

IIC

International Review of
Intellectual Property and Competition Law

Volume 45
Nos. 1–8/2014
Pp. 1–1010

Published by the Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition
Marshallplatz 1, 80539 Munich, Germany



 Springer

Verlag C. H. Beck

Table of Contents

Editorials

Burk, D.L.	The Inventive Concept in <i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i>	865
Ghidini, G.	For a Holistic and Systemic Approach to IP Law	381
Harhoff, D.	cf. Kur, A.	617
Kur, A. and Harhoff, D.	A Great Data, Nice Tale, but What's the Message? The OHIM/EPO Study on the Economic Relevance of IP-Intensive Industries in the EU.....	617
Köklü, K.	The Marrakesh Treaty – Time to End the Book Famine for Visually Impaired Persons Worldwide	737
Lim, D.	Reverse Payments – Life After <i>Actavis</i>	1
Sikorski, R.	Patent Law at the Centre of Today's IP Debate	125
de Werra, J.	Keeping the Genie of Licensing Out of the Bottle: Managing Inter-Dependence in Licensing Transactions.....	253
Westkamp, G.	Copyright Reform and Necessary Flexibilities	497

Articles

Acquah, D.	Extending the Limits of Protection of Pharmaceutical Patents and Data Outside the EU – Is There a Need to Rebalance?	256
Fischman Afori, O.	Proportionality – A New Mega Standard in European Copyright Law.....	889
Arezzo, E.	Hyperlinks and Making Available Right in the European Union – What Future for the Internet After <i>Svensson</i> ?	524
Christie, A.F. and Wright, R.	A Comparative Analysis of the Three-Step Tests in International Treaties	409
Du, W.	cf. Yu, L.	500
Filson, J.	cf. Gürkaynak, G.	128
Gürkaynak, G., Güner, A., and Filson, J.	The Global Reach of <i>FTC v. Actavis</i> – Will Europe Differ from the US Approach to Pay-for-Delay Agreements?	128
Geiger, C. and Izyumenko, E.	Copyright on the Human Rights' Trial: Redefining the Boundaries of Exclusivity Through Freedom of Expression.....	316
Gisclard, T.	Limitations of Autonomy of the Will in Conventions of Exploitation of Personality Rights.....	18
Güner, A.	cf. Gürkaynak, G.	128
Heath, C.	Patent Rights and the "Specific Mechanism" to Prevent Parallel Imports.....	399
Hou, L.	The Abusive Nature of Price Squeezes in the EU	43
Izyumenko, E.	cf. Geiger, C.	316
Kennedy, M.	The "Three-Step Test" and the Burden of Proof in Disputes Under the TRIPS Agreement.....	161

Articles (cont'd)

Kur, A.	Trade Marks Function, Don't They? CJEU Jurisprudence and Unfair Competition Principles.....	434
Li, J.	Copyright Exemptions to Facilitate Access to Published Works for the Print Disabled – The Gap Between National Laws and the Standards Required by the Marrakesh Treaty	740
Li, Y.	cf. Zhang, W.	556
Machnicka, A.A.	Territorial Aspects of Community Trademarks – The Single Market's Splendid Sovereignty.....	915
Malaga, M.	The European Patent with Unitary Effect: Incentive to Dominate? · A Look From the EU Competition Law Viewpoint.....	621
De Miguel Asensio, P.A.	Regulation (EU) No. 542/2014 and the International Jurisdiction of the Unified Patent Court.....	868
Ramalho, A.	Conceptualising the European Union's Competence in Copyright – What Can the EU Do?.....	178
Savola, P.	The Ultimate Copyright Shopping Opportunity – Jurisdiction and Choice of Law in Website Blocking Injunctions.....	287
Shen, W.	Intellectual Property Protection of Layout Designs on Printed Circuit Boards – From Comparative and Chinese Perspectives.....	6
Shiomi, H.	Can Non-Copyrightable Works Be Protected Under Unfair Competition Law? The Japanese “North Korea” Case.....	648
Sitko, J.J.	Special Criteria of Trade Mark Protection with Regard to Pharmaceutical Products in the European Union Legal System.....	658
Trimble, M.	The Marrakesh Puzzle	768
Vezzoso, S.	The Marrakesh Spirit – A Ghost in Three Steps?.....	796
Wei, L.	cf. Zhang, W.	556
Wright, R.	cf. Christie, A.F.....	128
Yu, L. and Du, W.	From “Dissimilarity” to “Significant Difference” – Recent Developments and Challenges in the Requirements for Design Patents in China.....	409
Zawadzka, Z.	The Unitary Patent Protection – A Voice in the Discussion from the Polish Perspective	383
Zhang, W., Wei, L., and Li, Y.	The Third Revision of Chinese Trademark Law – Analysis and Comment	556

