European Commission Research Project on Judicial Cooperation in Matters of Intellectual Property and Information Technology

International Litigation in Intellectual Property and Information Technology

Editor
Arnaud Nuyts

Co-Editors
Nikitas Hatzimihail
Katarzyna Szychowska

Other Contributors
Jean-Sylvestre Bergé
Alegría Borrás
Anna Gardella
Richard Fentiman
Joaquim J. Forner Delaygua
Cristina González Beilfuss
Burkhard Hess
Maksymilian Pazdan
Marta Pertegás
Maciej Szpunar
Paul L.C. Torremans
Chapter 2
The Community Framework for Cross-Border Intellectual Property and Information Technology Litigation 49
Jean-Sylvestre Bergé

I. Introduction 49

II. Yesterday: International Litigation prior to the Development of an EU Framework
   A. International Regulations 50
   B. International Litigation Strictly Speaking 51

III. Today: Changes in International Litigation Due to the Establishment of an EU Framework
   A. Establishment of an EU Framework for Intellectual Property Law 52
   B. The Establishment of a Community Framework for Information Technology Law 53
   C. The Establishment of a Community Framework for Private International Law 53
   D. The Changing Face of International Litigation 54

IV. Tomorrow: What Type of International Litigation and What Type of Community Law Can Be Expected? 55

APPENDIX 57
I. International Multilateral Texts Specific to Intellectual Property Law 57
II. Community Texts Specific to Intellectual Property 58
III. Community Texts Specific to Information Technology 59
IV. Community Texts Specific to International Private Law Containing Provisions Relating to Intellectual Property or Information Technology 59

Chapter 3
The Widening Reach of Exclusive Jurisdiction: Where Can You Litigate IP Rights after GAT? 61
Paul L.C. Torremans

I. Introduction 61

II. The Judgment
   A. A Somewhat Unusual Factual Basis 62
   B. The Case before the German Courts 62
   C. The Court of Justice Goes Back to Duijnste 63
   D. The Questionable Link with National Offices and National Law 65
   E. Article 22 and Its Position in the Scheme of the Regulation 66
   F. Further Points Raised in Support of Its Approach by the Court of Justice 69

III. The Position Adopted by the Court 71
# Table of Contents

## Chapter 6
**Suing At the Place of Infringement: The Application of Article 5(3) of Regulation 44/2001 to IP Matters and Internet Disputes**  
*Arnaud Nuyts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Introduction</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Legal Basis for Suing at the Place of Infringement</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Types of Actions that Can Be Brought at the Place of Infringement</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Determination of the Place of Infringement</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The Place of the Causal Event of Infringement</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The Place where Damage Is Sustained</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Territorial Limitation of Jurisdiction</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chapter 7
**Cross-Border Litigation of Unfair Competition over the Internet**  
*Maksymilian Pazdan and Maciej Szpunar*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Introduction</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Special Features of Unfair Competition Claims</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. The Law Applicable to Unfair Competition Claims</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Jurisdiction over Unfair Competition Claims</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Domicile of the Defendant</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Place where the Event Giving Rise to the Damage Took Place</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Place where the Data was Uploaded</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Place where the Server is Situated</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establishment of the Defendant</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Place where the Damage Occurred (Is Sustained)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What Kinds of Claims are Covered by Article 5, Paragraph 3?</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the Accessibility of the Website in One Country Justify the Possibility of Accepting Jurisdiction by the Courts of that Country?</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Possible Ways to Limit Jurisdiction</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proposal of a Wide Interpretation of the 'Place where Damage is Sustained' in Case of Torts Committed over the Internet</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Conclusions</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chapter 8
**Justiciability, Discretion and Foreign Rights**  
*Richard Fentiman*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Introduction</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. A Case Study: English Law</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Three Issues</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Entitlement</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Infringement</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exploitation</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 9

Torpedoes and Action for Negative Declarations in International IP Law Litigation

Anna Gardella

I. Introduction

II. Cross-Border Litigation of IP Rights Infringement within the European Judicial Area

III. The Torpedo Actions

IV. Torpedoes within the EU Judicial Area: Consistency or Inconsistency?
   A. Suing at the Defendant’s Domicile
   B. Suing at the Place of the Tort
   C. Successful Torpedoes: Establishment of lis pendens and Stay of Proceedings in other Member States

V. Flaws in the Torpedo: The Infringement and Validity Interface. Territorial Nature of IP Registered Rights and Obstacles to Cross-Border Infringement Litigation

