

Slashdot news, reviews, and articles that matters

Canon Tries To Shut Down "Fake" Canon Blog

Posted by [kdawson](#) on Sun Feb 15, 2009 03:25 PM
from the [what-part-of-fake-do-you-not-understand](#) dept.



[Thomas Hawk](#) writes

"An interesting twist over at the [Fake Chuck Westfall Blog](#). Fake Chuck (like Fake Steve before him) has a blog out parodying Canon's real Technical Information Advisor Chuck Westfall. It seems that Canon and their lawyers over at Loeb & Loeb are none too fond of all the fun that Fake Chuck and DSLR geeks everywhere have been having at their expense and have sent Fake Chuck's blog hosting company, WordPress, a notice to take the blog down. Canon's lawyers cite that Fake Chuck's blog is 'calculated to mislead recipients,' even though the blog has 'fake' in the title, 'fake' in the URL and 'fake' just about everywhere else in the blog. What in the heck is wrong with Canon? Do they really think that trying to shut down a parody blog is going to make their new 5D Mark II ship any faster?"

After Fake Chuck removed the Canon logo from his site, WordPress is standing behind him and has rebuffed Canon's demand.

Related Stories

[Firehose:Canon Tries to Shut Down "Fake" Canon Blog](#) by Anonymous Coward

This discussion has been archived. No new comments can be posted.

[Canon Tries To Shut Down "Fake" Canon Blog](#)

Fake First Post (Score:5, Funny)

by Anonymous Coward on Sunday February 15 2009, @03:32PM ([#26864961](#))

This post has fake all over it, so you can't mod it down.

Re:Fake First Post (Score:5, Funny)

by [Dachannien \(617929\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:42PM ([#26865337](#))

I only have fake mod points today, so I fake modded you down.

MS fakery (Score:5, Funny)

by [Goffee71 \(628501\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @03:35PM ([#26864973](#)) [Homepage](#)

Is there no fake Microsoft blog? If so, I'm guessing no one believes what they write anyway.

Re:MS fakery (Score:5, Interesting)

by [Cally \(10873\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:00PM (#26865101) [Homepage](#)
Sure there is. <http://fakesteveballmer.blogspot.com/> [blogspot.com]

Guess business is kinda slow (Score:5, Insightful)

by [iminplaya \(723125\)](#) <iminplaya@gmail.com NETBSDom minus bsd> on Sunday February 15 2009, @03:42PM (#26865013) [Journal](#)

More free press for Canon. The real intention all along. Good job.

Re:Guess business is kinda slow (Score:5, Insightful)

by [Anthony Cargile \(1336739\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:12PM (#26865169)
[Homepage](#)

With the lack of interest I would have for starting a blog centered around a key individual of Canon as opposed to Nikon/Motorola/etc., I wouldn't doubt it if the whole thing was staged just for publicity like this, after somebody at Canon saw the "fake steve jobs" fiasco. It probably isn't likely, but hey you never know these days.

You'd think by now... (Score:5, Insightful)

by [DeadPixels \(1391907\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @03:44PM (#26865027)
Companies would realize that not liking someone's views doesn't give them the right to censor the person.

Re:You'd think by now... (Score:5, Funny)

by Anonymous Coward on Sunday February 15 2009, @03:46PM (#26865041)

In this case, though, the views expressed are decidedly noncanonical.

Fake MWoody says... (Score:5, Funny)

by Anonymous Coward on Sunday February 15 2009, @03:57PM (#26865089)

...I'm a complete moron!

--Fake MWoody

Re: You'd think by now... (Score:5, Insightful)

by Anonymous Coward on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:00PM ([#26865099](#))

...that the above poster would have noticed the 'fake' in the author's pseudonym.

Re: You'd think by now... (Score:5, Insightful)

by [Chabil Ha' \(875116\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:49PM ([#26865359](#))

Risking being off-topic, but seeing these all the time since the new "Web 2.0" upgrades to the slashcode has now drawn out the 'troll'.

Please! Put the 'moderate' *button* back. Simply putting taking action on an index change on the drop down list makes it so that people can accidentally mod the wrong way. It's only by good fortune that there are some people who decided to post something in response to remove the moderation. By putting the button back to confirm the selection, you avoid the mess of people posting to remove moderation and posts like these to beg for that simple piece of functionality be put back.

The Karma Whores will love you for it.

Re: You'd think by now... (Score:5, Funny)

by [roguetrick \(1147853\)](#) <kazer@brIIIigands.org minus [threevowels](#)> on Sunday February 15 2009, @06:03PM ([#26865703](#)) [Homepage](#)

I tried to mod you offtopic but I ended up modding you insightful.

Re: You'd think by now... (Score:5, Informative)

by [Miseph \(979059\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @06:50PM ([#26866125](#)) [Journal](#)

"Also, but I'm not sure if it's because of my browser's ineptitude, posting something to undo moderation doesn't give you the modpoints back."

That is intentional, check the moderation FAQ. The stated reason is that it allows an abusive mod to mod up/down a post in a new article, then post once it comes off the front page (making it a lot less important) and get the points back to use again.

Re: You'd think by now... (Score:5, Informative)

by [Stuart Gibson \(544632\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:11PM ([#26865165](#))
[Homepage](#)

He's not pretending to be a real person other than himself, he's pretending to be a fake person other than himself

Thanks to Canon and Slashdot (Score:5, Insightful)

by [UnknowingFool \(672806\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @03:46PM ([#26865043](#))
The Streisand effect has now hit the Fake Chuck blog. I wasn't aware of the blog but thanks to Canon's own doing **more** people will be aware of it.