Opinions

Calboli, I.	The United States Supreme Court's Decision in <i>Kirtsaeng v. Wiley & Sons</i> : An “Inevitable” Step in Which Direction?.....	75
Hilty, R.M.	cf. Knaak, R.	953
Knaak, R., Kur, A., and Hilty, R.M.	Comments of the Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition of 3 June 2014 on the Proposal of the European Commission for a Directive on the Protection of Undisclosed Know-How and Business Information (Trade Secrets) Against Their Unlawful Acquisition, Use and Disclosure of 28 November 2013, COM(2013) 813 Final.....	953

Kur, A.	cf. Knaak, R.	953
Lamping, M.	Declaration on Patent Protection · Regulatory Sovereignty under TRIPS.....	679
Erratum		
Calboli, I.	Erratum to: The United States Supreme Court's Decision in <i>Kirtsaeng v. Wiley & Sons</i> : An "Inevitable" Step in Which Direction?	496
Reports		
Lee, Y.H.	United Kingdom Copyright Decisions 2013.....	206
Malevanny, N.	New Russian Legislation on ISP Liability and Copyright Enforcement.....	212
Mezei, P.	The New Orphan Works Regulation of Hungary.....	940
Powles, J.	United Kingdom Patent Decisions 2013.....	201
Stobbs, J. and Weller, G.	United Kingdom Trade Mark and Design Decisions 2013.....	221
Weller, G.	cf. Stobbs, J.	221
Book Reviews		
Ayal, A.	Wolfgang Fikentscher, Philipp Hacker and Rupprecht Podszun: <i>Fair Economy: Crises, Culture, Competition and the Role of Law</i> · Springer Publishing, Heidelberg 2013.....	734
Beiter, K.D.	Laurence R. Helfer (ed.), <i>Intellectual Property and Human Rights – Critical Concepts in Intellectual Property Law</i> , Vol. 7 · Edward Elgar, Cheltenham 2013.....	858
Heath, C.	Toshiko Takenaka (ed.): <i>Intellectual Property in Common Law and Civil Law</i> · Edward Elgar 2013 · pp. 454 · ISBN-13: 978-0857934369 · € 123.00.....	614
Heinemann, A.	Josef Drexl, Mor Bakhom, Eleanor M. Fox, Michal S. Gal and David J. Gerber (eds.): <i>Competition Policy and Regional Integration in Developing Countries</i> · Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA, 2012. pp. xiv, 333. ISBN 978 1 78100 430 2.£90.00	375
Mulder, C.A.M.	Hugo Meinders, Ingo Beckedorf and Gérard Weiss: <i>Overview of the Appeal Proceedings According to the EPC – Überblick über das Beschwerdeverfahren nach dem EPÜ – Aperçu sur la procédure de recours selon la CBE</i> . H. Tel Publisher, Haarlem, The Netherlands, (first edition) 2013, Trilingual. pp. 275. ISBN 978-90-783-0-0909. €55.00.....	249
Norrgård, M.	Josef Drexl and Nari Lee (eds.): <i>Pharmaceutical Innovation, Competition and Patent Law. A Trilateral Perspective</i> · Edward Elgar, Cheltenham/Northampton, 2013. pp. 337. ISBN: 978-0-85793-245-7. £81.00.....	493
Picht, P.	Daryl Lim: <i>Patent Misuse and Antitrust Law – Empirical, Doctrinal and Policy Perspectives</i> · Edward Elgar, Cheltenham/Northampton, 2013.....	1007
Podszun, R.	Mark Williams (ed.): <i>The Political Economy of Competition Law in Asia</i> . Edward Elgar, Cheltenham/Northampton, 2013. pp. 438. ISBN-13: 978-1781001677. £94.50.....	120

Case Notes

<i>European Union</i> Husovec, M.	Comment on "Pinckney" · Council Regulation (EC) No. 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters, Art. 5(3) – <i>Peter Pinckney v. KDG Mediatech AG</i>	370
<i>European Union</i> Minero, G.	Case Note on "UPC Telekabel Wien" · Directive 2001/29/EC, Art. 8(3) – <i>UPC Telekabel Wien GmbH v. Constantin Film Verleih GmbH and Wega Filmproduktionsgesellschaft mbH</i>	848
<i>Argentina</i> Marzetti, M.	Case Note on "Chinese Take-Away" · Copyright Law (No. 11.723), Art. 71; Criminal Code, Art. 172 – <i>in re "P, L. et al."</i>	730
<i>France</i> Chiou, T.	Case Note on "Trésor-Armani-Mania" · Intellectual Property Code, Sec. L. 112-1 – <i>SNC Lancôme Parfums et Beauté and co., GA Modéfine and Prestige et collection international v. M.X.</i>	852
<i>Israel</i> Efroni, Z.	Comment on "Telran v. Charlton" · Copyright Act of 1911 – <i>Telran Communication (1986) Ltd. vs. Charlton Ltd.</i>	245
<i>Italy</i> Bellia, M.	Case Note on "Pfizer" · Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Art. 102 – <i>Autorità Garante della Concorrenza e del Mercato, Ratiopharm Italia s.r.l. and others v. Pfizer Italia s.r.l., Pfizer Health AB and Pfizer Inc.</i>	855
<i>Switzerland</i> Nusser, R.	Case Note on "Red Bull v. Bulldog" · Trade Mark Act – <i>Red Bull Ltd. v. Sun Mark Limited</i>	1004
<i>Spain</i> Flores, A.	Case Note on "Orange" · Trade Mark Law No. 17/2001, Arts. 4.1, 4.2(b), 5.1(a), 5.1(b) – <i>Orange Personal Communications Ltd. v. Spain/Jazz Telecom, S.A.U.</i>	612

