


Intellectual Property and Private International Law

Comparative Perspectives

Edited by
Toshiyuki Kono



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2012

CONTENTS

Series Editors' Preface	v
General Report	1
<i>Toshiyuki Kono and Paulius Jurčys</i>	
Austria	217
<i>Thomas Petz</i>	
Belgium	347
<i>Marie-Christine Janssens</i>	
Canada	425
<i>Joost Blom</i>	
Croatia	477
<i>Ivana Kunda</i>	
France	525
<i>Marie-Elodie Ancel</i>	
Germany	581
<i>Axel Metzger</i>	
Greece	619
<i>Anastasia Grammaticaki-Alexiou and Tatiana Synodinou</i>	
Hungary	637
<i>Levente Tattay</i>	
India	681
<i>Vandana Singh</i>	
Italy	707
<i>Nerina Boschiero and Benedetta Ubertazzi</i>	
Japan	763
<i>Dai Yokomizo</i>	
Korea	793
<i>Gyooho Lee</i>	
Netherlands	851
<i>Dick van Engelen</i>	
Portugal	877
<i>Alexandre Dias Pereira</i>	

Slovenia <i>Damjan Možina</i>	941
Spain <i>Pedro A de Miguel Asensio</i>	975
Sweden <i>Ulf Maunsbach</i>	1023
Switzerland <i>Amélie Charbon and Iris Sidler</i>	1051
United Kingdom <i>Christopher Wadlow</i>	1061
United States <i>Howard B Abrams</i>	1103
Appendix I	1123
Appendix II	1129
Index	1131

General Report

TOSHIYUKI KONO* and PAULIUS JURČYS**

Contents

Introduction.....	6
Part I General Overview.....	8
1 Intellectual Property and Private International Law: Legal and Institutional Background	8
1.1 IP and Private International Law: Legal Framework in Different States.....	8
1.2 The Hague Judgments Convention and Legislative Proposals.....	11
1.2.1 The ALI Principles.....	11
1.2.2 The CLIP Principles	12
1.2.3 The Transparency Principles and Joint Japanese–Korean Proposal (Waseda Principles).....	12
1.3 Institutional Framework of Cross-Border Enforcement of IP Rights	13
1.3.1 Canada and the United States.....	13
1.3.2 European States	13
1.3.3 Asian States	14
2 The Principle of Territoriality of IP Rights and the <i>Lex Protectionis</i>	15
2.1 Main Principles of the Paris Convention	15
2.2 The Principle of the Protecting Country in the Berne Convention	16
2.3 Current Discussion concerning the Appropriateness of the Territoriality Principle.....	18
Part II Jurisdiction over Disputes Concerning Intellectual Property Rights	
3 Personal Jurisdiction in IP Cases	19
3.1 Personal Jurisdiction in the Hague Judgments Convention	19
3.2 Personal Jurisdiction in North America.....	20
3.2.1 Canadian and US Law	20
3.2.2 Personal Jurisdiction in the ALI Principles	22
3.3 Personal Jurisdiction in European Countries	23
3.3.1 Defendant’s Domicile as the General Ground of Jurisdiction according to the Brussels/Lugano Regime	24
3.3.2 Jurisdiction based upon the Defendant’s Domicile in IP-Related Disputes.....	24
3.3.3 Third-Country Situations	26
3.3.4 Brussels I Reform Proposals.....	27

* Professor of Law at Kyushu University.

