

Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) Takedown Notice

Date: July 07, 2025

From: DataShield Protection Unit

Email: xxx@xxx.com

To: GitHub, Inc.

88 Colin P Kelly Jr St

San Francisco, CA 94107

Via: copyright@github.com

To Whom It May Concern:

This is a formal notification under Section 512(c) of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) seeking the removal of infringing material from your service. I certify under penalty of perjury that I am authorized to act on behalf of the owner of the intellectual property rights described below.

1. IDENTIFICATION OF COPYRIGHTED WORK

Repository URL:	https://github.com/FIL-Builders/fs-upload-dapp
Repository ID:	3
Registration Date:	1751874450
Blockchain TX:	N/A...
Content Hash:	2b1164a0f2ae662420201071b4a4b6bf...
License Type:	MIT

2. IDENTIFICATION OF INFRINGING MATERIAL

Infringing URL:	https://github.com/dyenaan/fs-upload-dapp
Repository Name:	Unknown

Similarity Score:	99.30%
Detection Date:	2025-07-07T09:26:10.678241

3. EVIDENCE OF INFRINGEMENT

Our automated analysis has detected substantial similarity between the protected repository and the allegedly infringing material. The similarity score of 99.30% indicates significant code duplication beyond what would be expected from coincidental development.

Specific evidence includes:

- File 'config.ts' is 100.00% similar
 - File 'next.config.ts' is 100.00% similar
 - File 'types.ts' is 97.89% similar
- AI Assessment: To analyze the similarity between the two repositories, we can break down the assessment into several key considerations based on the initial evidence and the points provided: ### 1. Code Structure and Patterns The files `config.ts` and `next.config.ts` show 100% similarity, indicating that the overall configuration setup for the projects is effectively identical. This could suggest that both repositories are built upon the same framework or base code, possibly for a similar application purpose, which in this case seems to be a file upload decentralized application (dApp). The file `types.ts` shows a very high similarity (97.89%), which indicates that both repositories share many common type definitions. This further points to a similarity in how these applications are designed or the libraries they utilize. ### 2. Algorithm Implementation While the evidence does not provide specific details about algorithm implementations directly, the high similarity in configuration files implies that the underlying algorithms related to configurations are likely to be similar as well. If the main functionalities are also derived from these configuration files, then the algorithms for dealing with file uploads and interactions with a decentralized network might mirror each other closely. ### 3. Unique Features or Innovations To identify unique features or innovations, a thorough code review (beyond configuration files) would be necessary. If both repositories implement the same features without significant modifications or adaptations, this could suggest a lack of innovation or originality. However, if one repository introduces novel aspects (e.g., unique handling of uploads, additional functionalities, etc.), it could differentiate it from the other. ### 4. Legitimate Inspiration vs. Copying Based on the evidence so far, there are strong reasons to suspect that one of the repositories may have copied the code from the other. The identical nature of key configuration files and high similarity in types suggests a direct influence, which leans towards the copying side unless one can demonstrate that both repositories were independently developed through shared knowledge or community practices. ### Conclusion The similarities between the two repositories raise concerns about potential code infringement. The identical files and high similarity in `types.ts` could indicate illicit copying rather than legitimate inspiration, especially if no significant changes or unique implementations are present in one of the repositories. If one repository is indeed a derivative work without proper attribution or licensing, it would be advisable for the original creator to consider action under copyright laws. A deeper review of the entire codebases would be required for a more definitive conclusion.

4. CONTENT AUTHENTICITY & PROVENANCE

The original work is protected with C2PA (Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity) metadata, providing cryptographic proof of ownership and creation date. This metadata has been verified and is stored on the blockchain for immutable reference.

5. STATEMENT OF GOOD FAITH

I have a good faith belief that use of the material in the manner complained of is not authorized by the copyright owner, its agent, or the law.

6. STATEMENT OF ACCURACY

I certify under penalty of perjury that the information in this notification is accurate and that I am authorized to act on behalf of the owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly infringed.

7. REQUESTED ACTION

Please expeditiously remove or disable access to the infringing material. Please also provide written confirmation when this has been completed.

Sincerely,

DataShield Protection Unit

Authorized Agent

Date: July 07, 2025

Reference: [DMCA-3-20250707_092610](#)

Original Repository Hash: [2b1164a0f2ae662420201071b4a4b6bfa06235bfc808893b2d4990517b0acfce](#)