Decisions

PATENT LAW

<i>Europe</i> European Patent Office Technical Board 3.3.8 · 4 February 2014 – Case No. T 2221/10	"Culturing Stem Cells/TECHNIKON" · European Patent Convention, Art. 53(a), Rule 28(c) – <i>In re Technikon Research and Development Foundation</i>	455
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fourth Chamber) · 11 April 2013 – Case No. C-535/11	"Novartis Pharma" · Regulation (EC) No. 726/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 Laying Down Community Procedures for the Authorisation and Supervision of Medicinal Products for Human and Veterinary Use and Establishing a European Medicines Agency – <i>Novartis Pharma GmbH v. Apozyt GmbH</i>	227
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Grand Chamber) · 16 April 2013 – Case Nos. C-274/11 and C-295/11	"Unitary Patent" · Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Arts. 326, 327, 329(1); Treaty on European Union, Art. 20 – <i>Kingdom of Spain and Italian Republic v. Council of the European Union</i>	343

Decisions (cont'd)

<p><i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Grand Chamber) · 18 July 2013 – Case No. C-414/11</p>	<p>“Daiichi Sankyo and Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland” · Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Art. 207; Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Arts. 27, 70 – <i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. Ltd, Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH v. DEMO Anonimos Viomikhaniki kai Emporiki Etairia Farmakon</i></p>	91
<p><i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Eighth Chamber) · 17 October 2013 – Case No. C-210/12</p>	<p>“Sumitomo Chemical” · Regulation (EC) No. 1610/96 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 1996 Concerning the Creation of a Supplementary Protection Certificate for Plant Protection Products, Arts. 3(1)(b), 7(1); Council Directive 91/414/EEC of 15 July 1991 Concerning the Placing of Plant Protection Products on the Market, Art 8(4) – <i>Sumitomo Chemical Co. Ltd v. Deutsches Patent- und Markenamt</i></p>	346
<p><i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) · 12 December 2013 – Case No. C-443/12</p>	<p>“Actavis Group and Actavis” · Regulation (EC) No 469/2009 Concerning the Supplementary Protection Certificate for Medicinal Products, Art. 3 – <i>Actavis Group PTC EHF and Actavis UK Ltd v. Sanofi</i>.....</p>	587
<p><i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) · 12 December 2013 – Case No. C-493/12</p>	<p>“Eli Lilly and Company” · Regulation (EC) No 469/2009 Concerning the Supplementary Protection Certificate for Medicinal Products, Art. 3(a) – <i>Eli Lilly and Company Ltd v. Human Genome Sciences Inc.</i>.....</p>	588
<p><i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) · 12 December 2013 – Case No. C-484/12</p>	<p>“Georgetown University” · Regulation (EC) No 469/2009 Concerning the Supplementary Protection Certificate for Medicinal Products, Art. 3(a) and (c) – <i>Georgetown University v. Octrooicentrum Nederland (NL Octrooicentrum)</i>.....</p>	589
<p><i>France</i> Supreme Court (Cour de cassation) · 14 February 2012</p>	<p>“Engraving Machine” · European Patent Convention, Art. 138(1)(e) – <i>Pio Echeverria Lizarazou v. Sic Marketing SAS</i>.....</p>	968
<p><i>France</i> Paris Court of Appeal (Cour d’appel) · 11 December 2012</p>	<p>“Valsartan” · Intellectual Property Code, Sec. L-615-3 – <i>Novartis et al. v. Sanofi -Aventis et al.</i>.....</p>	969
<p><i>France</i> Paris District Court (Tribunal de grande instance) · 6 October 2009</p>	<p>“Allergy Treatment” · European Patent Convention, Art. 38 – <i>Teva v. Sepracor</i>.....</p>	699
<p><i>France</i> Paris District Court (Tribunal de grande instance) · 9 April 2010</p>	<p>“Bicycle” · Patent Act – <i>Mrc Remiller v. CycloEurope Industries and Patent Attorneys’ Firm X</i>.....</p>	821

