On Tuesday, April 15th, 2025 at 4:41 AM, Robert Grubbs <a href="mailto:robertgrubbs854@gmail.com">robertgrubbs854@gmail.com</a> wrote:

Dear Dennis Watson,

I am writing to formally request the removal of content published on your blog that reproduces copyrighted material without authorization.

## **Infringing URL:**

https://gangstersout.blogspot.com/2023/04/police-seize-90-kilos-of-cocaine-in.html

## **Original Source:**

https://calgaryherald.com/news/crime/91-kilograms-cocaine-seizure-calgary-two-charged

The article in question contains verbatim excerpts and derivative content from the Calgary Herald, which is copyrighted material. As the content was used without permission or proper attribution, it constitutes a breach of copyright under applicable intellectual property laws.

I respectfully request that you remove the infringing content from your blog immediately.

Please confirm once the content has been removed. If no action is taken, I may be required to escalate this issue through formal channels, including submitting a DMCA notice to Blogger/Google.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely, Robert Grubbs

On Tuesday, April 15th, 2025 at 9:42 PM, Robert Grubbs <robertgrubbs854@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Watson,

Thank you for your response and for removing the copyrighted image from your blog post.

To address your questions:

I am acting on behalf of the copyright holder, Postmedia Network Inc., the publisher of the Calgary Herald.

I am not required to be legal counsel to submit a formal request regarding unauthorized use of copyrighted material.

No, I am not "new at this" — and I would appreciate a more respectful tone in future correspondence.

Regarding the issue at hand:

While fair use can apply in certain cases, it is not an automatic shield for all online commentary. U.S. fair use (17 U.S. Code § 107) considers several factors, including:

The purpose and character of the use (e.g., whether it's transformative or for commercial use),

The nature of the copyrighted work,

The amount and substantiality of the portion used,

The effect of the use on the potential market or value of the original.

In your blog post, you included more than just a short quote — portions of the original article were reproduced or closely paraphrased without transformation, commentary, or sufficient added value. While you may have linked to the original article, this does not override copyright protections, nor does it substitute for obtaining permission.

Additionally, a single sentence — especially if it's a central, expressive portion of the article — may still be subject to copyright protection depending on how it is used. Including quotation marks does not eliminate liability if the usage exceeds fair use boundaries.

In terms of precedent, the U.S. Supreme Court and multiple lower courts have ruled on the limits of fair use. One relevant example is Harper & Row v. Nation Enterprises, 471 U.S. 539 (1985), where even brief excerpts were deemed infringing due to their qualitative importance and the context of their use.

Our intent here is not adversarial — we simply wish to ensure the copyrighted material is not being used without proper authorization. As you have removed the image, I appreciate that action. I ask that you similarly review the textual content and ensure it complies fully with fair use, or remove any potentially infringing portions.

Thank you again for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely, Robert Grubbs

On Wednesday, April 16th, 2025 at 4:53 AM, Robert Grubbs <a href="color: blue, april 16th">color: blue, april 16th, 2025 at 4:53 AM, Robert Grubbs <a href="color: blue, april 16th">color: blue, april 16th, 2025 at 4:53 AM, Robert Grubbs <a href="color: blue, april 16th">color: blue, april 16th, 2025 at 4:53 AM, Robert Grubbs <a href="color: blue, april 16th">color: blue, april 16th, 2025 at 4:53 AM, Robert Grubbs <a href="color: blue, april 16th">color: blue, april 16th, april 16th

Dear Mr. Watson,

Thank you again for your earlier response and for removing the body content of the blog post located at:

## **Infringing URL:**

https://gangstersout.blogspot.com/2023/04/police-seize-90-kilos-of-cocaine-in.html

While we acknowledge that the original text has been taken down, the title remains unchanged: "Police seize 90 kilos of cocaine in Calgary"

This headline directly mirrors the original Calgary Herald article, and more importantly, continues to show up in Google search results, potentially misleading readers and falsely implying that the original content still exists at that link.

This undermines the resolution of the issue and continues to cause reputational and copyright concerns. To fully address this, we respectfully request that you either:

Change the title to reflect the new source and your original content, or

Remove the post entirely to prevent misleading search indexing.

We appreciate your attention to this final detail and hope to resolve the matter fully and amicably.

Sincerely, Robert Grubbs

On Wednesday, April 16th, 2025 at 10:26 PM, Robert Grubbs <robertgrubbs854@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Watson,

I appreciate your previous response and the removal of the post's body text. However, this matter is not yet fully resolved.

Although the content has been taken down, the URL remains the same and the original title – "Police seize 90 kilos of cocaine in Calgary" – is still live and indexed by Google.

This creates the ongoing impression that the original content is still published under that title, and it continues to appear in search results like this:

**Example Google Search Result:** 

Police seize 90 kilos of cocaine in Calgary – gangstersout.blogspot.com

This situation is misleading and causes continued harm to those involved, as it may associate individuals with information no longer present on the page. Furthermore, the title itself is copyrighted and copied verbatim from the Calgary Herald headline.

To fully resolve this, we respectfully ask that you either:

Change the blog post URL, or

Remove the post entirely.

We appreciate your cooperation and your attention to this final aspect of the issue.

Sincerely, Robert Grubbs

On Thursday, April 17th, 2025 at 5:27 AM, Dennis Watson <dennis\_watson100@protonmail.com>wrote:

I'm willing to discuss this but I'm going to need some ID. I need some proof of who you are and who you represent. I have received no confirmation that you do in fact represent Post Media News. That is what we need before we proceed.

**Dennis Watson**