VI. The ECJ’s GAT v. LuK Decision

VII. GAT v. LuK and Roche Cases: Adverse Effects on Torpedo Practice

VIII. Negative Attitude of Domestic Courts in Respect of Torpedoes

IX. (In)Consistency of Negative Declarations with Article 5(3) Convention/Regulation?
   A. The Requirement of an Injury Having Already Occurred
   B. The Amendment to Article 5(3) by Regulation EC n. 44/2001: Inclusion of Threatened Wrongs
   C. The Notion of Matter Relating to Tort
   D. Forum Actoris, Proximity Principle and Negative Declarations
   E. Proposals to Avoid Abusive Litigation in Cross-Border Negative Declarations
Table of Contents

X. Consistency of Negative Declarations with the Convention/Regulation Framework: The Interface with Admissibility Preconditions Provided for by National Law 205
XI. Concluding Remarks 206

Chapter 10
Jurisdiction to Grant Provisional and Protective Measures in Intellectual Property Matters 207
Katarzyna Szychowska

I. Introduction 207
II. Definition of Provisional and Protective Measures 208
III. International Jurisdiction to Order Provisional Including Protective Measures 213
   A. Interim Relief Application Before a Court Having Jurisdiction as to the Substance of the Case 214
      1. Domicile of the Defendant 215
      2. Domicile of One of the Defendants 217
   B. Proceedings Instituted Under Article 31 221
      1. Conditions of Application of Article 31 222
         a. Notion of Provisional, Including Protective, Measures 222
         b. Territorial Scope of the Relief 223
      2. Autonomous Character of Article 31 228
         a. An Old Debate: Is Article 31 an Autonomous Head of Jurisdiction? 228
         b. A New Element: Is Article 31 Applicable Regardless of the Domicile of the Defendant? 230
IV. Conclusion 235

Chapter 11
Interactions between Community Instruments and International Conventions (Including the Draft New Lugano Convention) in Intellectual Property Matters 237
Alegriá Borrás

I. Introduction 237
II. The Determining Factors 238
   A. In General 238
   B. The Opinion of the European Court of Justice on the Competence of the Community to Conclude the Revised Lugano Convention 240
   C. The Community Patent 245
III. The Results 247
   A. In General 247
   B. The Revision of the Lugano Convention 247
   C. The Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements of 30 June 2005 251
IV. Final Considerations 255
Table of Contents

Chapter 12
The Impact of the Enforcement Directive on the Brussels I Regime 257
Joaquim J. Forner Delaygua


II. Obtaining of Evidence v. Provisional and Precautionary Measures 262
   A. The Directive: Scope 262
      1. Obtaining Evidence 263
      2. Preserving Evidence and Preserving the Right to Be Adjudicated on the Merits 265
   B. The Respective Roles of BIR and ER 268
   C. Jurisdiction to Order 'Provisional, Including Protective, Measures' under Article 31 BIR 271

III. Jurisdiction on the Merits 273
   A. Remedies Provided for in the Directive and Roles of Articles 2 and 5.3 BIR 273
   B. Reach of Exclusive Jurisdiction under BIR (Article 22.4 BIR) and Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights 276
   C. Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights and the Co-Defendants Rule of Jurisdiction (Article 6.1 BIR) 280

IV. Recognition and Enforcement of Decisions 282
   A. Ex Parte Directive Measures 283
   B. Exclusive Jurisdiction, Public Policy and Irreconcilable Judgments Exceptions 285
      1. Exclusive Jurisdiction 285
      2. Public Policy and Irreconcilable Judgments 286

V. Concluding Remarks 288

Chapter 13
Preservation and Taking of Evidence in Cross-Border Proceedings – Comparative Remarks in the Context of IP Litigation 289
Burkhard Hess

I. Introduction 289
II. The Different National Systems 290
   A. Gathering of Information and Preservation of Evidence 290
   B. Provisional Measures for the Preservation of Evidence 291

III. The EC-Framework 293
   A. The Evidence Regulation EC 1206/2001 293
   B. The Brussels I Regulation EC 44/2001 294
   D. The ECJ's Decision in St Paul's Dairy – A Missed Opportunity 297
Table of Contents

E. The *Tedesco Case* 298
F. The Preservation of Evidence under Articles 31 and 32 of the Judgments Regulation 299
IV. Concluding Remarks 301

Chapter 14
*Nikitas Hatzimihail*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Introduction</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. The Evolving Intellectual Property Paradigm</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Evolving International Regimes of Intellectual Property Protection</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Territoriality in Intellectual Property</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Conclusion</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index 309