Decisions (cont'd)

<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 14 May 2013 – Case No. X ZR 107/10	“Lift Multi-Group Control System” · European Patent Convention, Art. 56	228
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 27 August 2013 – Case No. X ZR 19/12	“Bicycle Crank Arm Apparatus (Tretkurbeleinheit)” · Patent Act, Sec. 117; Code of Civil Procedure, Secs. 529(1) No. 2, 531(2) first sentence, Nos. 1–3	457
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 3 September 2013 – Case No. X ZR 130/12	“Cable Lock (Kabelschloss)” · Patent Act, Sec. 139(2); Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 543(2) first sentence.....	347
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 11 September 2013 – Case No. X ZB 8/12	“Dipeptidyl Peptidase Inhibitors” · Patent Act, Secs. 21(2) No. 1, 34(4)	700
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 24 September 2013 – Case No. X ZR 40/12	“Fatty Acids (Fettsäuren)” · European Patent Convention, Art. 54(5); Patent Act, Sec. 3(4)	590
<i>Italy</i> Supreme Court (Grand Chamber) · 10 June 2013	“Italian Torpedo” · Brussels Regulation, Art. 5(3) – <i>The General Hospital Corporation and Palomar Medical Technologies Inc. v. Asclepion Laser Technologies GmbH</i>	822
<i>Japan</i> Tokyo District Court · 30 October 2013 – Case No. 2011 (wa) 21757	“IBM Japan” · Patent Act (old version), Sec. 35(iii) and (iv) – <i>X v. HGST Japan</i>	707
<i>The Netherlands</i> Supreme Court (Hooge Raad) · 22 June 2012 and The Hague Court of Appeal · 2 November 2010	“G-Standard” · Dutch Patent Act 1995 (Rijsoctrooiwet 1995), Sec. 53(1)(b) – <i>Glaxo v. Pharmachemie</i>	973
<i>United Kingdom</i> Supreme Court · 13 March 2013 – Case No. [2013] UKSC 16	“Schütz” · European Patent Convention, Art. 69(1); Community Patent Convention, Art. 25(a); Patents Act 1997, Secs. 60(1)(a), 125(1), 130(7) – <i>Schütz (UK) Limited v. Werit (UK) Limited</i>	350

Decisions (cont'd)

<i>United Kingdom</i> Supreme Court · 3 July 2013 – Case No. [2013] UKSC 46	“Virgin Atlantic Airways v. Zodiac Seats” · Patents Act 1977, Sec. 77(1)–(4A) – <i>Virgin Atlantic Airways Limited v. Zodiac Seats UK Limited</i>	352
<i>United States of America</i> Supreme Court · 22 January 2014 – Case No. 12-1128	“Medtronic v. Mirowski” · Patent Law – <i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Mirowski Family Ventures, LLC</i>	825
<i>United States of America</i> Supreme Court · 19 June 2014 – Case No. 13-298	“Alice Corp v. CLS Bank Int’l. et al.” · Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 101 – <i>Alice Corporation Ptv. Ltd. V. CLS Bank International et al.</i>	977

COPYRIGHT LAW

<i>Europe</i> European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section) · 10 January 2013 – Case No. 36769/08	“Ashby Donald and others v. France” · European Convention on Human Rights, Art. 10; French Intellectual Property Code, Art. L. 122-5 9° – <i>Ashby Donald and others v. France</i>	354
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fourth Chamber) · 3 October 2013 – Case No. C-170/12	“Pinckney” · Council Regulation (EC) No.44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters, Art. 5(3) – <i>Peter Pinckney v. KDG Mediatech AG</i>	361
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fourth Chamber) · 23 January 2014 – Case No. C-355/12	“Nintendo” · Directive 2001/29/EC on the Harmonisation of Certain Aspects of Copyright and Related Rights in the Information Society, Art. 6(3) – <i>Nintendo Co. Ltd, Nintendo of America Inc., Nintendo of Europe GmbH v. PC Box Srl, 9Net Srl</i>	591
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fourth Chamber) · 13 February 2014 – Case No. C-466/12	“Svensson” · Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the Harmonisation of Certain Aspects of Copyright and Related Rights in the Information Society, Art. 3(1) – <i>Nils Svensson, Sten Sjögren, Madelaine Sahlman and Pia Gadd v. Retriever Sverige AB</i>	466
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fourth Chamber) · 27 March 2014 – Case No. C-314/12	“UPC Telekabel Wien” · Directive 2001/29/EC, Art. 8(3) – <i>UPC Telekabel Wien GmbH v. Constantin Film Verleih GmbH and Wega Filmproduktionsgesellschaft mbH</i>	826

Decisions (cont'd)

