. IIPA recommends greater cooperation between these two agencies to improve border enforcement, and to expedite the procedures by which Customs may make independent seizures of clearly infringing products. Additionally, the Customs Code needs to be amended to grant customs officers ex officio powers.

In 2006, the PGR established a task force with Customs, the Ministry of the Economy and private sector representatives (music and film), to monitor and develop intelligence on blank media imports. Unfortunately, in 2011, PGR halted its seizure of in-transit containers, claiming a lack of authority, and it never implemented a new “protocol” between the PGR and Customs officials. Imported raw materials – blank CD-Rs, blank DVD-Rs, jewel boxes and burners – are still widely used to produce pirate material in Mexico. These importations are not considered a crime, but coordinated administrative actions by the PGR, SAT and APCM have resulted in a few seizures of illegal imported raw material.

IIPA continues to recommend cooperative efforts between U.S. and Mexican customs authorities, not only to prevent Mexican exports of pirate movies to the U.S. and Latin markets, but also to control blank media exports...
from Southeast Asia that pass through the U.S. to Mexico (to avoid Mexican taxes). Mexico should also implement the recently enacted legislation to create a centralized customs registration database to assist with identification of infringing shipments. Other needed improvements include: adopting procedures to address changes in the size and frequency of shipments, and to deal with falsified documents; re-launching Customs’ inspection program and its program for seizing goods arriving at local ports, destined for other countries; adopting a maximum quota on blank media importations used for the pirate market; and developing a strategy to identify infringers who import their goods using falsified information.

The Customs authorities have continued their anti-piracy initiatives with the support of the local American Chamber of Commerce, participating in regular training programs in conjunction with IMPI for Mexican officials at various ports on intellectual property enforcement issues and the identification of various types of pirated product, and with regular meetings with industry members. ESA continues to report positive results from ongoing training efforts with Mexican Customs officials, including detention notifications and seizures of pirated video game product from diverse ports, in particular, Guadalajara and Monterrey. ESA notes that importers are now reducing the size of their shipments to avoid detection, making border enforcement even more critical, but more difficult. ESA did report an improvement in the level of support from Customs in dealing with shipments of circumvention devices, with thousands of video game components seized in 2014.

COPYRIGHT AND RELATED LAWS IN MEXICO

Federal Law on Copyright (1996, as amended): The 1996 Copyright Law was last amended effective in 2003 (with implementing regulations in 2005). Mexico acceded to both the WIPO Internet Treaties (the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT)) in 2002 (but never fully implemented the treaties, and did not publish the ratification of the treaties with the Agreed Statements). Draft laws to implement the digital treaties have circulated for years, but have never been enacted. Drafts that publicly circulated last year (2013) would fall far short of proper implementation on issues relating to technological protection measures, for example. One other component of digital treaty implementation that has been proposed in recent years, but never enacted, would enforce a rights holder’s authorization for “making available” (i.e., for the distribution or commercialization of copyright material on websites). There are many remaining deficiencies in the Copyright Law (including long-standing NAFTA and WTO TRIPS obligations), as well as those relating to full digital treaty implementation. For details see http://www.iipa.com/rbc/2010/2010SPEC301MEXICO.pdf.

In 2013, a new broadcasting and theatrical exhibition regulation went in to force that will be burdensome to implement for motion picture and television program producers. The regulation restricts the advertising of “junk food” and sugary beverages on television and in theaters, specifically during programming intended for children. In addition, some legislators have periodically proposed the adoption of screen quotas, which if adopted, would severely limit the exhibition of U.S. films in Mexico; these would violate NAFTA and should be opposed.

Legislative Recommendations: Other legislative reforms needed for effective enforcement (in addition to Copyright Law amendments, and the other recommendations already noted above) include:

- Amendments to the Criminal Code to punish – with a prison term (three to ten years) and fines – the unauthorized camcording of films in theaters. The legislation needs to eliminate any required proof of commercial intent.
- Amendments to the Criminal Code to eliminate proof of a profit motive as a prerequisite to criminal liability for large-scale copyright infringements.
- Amendments to the Copyright Law or Criminal Code to establish criminal sanctions for the distribution or trafficking of devices used for the circumvention of TPMs. This should include “acts” as well as devices, components and services. Mexico’s existing criminal law concerning TPM protection (Penal Code, Article 42) has proven ineffective because it only applies to the domestic manufacture of circumvention devices.
Since such devices are made abroad and imported into Mexico, there is no criminal enforcement against retailers of these devices.

- Amendments to the Customs Code to grant customs inspectors *ex officio* powers to detain and seize infringing imports.
- Amendments to strengthen administrative enforcement by: (1) providing tax crime prosecution of copyright infringement (when it implicates tax liability); and (2) increasing administrative sanctions.
- Ensure that all relevant rights holders are entitled in law and practice to operate effectively through the collecting bodies of their choice in the licensing of broadcasting, public performance and other communications to the public.