

#### Argument for Pros:

Technically, the harm to the market will not be occurring as copyright isn't the concern. The popularity of the song would be increasing. This will increase the popularity of the artist. Thus making more sales for the music and increasing their brand value. Brand awareness will facilitate concerts and merchandise. From here, it seems rather unlikely to see how the copyright market is being disturbed as the popularity of the producer is directly proportional to the extent and sales of its product.

The content provider for Bopper is Xtunes. They provide the music, and the licensing to Bopper to resell the music. Technically, we are going through the correct channels and following all the necessary legal steps to provide and meet our customer's demands. With the information that has been provided, there is no mentioning that Xtunes is not giving a share of royalty to the artists and/or band itself. It is the law that upon distribution of the music produced by the artist or band that they should be compensated. According to that, Xtunes must be following the guidelines.

The question should not be about copyright as none of the original songs or music is being modified. In turn, the original owner is the one who is getting credited. Their information remains consistent and persists throughout the selling and distributing process. The agreement between Bopper and Xtunes allows Bopper to distribute the music sold to them. It does not mention that we have the copyrights of the music itself. We have been given the right to sell the music. Thus, the music that is being sold to the clients, cannot be infringing the copyright law as Bopper is under its right to distribute the copies of the music and not change or modify the music itself.