<p><i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fourth Chamber) · 5 June 2014 – Case No. C-360/13</p>	<p>“Public Relations Consultants Association” · Directive 2001/29/EC, Article 5(1) and (5) – <i>Public Relations Consultants Association Ltd v. Newspaper Licensing Agency Ltd and Others</i></p>	<p>828</p>
<p><i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fourth Chamber) · 11 September 2014 – Case No. C-117/13</p>	<p>“Technische Universität Darmstadt” · Directive 2001/29/EC, Article 5(3)(n) – <i>Technische Universität Darmstadt v. Eugen Ulmer KG</i></p>	<p>980</p>
<p><i>Argentina</i> National Criminal and Correctional Court of Appeals (5th Chamber) · 28 October 2013 – Case No. CCC 13630/2012/CA2</p>	<p>“Chinese Take-Away” · Copyright Law (No. 11.723), Art. 71; Criminal Code, Art. 172 – <i>in re “P. L. et al.”</i></p>	<p>711</p>
<p><i>Austria</i> Supreme Court (Oberster Gerichtshof) · 12 February 2013 – Case No. 4 Ob 190/12p</p>	<p>“Hundertwasser Scarf” · Council Regulation (EC) No. 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (Brussels I Regulation), Arts. 5(3), 6, 24; Regulation (EC) No. 864/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on the Law Applicable to Non-Contractual Obligations (Rome II), Arts. 8(1), 24; Copyright Act, Secs. 1(1), 3, 5(2), 54(1)(5)</p>	<p>92</p>
<p><i>Canada</i> Supreme Court · 12 July 2012 – Case No. 34210</p>	<p>“Re: Sound v. Motion Picture Theatre Associations of Canada” · Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1985, Chap. C-42, Secs. 2 “sound recording”, 19 – <i>Re: Sound v. Motion Picture Theatre Associations of Canada, Rogers Communications Inc., Shaw Communications Inc., Bell ExpressVu LLP, Cogeco Cable Inc., Eastlink, Quebecor Media, TELUS Communications Company, Canadian Association of Broadcasters and Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and Samuelson-Glushko Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic</i></p>	<p>96</p>
<p><i>Canada</i> Supreme Court · 13 December 2012 – Case No. 34231</p>	<p>“Broadcasting Regulatory Policy” · Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1985, Chap. C-42, Secs. 2, 21, 31, 89; Broadcasting Act, S.C. 1991, Chap. 11, Secs. 2, 3, 5, 9, 10 – <i>Cogeco Cable Inc., Rogers Communications Inc., TELUS Communications Company and Shaw Communications Inc. v. Bell Media Inc. (formerly CTV Globemedia Inc.), V Interactions Inc., Newfoundland Broadcasting Co. Ltd. and Canwest Television Limited Partnership and Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission</i></p>	<p>229</p>

Decisions (cont'd)

<p><i>Canada</i> Supreme Court · 23 December 2013 – 2013 SCC 73, [2013] 3 S.C.R. 11 68</p>	<p>“Robinson Curiosity” · Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1985, Chap. C-42, Sec. 35; Civil Code of Québec, S.Q. 1991, Chap. 64, Art. 1621; Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, R.S.Q., Chap. C-12, Sec. 49 – <i>Cinar Corporation and Les Films Cinar Inc. v. Claude Robinson and Les Productions Nilem Inc.</i>; <i>Ronald A. Weinberg and Ronald A. Weinberg, in his capacity as sole liquidator of the succession of the late Micheline Charest v. Claude Robinson and Les Productions Nilem Inc.</i>; <i>Christophe Izard, France Animation S.A., Ravensburger Film + TV GmbH and RTV Family Entertainment AG v. Claude Robinson and Les Productions Nilem Inc.</i>; and <i>Claude Robinson and Les Productions Nilem Inc. v. France Animation S.A., Ravensburger Film + TV GmbH, Videal Gesellschaft zur Herstellung von audiovisuellen Produkten MHB, RTV Family Entertainment AG, Christian Davin, Christophe Izard, Les Films Cinar Inc., Cinar Corporation, 3918203 Canada Inc., Ronald A. Weinberg and Ronald A. Weinberg, in his capacity as sole liquidator of the succession of the late Micheline Charest</i>.....</p>	593
<p><i>France</i> Supreme Court (Cour de cassation) · Civil Law Section 1st Chamber · 30 May 2012 – Case No. 10-17.780</p>	<p>“Implicit Copyright Transfer” · Intellectual Property Code, Arts. L. 122-4, L. 131-3; Civil Code, Arts. 1134, 1135 – <i>Corbis Sygma Co. v. Unknown Party</i>.....</p>	231
<p><i>France</i> Supreme Court (Cour de cassation) (First Civil Chamber) · 11 September 2013 – Case No. 12-17.794</p>	<p>“Spedidam” · WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty of 20 December 1996, Art. 2(e); Rome Convention of 26 October 1961 for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations, Art. 3(b); Intellectual Property Code, Secs. L.212-3, L.321-1 – <i>Spedidam, SNEP et al. v. Apple Inc. (iTunes)</i>.....</p>	362
<p><i>France</i> Supreme Court (Cour de cassation) · (Commercial Chamber) · 10 December 2013 – Case No. 11-19.872</p>	<p>“Trésor-Armani-Mania” · Intellectual Property Code, Art. L. 112-1 – <i>SNC Lancôme Parfums et Beauté and co., GA Modéfine and Prestige et collection international v. M.X</i>.....</p>	829
<p><i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 17 July 2013 – Case No. I ZR 52/12</p>	<p>“Pippi Longstocking Costume (Pippi-Langstrumpf-Kostüm)” · Copyright Act, Secs. 2(1)(1), 23, 24(1).....</p>	467
<p><i>Germany</i> Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 17 July 2013 – Case No. I ZR 129/08</p>	<p>“UsedSoft II” · Copyright Act, Sec. 69(d)(1)</p>	595

