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: 2025-07-07T09:16:15.958589

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: Based on the initial evidence you've provided, there appears to be a high degree of similarity between the two repositories. Here's a detailed analysis of the similarities and potential infringement concerns, considering the factors you outlined: ### 1. Code Structure and Patterns The fact that both repositories have files (`config.ts` and `next.config.ts`) that are 100% similar indicates that the overall code structure is likely identical as well. This suggests that the two repositories follow the same architecture and patterns for organizing code, which could be indicative of direct copying or heavy inspiration from one another. ### 2. Algorithm Implementation Since the third file (`types.ts`) has a 97.89% similarity, it indicates that while it might not be identical, the underlying algorithms or data structures used within this file are likely very similar. If the implementations are substantially the same, it could point towards copying, rather than independent implementation, unless the underlying algorithms are standard or widely accepted. ### 3. Unique Features or Innovations To determine if there are unique features or innovations in either repository, a deeper inspection of the code would be required. If one repository has distinct features or a different approach to solving problems that are not present in the other, it could help distinguish it as an independent work. However, if no significant innovations are found, it could further substantiate the copying claim. ### 4. Inspiration vs. Copying Legitimate inspiration typically leads to original implementations or adaptations of concepts, particularly when the developers create novel portions or modify existing designs. The high similarity in core files suggests that the second repository might fall into the realm of copying rather than merely being inspired by the first. This may be compounded if there are no substantial modifications or unique features introduced in Repository 2. ### Brief Assessment of Similarity and Potential Infringement **Similarity**: The two repositories show a very high level of similarity, particularly the configuration files and much of the type definitions. **Potential Infringement**: Given the extent of the similarity in code, particularly with multiple files being nearly identical, this raises a strong concern of copyright infringement. Legally, if one repository is found to have copied another without permission, it could be considered a violation of intellectual property rights, regardless of whether it was done with knowledge or intent. In conclusion, the apparent high level of similarity suggests that Repository 2 may have copied elements from Repository 1 rather than merely being inspired by it. Without clear evidence of unique contributions from Repository 2, it may be prudent for its owner to seek legal advice to address potential copyright issues.

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_091615
Original Repository Hash: 2b1164a0f2ae662420201071b4a4b6bfa06235bfc808893b2d4990517b0acfce