** Lecturer at Kyushu University.

3.4	Asian Countries.....	27
3.4.1	General Grounds of Jurisdiction in India and Taiwan.....	27
3.4.2	The Main Principles of the Exercise of International Jurisdiction in Japan.....	28
3.4.3	Personal Jurisdiction in Korea.....	32
3.5	Comparative Observations.....	33
4	Exclusive/Subject-Matter Jurisdiction.....	33
4.1	Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in the 2001 Draft of the Hague Judgments Convention.....	33
4.2	North American States.....	35
4.2.1	Subject-Matter Jurisdiction of Canadian and US Courts.....	35
4.2.2	Subject-Matter Jurisdiction in the ALI Principles.....	36
4.3	European States.....	37
4.3.1	Brussels/Lugano Regime: General Considerations.....	37
4.3.2	The ECJ Decision in the Case of <i>GAT v LuK</i>	39
4.3.3	Third-Country Situations.....	42
4.3.4	Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in Commission Proposal (2010) and the CLIP Principles.....	43
4.4	Exclusive Jurisdiction in IP Disputes in Asian States.....	43
4.4.1	Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in India and Taiwan.....	43
4.4.2	Exclusive Jurisdiction over IP Disputes in Japan.....	44
4.4.3	Exclusive Jurisdiction in IP Disputes according to Korean Law.....	47
4.5	Comparative Observations.....	48
5	Jurisdiction in IP Infringement Disputes.....	48
5.1	Infringement Jurisdiction in the 2001 Draft of the Hague Judgments Convention.....	49
5.2	Jurisdiction over IP Infringements in North American Countries.....	50
5.2.1	Jurisdiction over IP Infringement Disputes of Canadian Courts.....	50
5.2.2	Jurisdiction of US Courts over Claims concerning IP Infringements.....	51
5.2.3	Jurisdiction over IP Infringements according to the ALI Principles.....	52
5.3	Jurisdiction over IP Infringement Disputes in Europe.....	53
5.3.1	Brussels/Lugano Regime: Infringement Jurisdiction.....	53
5.3.2	Application of Article 5(3) to Infringements of IP Rights.....	55
5.3.3	Jurisdiction over Internet-Related Infringements.....	56
5.3.4	Third-Country Situations.....	57
5.3.5	Infringement Jurisdiction in the CLIP Principles.....	58
5.4	Asian Countries.....	59
5.4.1	India and Taiwan.....	59
5.4.2	Jurisdiction over IP Infringements according to Japanese Law and Latest Legislative Proposals.....	59
5.4.3	Infringement Jurisdiction in Korea.....	61
5.5	Comparative Observations.....	62
6	Jurisdiction in Contract-Related Disputes.....	62
6.1	The 2001 Draft of Hague Judgments Convention.....	62
6.2	Jurisdiction in Contract Disputes in the ALI Principles.....	63
6.3	European Countries.....	63
6.3.1	The Brussels/Lugano Regime.....	63
6.3.2	The CLIP Principles.....	68
6.4	Asian Countries.....	68
6.4.1	Jurisdiction over Contractual Disputes according to Japanese Law.....	68
6.4.2	Legislative Proposals.....	69
6.5	Comparative Observations.....	70

7	Consolidation of Proceedings.....	71
7.1	Consolidation of Claims in the 1999 Draft of the Hague Convention.....	71
7.2	North American Countries.....	72
7.2.1	Canadian Approach to the Consolidation of Claims	72
7.2.2	Consolidation of Claims in the United States.....	73
7.2.3	Claims against Multiple Parties and Other Possibilities of Consolidation in the ALI Principles	74
7.3	Consolidation of Claims in European States	74
7.3.1	Brussels/Lugano Regime: General Considerations.....	74
7.3.2	The Early Practice of Domestic Courts in IP Infringement Cases.....	76
7.3.3	'Roche Nederland' and its Aftermath	78
7.3.4	Third-Country Situations	81
7.3.5	Consolidation Possibilities according to the CLIP Principles.....	83
7.3.6	European Patent Litigation Scheme	83
7.4	Asian Countries	85
7.4.1	Consolidation of Claims in India and Taiwan	85
7.4.2	Consolidation of Claims according to Japanese Law.....	85
7.4.3	Consolidation of Proceedings in Korea.....	90
7.5	Comparative Observations	91
8	Parallel Proceedings in IP Disputes	92
8.1	Parallel Proceedings in the 2001 Draft of the Hague Judgments Convention	93
8.2	North American Countries.....	95
8.2.1	Parallel Proceedings According to Canadian Law.....	95
8.2.2	Parallel Proceedings in US law and the ALI Principles.....	96
8.3	European Countries	98
8.3.1	Parallel and Related Proceedings	98
8.3.2	IP Litigation Strategies	100
8.3.3	Third-Country Situations	103
8.3.4	Review of the Brussels I Regulation: Parallel Proceedings in the Commission Proposal and the CLIP Principles	106
8.4	Asian Countries	108
8.4.1	Parallel Proceedings according to the Laws of India and Taiwan	108
8.4.2	Parallel Proceedings according to Japanese Law and Recent Asian Legislative Proposals.....	108
8.5	Comparative Observations	111
9	Jurisdiction to Order Provisional or Protective Measures in IP Disputes	112
9.1	Provisional and Protective Measures in the 2001 Draft of the Hague Judgments Convention	112
9.2	Jurisdiction to Grant Provisional Measures and Interim Injunctions under the Laws of North American Countries.....	113
9.2.1	Legal Situation in Canada	113
9.2.2	Provisional and Protective Measures in the ALI Principles.....	114
9.3	Provisional and Protective Measures in the European Countries.....	114
9.3.1	Brussels/Lugano Regime	114
9.3.2	Provisional Measures and IP-Related Issues	116
9.3.3	Third State Situations.....	119
9.3.4	Provisional and Protective Measures in European Reform Proposals.....	119
9.4	Jurisdiction to Order Provisional and Protective Measures in Asian States.....	120
9.4.1	India and Taiwan	120
9.4.2	Japan.....	121
9.4.3	Korea	122
9.5	Comparative Observations	123