Decisions (cont'd)

<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 15 August 2013 – Case No. I ZR 80/12	“Rapidshare III” · Copyright Act, Sec. 97; Telemedia Act, Secs. 7(2), 10.....	716
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 13 November 2013 – Case No. I ZR 143/12	“Birthday Train (Geburtstagszug)” · Copyright Act, Secs. 2(1)(4)(2), 32(1)(3)(2) sentence 2, 32a(1) sentence 1	831
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 19 March 2014 – Case No. I ZR 35/13	“Portrait Art (Porträtkunst)” · Directive 2001/29/EEC, Art. 5(2)(a); Copyright Act, Sec. 53(1).....	97
<i>Germany</i> Munich Court of Appeal (Oberlandesgericht) · 29 April 2010 – Case No. 29 U 3698/09	“MyVideo” · Regulation (EC) No. 864/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on the Law Applicable to Non-Contractual Obligations (Rome II), Art. 8(1); Copyright Act, Secs. 16, 31,97	981
<i>Greece</i> Athens District Court (Polimeles Protodikio Athinon) · 5 February 2013 – Case No. 525/2013	“Olympic Champions” · Copyright Act (Law No. 2121/1993), Art. 2(1)	468
<i>India</i> High Court of Delhi · 30 August 2013 – Case Nos. FAO(OS) 153/2013, CM APPL. 4665/2013; FAO(OS) 160/2013, CAV 265/2013, CAV 266/2013, CM APPL. 4880/2013, CM APPL. 4881/2013, CM APPL. 4882/2013; FAO(OS) 161/2013, CAV 267/2013, CAV 268/2013, CM APPL. 4883/2013, CM APPL. 4884/2013	“Aquate Internet Services et al. v. Star India” · Copyright Act, Sec. 16 – <i>Aquate Internet Services Pvt. Ltd. & Anr., Onmobile Global Limited and Idea Cellular Ltd. v. Star India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr.</i>	103
<i>Israel</i> Supreme Court · 2 September 2013 – Civil Appeal No. 5097/11	“Telran v. Charlton” · Copyright Act of 1911 – <i>Telran Communication (1986) Ltd. vs. Charlton Ltd.</i>	233

Decisions (cont'd)

<i>Slovakia</i> Supreme Court (Najvyšší súd SR) · 27 September 2012 – Case No. 2 Cdo 190/2012	“Tank Man” · Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the Harmonisation of Certain Aspects of Copyright and Related Rights in the Information Society, Arts. 2, 5(d) and (e); Enforcement Directive, Art. 8; Copyright Term Directive, Art. 6; Copyright Act, Secs. 5(7), 7, 17, 35, 56(d).....	364
<i>United States of America</i> U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York · 14 November 2013 – Case No. 1:05-civ-8136-DC	“Google Books” · 17 U.S.C., § 107 Limitations on Exclusive Rights: Fair Use – <i>The Authors Guild, Inc., Betty Miles, Joseph Goulden and Jim Bouton v. Google Inc.</i>	237
<i>United States of America</i> Supreme Court · 25 June 2014 – Case No. 13-461	“Aereo” · Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101, 106(4) – <i>American Broadcasting Cos., Inc., et al. v. Aereo, Inc., fka Bamboom Labs, Inc.</i>	985

COPYRIGHT LAW / DATABASE SUI GENERIS PROTECTION

<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fifth Chamber) · 19 December 2013 – Case No. C-202/12	“Innoweb” · Directive No. 96/9/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 1996 on the Legal Protection of Databases, Art. 7(1) and (5) – <i>Innoweb BV v. Wegener ICT Media BV and Wegener Mediaventions BV</i>	465
---	---	-----