Bad Summary (Score:5, Informative)

by [the eric conspiracy \(20178\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @03:58PM ([#26865091](#))

The take down letter asked for 4 things:

1. Stop using the Canon logo.
2. Remove references to violence.
3. Remove references to Chuck's family.
4. Changes to the look and feel of the blog so it would not be confused with actual Canon corporate sites.

It wasn't a totally unreasonable blanket take-down demand, and as such Fake Chuck will easily be able to comply and continue as a source of satire and humor.

Re:Bad Summary (Score:5, Informative)

by [rcw-home \(122017\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:33PM ([#26865291](#))

I looked at the PDF of the takedown. Yes, it mentioned those four things as "particularly egregious" but it *was* a blanket take-down demand. Let's examine the basis they list for their complaint and their demand:

<http://fakechuckwestfall.wordpress.com/> [wordpress.com] (the "Blog") - is **using our client's trademark and Mr. Westfall's name and likeness without authorization**

Accordingly, we hereby demand that you immediately remove the above-mentioned objectionable and harmful content from your website, **as well as** terminate the Blog author's account.

(emphasis mine)

If Wordpress hadn't exhibited some common sense, Fake Chuck would have had to find a new home.

Bad lawyers (Score:4, Insightful)

by [Kupfernigk \(1190345\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @05:02PM ([#26865413](#))
The take down letter made other, unreasonable demands. As I've posted before, it's often the case that from the plaintiff point of view, the weaker the case the stronger the language, and contrariwise for the defendant. This was a weak case so L&L tried to boost it with strong language demanding that Wordpress cease to allow the fake CW to publish any blogs. Wordpress detected it was a weak case and offered the minimum actually needed to comply. And now, people who had no idea that some people think Canon DSLRs are not very good, and have inadequate QA, are suddenly informed on the subject.

I had to issue a takedown notice last year when I discovered that a fake business had stolen the identity of our legitimate business. As a result, we could have been raided by the police and had our equipment taken by them, which could have driven us out of business. The initial response of the website host was to go away. Before I could respond to this, which would have involved a High Court injunction, they obviously took legal advice and I suddenly got a grovel. So I am sympathetic to legitimate takedowns. As you say, part of this one was legitimate. But L&L should have done better than have it drafted by a paralegal, and simply insisted that the genuinely infringing material be removed or fixed, and requested as a matter of courtesy that the blog confine itself to technical matters. Despite their claims to the contrary, lawyers are frequently not the shiniest apples in the barrel.

Fwd: Thanks for the heads up about your blog! (Score:3, Interesting)

by [samj \(115984\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:35PM ([#26865295](#)) [Homepage](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Sam Johnston <samj-at-.net>

Date: Sun, Feb 15, 2009 at 9:31 PM

Subject: Thanks for the heads up about your blog!

To: Chuck Westfall <cwestfall@cusa.canon.com>

Cc: Toni Scheinder <toni@automattic.com>, "Douglas E. Mirell" <dmirell@loeb.com>

G'day Chuck,

It's not every day that something truly entertaining comes to my attention but thanks to my mates at Slashdot[1] and your mates at Loeb & Loeb with their (surely fake?) letter[2] I was drawn attention to your refreshingly entertaining fake blog[3]. Anyway I'm sure I'm one of many who have immediately added your blog to my reader - it's truly amazing what a bit of viral marketing can do for you!

Kodos to the guys at Automattic too for identifying the letter for what it was so quickly and taking appropriate action - those guys rock!

Eagerly awaiting your next post,

Your [virtual] friend,

Sam

1. <http://fakechuckwestfall.files.wordpress.com/2009/02/982873542.pdf> [wordpress.com]
2. <http://yro.slashdot.org/article.pl?sid=09/02/15/1830217> [slashdot.org]
3. <http://fakechuckwestfall.wordpress.com/> [wordpress.com]

I would not even have removed the logo (Score:5, Informative)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @05:06PM ([#26865433](#))
since using it in obvious parody is protected fair use.

Re: (Score:3, Informative)

by [CRCulver \(715279\)](#)

It's been [available at Amazon](#) [amazon.com] for a while now, with several different retailers offering it and already over 50 customer reviews posted.

Re:5D Mk II (Score:5, Insightful)

by [WillKemp \(1338605\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @05:43PM ([#26865603](#))
[Homepage](#)

[.....] already over 50 customer reviews posted.

Looks like Canon's marketing dept have been busy then!

Re:WTF (Score:4, Informative)

by [Teun \(17872\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @04:10PM ([#26865155](#)) [Homepage](#)
Because this is one of their flagship products and it has according to early reports performed a bit sub-par?
[Canon](#) [luminous-landscape.com]

Re:What? (Score:4, Insightful)

by [hyades1 \(1149581\)](#) <hyades1@hotmail.com> on Sunday February 15 2009,
@07:06PM ([#26866265](#))

The story's not about photography. It's about a major multinational corporation using its lawyers and money to bully into silence bloggers who point out its failures.

You didn't get that?

Re:the biggest threat to Canon profits (Score:4, Insightful)

by [kimvette \(919543\)](#) on Sunday February 15 2009, @10:47PM ([#26868125](#)) [Homepage](#)

When Canon started chipping their cartridges I finally took the plunge and bought a Xerox color laser printer. I haven't looked back since.

FUCK the whole cheap printer/expensive ink business model.

The solution of problems is the most characteristic and peculiar sort of voluntary thinking. -- William James

All trademarks and copyrights on this page are owned by their respective owners. Comments are owned by the Poster. The Rest © 1997-2010 [Geeknet, Inc.](#)