10	Choice of Court Agreements in Cross-Border IP Disputes.....	123
10.1	The 2005 Hague Choice of Court Convention	124
10.1.1	General Principles of the Hague Convention	124
10.1.2	Choice of Court Agreements in IP Disputes.....	125
10.2	Choice of Court Agreements in North American Countries	126
10.2.1	Canada	126
10.2.2	Choice of Court Agreements according to the ALI Principles.....	127
10.3	European Countries	128
10.3.1	Choice of Court Agreements according to the Brussels/Lugano Regime.....	128
10.3.2	Choice of Court Agreements in IP Disputes.....	129
10.3.3	Choice of Court Agreements according to the CLIP Principles	131
10.4	Choice of Court Agreements in Asian Countries	132
10.4.1	Choice of Court Agreements in India and Taiwan	132
10.4.2	Choice of Court Agreements in IP Disputes according to Japanese Law and other Asian Legislative Proposals.....	132
10.5	Comparative Observations	135
Part III Choice-of-Law Issues in Intellectual Property Disputes.....		135
11	Applicable Law to Proprietary Matters of IP Rights.....	135
11.1	Applicable Law to Proprietary Aspects of IP Rights in North American Countries.....	136
11.1.1	The United States.....	136
11.1.2	The ALI Principles.....	136
11.2	European Countries	137
11.2.1	Early European Proposals	137
11.2.2	European States	138
11.2.3	The CLIP Principles	141
11.3	Applicable Law to Proprietary Aspects of IP Rights in Asian Countries.....	142
11.3.1	India and Taiwan	142
11.3.2	Japan.....	142
11.3.3	Korea	143
11.4	Comparative Observations	144
12	Applicable Law to Infringement of IP rights.....	145
12.1	North American Countries	145
12.1.1	Applicable Law to Infringements of IP Rights in Canada.....	145
12.1.2	Applicable Law to Infringements of IP Rights in the United States	146
12.1.3	Applicable Law to Infringements of IP Rights in the ALI Principles.....	148
12.2	European Countries	149
12.2.1	Rome II Regulation on the Law Applicable to Non-Contractual Obligations: General Rules	149
12.2.2	Special Choice-of-law Rules for Infringements of IP Rights (Art 8)	150
12.2.3	Prohibition of the Choice of Law	152
12.2.4	Ubiquitous Infringements.....	153
12.2.5	Law Governing the Liability of ISP.....	154
12.2.6	Infringements of IP Rights according to Swiss and Croatian Laws	155
12.2.7	The CLIP Principles	156
12.3	Asian Countries.....	157
12.3.1	India and Taiwan	157
12.3.2	Japan.....	158
12.3.3	Korea	162
12.4	Comparative Observations	163

13	Applicable Law to the Contracts for the Transfer of IP Rights	164
13.1	North American Countries	164
13.1.1	Canadian Law	164
13.1.2	The United States.....	165
13.1.3	Law Governing Transfers of Title and Grants of Licenses under the ALI Principles.....	167
13.2	European Countries	168
13.2.1	Rome I Regulation: General Principles	168
13.2.2	Problems Related to IP-Contracts	170
13.2.3	Law Governing Contractual Obligations according to Swiss and Croatian Law	174
13.2.4	Applicable Law to Contracts according to the CLIP Principles.....	175
13.3	Asian Countries	177
13.3.1	Applicable Law to IP Transfer Agreements in India and Taiwan	177
13.3.2	Japan.....	177
13.3.3	Korea	179
13.4	Comparative Observations	179
14	Applicable Law to IP Rights Created in the Course of Employment Relationship.....	180
14.1	North American Countries	180
14.1.1	Canada	180
14.1.2	The ALI Principles.....	181
14.2	European Countries	182
14.2.1	Overview of the Law in Different Countries.....	182
14.2.2	The CLIP Principles	183
14.3	Asian Countries	184
14.3.1	Japan.....	184
14.3.2	Korea	185
14.4	Comparative Observations	186
15	Applicable law to Securities in IP.....	186
16	Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	188
16.1	Recognition and Enforcement in the 2001 Draft of the Hague Judgments Convention	189
16.2	North American Countries.....	191
16.2.1	Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in IP Disputes according to Canadian and US Law.....	191
16.2.2	Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in the ALI Principles.....	194
16.3	European Countries	196
16.3.1	Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments according to the Brussels/Lugano Regime.....	196
16.3.2	The Recognition and Enforcement of Third-country Judgments.....	199
16.3.3	Brussels I Reform Proposals.....	201
16.4	Asian Countries	203
16.4.1	Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Taiwan.....	203
16.4.2	Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Japan	204
16.4.3	Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Korea.....	210
16.5	Comparative Observations	210
	CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS	211