COPYRIGHT AND UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

<i>Japan</i> Supreme Court · 8 December 2011	“Mitsurei 27” · Bern Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Art. 3(1)(i); Copyright Act, Sec. 6(iii), Civil Code, Sec. 709 – <i>Chosen Yushutsu Nyusha et al. v. Nihon Telebi</i>	720
--	--	-----

DESIGN LAW

<i>France</i> Supreme Court (Cour de cassation) · 28 September 2010	“Regie souple graduee” · Intellectual Property Code, Art. 512-4d.....	600
--	---	-----

Decisions (cont'd)**TRADE MARK LAW**

<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Second Chamber) · 18 October 2012 – Case No. C-402/11 P	“Redtube/REDTUBE” · Commission Regulation (EC) No. 2868/95 of 13 December 1995 Implementing Council Regulation (EC) No. 40/94 on the Community Trade Mark, Rule 18(1) <i>Jager & Polacek GmbH v. Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)(OHIM)</i>	107
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) · 25 October 2012 – Case No. C-553/11 P	“Rintisch” · First Council Directive 89/104/EEC of 21 December 1988 to Approximate the Laws of the Member States Relating to Trade Marks, Art. 10(1) and (2)(a) – <i>Bernhard Rintisch v. Klaus Eder</i>	109
<i>European Union</i> The European Court of Justice (Tenth Chamber) · 7 February 2013 – Case No. C-266/12 P	“Majtczak v. Feng Shen Technology and OHIM” · Council Regulation (EC) No. 40/94 of 20 December 1993 on the Community Trade Mark, Art. 51(1)(b) – <i>Jarosław Majtczak v. Feng Shen Technology Co. Ltd and Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM)</i>	367
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) · 19 September 2013 – Case No. C-661/11	“Specsavers” · Council Regulation (EC) No. 207/2009 of 26 February 2009 on the Community Trade Mark, Arts. 9(1)(b) and (c), 15(1), 51(1)(a) – <i>Specsavers International Healthcare Ltd, Specsavers BV, Specsavers Optical Group Ltd and Specsavers Optical Superstores Ltd v. Asda Stores Ltd</i>	368
<i>European Union</i> Decision of the European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) · 10 July 2014 – Case No. C-421/13	“Martin y Paz Diffusion SA v. Depuydt” · First Council Directive 89/104/EEC of 21 December 1988 to Approximate the Laws of the Member States Relating to Trade Marks, Art. 5 – <i>Martin y Paz Diffusion SA v. David Depuydt, Fabrik van Maroquinerie Gauquie NV</i>	369
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) · 18 July 2014 – Case No. C-252/12	“Apple Flagship Stores” · Directive 2008/95/EC, Arts. 2 and 3 – <i>Apple Inc. v. Deutsches Patent- und Markenamt</i>	988
<i>Austria</i> Supreme Court (Oberster Gerichtshof) · 15 January 2013 – Case No. 4 Ob 221/12x	“Red Bull v. Pit Bull” · Jurisdiction Regulation, Art. 6(1); Regulation (EC) No. 207/2009 on the Community Trade Mark, Arts. 9(1)(c), 94(1); Trade Mark Act, Sec. 10(2); Act Against Unfair Competition, Sec. 1	472
<i>France</i> Supreme Court (Cour de cassation) · 2 February 2010	“Christian Dior” · Intellectual Property Code, Art. L.713-4 – <i>Copad v. Christian Dior et al.</i>	724

Decisions (cont'd)

<i>France</i> Paris District Court (Tribunal de Grande Instance) · 16 December 2009	<i>"Pictograms"</i> · Intellectual Property Code, Art. L. 711-1 – <i>Groupement International d'Etiquetage pour l'Entretien des Textiles and COFREET v. Victoire sas</i>	601
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 13 December 2012 – Case No. I ZR 217/10	<i>"MOST-Pralinen"</i> · Trade Mark Act, Sec. 14(2)(1) and (2).....	110
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 13 December 2012 – Case No. I ZR 23/12	<i>"Bolero"</i> · Council Regulation (EC) No. 6/2002 of 12 December 2001 on Community Designs, Arts. 11, 14(1) and (3), 85(2) first sentence	239
<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 30 April 2014 – Case No. I ZR 224/12	<i>"Booking Flights on the Internet (Flugvermittlung im Internet)"</i> · Act Against Unfair Competition, Sec. 4(10).....	105
<i>Japan</i> Intellectual Property High Court · 28 August 2013 – Case No. 2012 (Gyo ke) 10352	<i>"Hot Lemon"</i> · Trade Mark Act, Sec. 3(1)(iii) and (2).....	479
<i>Spain</i> Supreme Court (Administrative Disputes Division, 3rd Section) · 2 December 2013 – Appeal No. 4301/2012	<i>"Orange"</i> · Trade Mark Law No. 17/2001, Arts. 4.1, 4.2(b), 5.1(a), 5.1(b) – <i>Orange Personal Communications Ltd. v. Spain/Jazz Telecom, S.A.U.</i>	603
<i>Switzerland</i> Decision of the Federal Administrative Court (Division II) · 28 April 2014 – Case No. B-2766/2013	<i>"Red Bull v. Bulldog"</i> · Trade Mark Act – <i>Red Bull Ltd. v. Sun Mark Limited</i>	989

Decisions (cont'd)**TRADE MARK AND UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW**

<i>Italy</i> Milan District Court · 15 May 2012	“Espiritu de Cuba” · Industrial Property Code, Secs. 29, 30 – <i>Pernod Ricard Italia SpA and Havanna Club International SA v.</i> <i>1872 Holding V.O.F et al.</i>	835
---	---	-----

UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (First Chamber) · 17 January 2013 – Case No. C-206/11	“Köck” · Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 Concerning Unfair Business-to-Consumer Commercial Practices in the Internal Market – <i>Georg Köck v.</i> <i>Schutzverband gegen unlauteren Wettbewerb</i>	244
--	--	-----

<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 24 January 2013 – Case No. I ZR 136/11	“Shelving System (Regalsystem)” · Act Against Unfair Competition, Sec. 4(9)(a) and (b); Code of Civil Procedure Sec. 314, 1st sentence.....	607
---	--	-----

<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 17 July 2013 – Case No. I ZR 34/12	“Runes of Magic” · Act Against Unfair Competition, Annex to Sec 3(3) No. 28.....	725
--	---	-----

<i>Germany</i> Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 15 August 2013 – Case No. I ZR 188/11	“Hard Rock Cafe” · Act Against Unfair Competition, No. 13 Annex to Sec. 3(3), Sec. 5(1) sentence 2 No. 1, (2); Civil Code Sec. 242 Cc	484
--	--	-----

<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 22 January 2014 – Case No. I ZR 164/12	“wetteronline.de” · Civil Code, Sec. 12; Act Against Unfair Competition, Sec. 4(10)	995
--	--	-----

<i>Germany</i> Federal Supreme Court (Bundesgerichtshof) · 30 April 2014 – Case No. I ZR 224/12	“Booking Flights on the Internet (Flugvermittlung im Internet)” · Act Against Unfair Competition, Sec. 4(10).....	999
--	--	-----

COMPETITION LAW, COMMERCIAL LAW, CONSUMER LAW

<i>France</i> Supreme Court (Cour de cassation) (First Civil Chamber) · 5 February 2014 – Case No. 12-25748	“Lenovo France” · Directive No. 2005/29/CE, Arts. 2(d), 5(2); Consumer Code, Art. L 122-5 – <i>Lenovo France v. M.X.</i>	993
--	---	-----

Decisions (cont'd)**UNFAIR COMPETITION AND TORT LAW**

<i>Japan</i> Decision of the Supreme Court · 25 March 2010	"Metallic Machine Tools" · Civil Code, Sec. 709.....	841
---	--	-----

RESTRAINTS OF COMPETITION LAW

<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (First Chamber) · 6 December 2012 – Case No. C-457/10 P	<i>AstraZeneca</i> · EC Treaty, Art. 82; Council Directive 65/65/EEC of 26 January 1965 on the Approximation of Provisions Laid Down by Law, Regulation or Administrative Action Relating to Medicinal Products, Art. 4 – <i>AstraZeneca AB and AstraZeneca plc v. European Commission and European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA)</i>	117
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) · 18 July 2013 – Case No. C-201/11 P	"UEFA and FIFA v. Commission" · Council Directive 89/552/EEC of 3 October 1989 on the Coordination of Certain Provisions Laid Down by Law, Regulation or Administrative Action in Member States Concerning the Pursuit of Television Broadcasting Activities, Art. 3a – <i>Union des associations européennes de football (UEFA) v. European Commission and Kingdom of Belgium, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</i>	491
<i>European Union</i> European Court of Justice (Fifth Chamber) · 5 June 2014 – Case No. C-557/12	"Kone" · Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Art. 101 – <i>Kone AG, Otis GmbH, Schindler Aufzüge und Fahrtreppen GmbH, Schindler Liegenschaftsverwaltung GmbH and ThyssenKrupp Aufzüge GmbH v. ÖBB-Infrastruktur AG</i>	1003
<i>Italy</i> Supreme Administrative Court (Consiglio di Stato) · 12 February 2014 – Case No. 9181/2012	"Pfizer" · Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Art. 102 – <i>Autorità Garante della Concorrenza e del Mercato, Ratiopharm Italia s.r.l. and others v. Pfizer Italia s.r.l., Pfizer Health AB and Pfizer Inc</i>	844

IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and
Competition Law

Editors-in-Chief: Hilty, R.M.; Drexl, J.

ISSN: 0018-9855 (print version)

ISSN: 2195-0237 (electronic version)

Journal no. 40319