

# Table of contents

Duncan Matthews, Paul Torremans

**Foreword — V**

Lord Justice Colin Birss

**Preface — VII**

**List of contributors — XXIII**

Duncan Matthews, Paul Torremans

**Introduction — XXV**

## Part 1: The existing system: the EPC

Jean-Christophe Galloux

**1 The role of EPO Boards of Appeal in shaping of patent law in Europe — 3**

1.1 Boards of Appeal's characters — 4

1.2 BoA's role — 6

1.2.1 BoA's ways in shaping European patent law — 6

1.2.2 BoA's real influence on contracting states jurisdictions — 9

1.3 BoA's limits in shaping of patent law in Europe — 11

1.3.1 Limits inherent to the European law system — 11

1.3.2 Dialog of judges: a necessity — 14

Heinz Goddar, Konstantin Werner

**2 The interaction between the UPC, national courts, and the EPO Boards of Appeal — 17**

2.1 Introduction — 17

2.2 Initial situation — 17

2.2.1 Obtaining patent protection in Europe – the present system — 17

2.2.2 Future UPs and the role of national courts vs. UPC — 19

2.3 The interplay between national courts, UPC, and Boards of Appeal ('BoA') of EPO in future — 20

2.4 The best filing strategy in Europe in the future — 22

2.4.1 "Category A" — 22

2.4.2 "Category B" — 24

2.4.3 "Category C" — 24

2.5 Conclusions — 25

Żaneta Zemła-Pacud, Tomasz Targosz

**3 Cross-border patent litigation under the EPC — 27**

- 3.1 Introduction — 27
- 3.2 Existing rules of cross-border patent litigation in the EU – jurisdiction — 28
- 3.3 Unfair tactical litigation — 36
- 3.4 Infringing acts in multiple countries — 37
- 3.5 Practical ramifications of the status quo: inconsistency of decision-making, high costs, forum shopping — 38
- 3.6 Concluding thoughts — 40
- 3.7 References — 41

Alison Slade

**4 Plausibility: a route to stronger and more robust patents? — 43**

- 4.1 Introduction — 43
- 4.2 Why a plausibility test? — 45
- 4.3 Filling the legislative lacuna — 46
- 4.4 Defining the plausibility standard — 48
- 4.5 Which approach would secure stronger and more robust patents? — 52
- 4.6 Implications for the UPC: a lack of legal coherency — 55
- 4.7 Conclusion — 57

Amandine Léonard

**5 Wrongful preliminary injunctions and EU procedural law — 59**

- 5.1 Introduction — 59
- 5.2 Wrongful preliminary injunctions – liability with or without fault? — 60
  - 5.2.1 The case — 63
  - 5.2.2 Analysis — 64
- 5.3 ‘Appropriate compensation’ and the meaning of ‘abuse’ under IPRED — 67
  - 5.3.1 A uniform interpretation of ‘appropriate compensation’ — 67
  - 5.3.2 The question of ‘abuse’ under article 3(2) IPRED — 70
- 5.4 EU procedural law and patent litigation — 72
  - 5.4.1 IP enforcement and vertical harmonisation — 72
  - 5.4.2 Reflections for patent litigation and civil procedural law — 74
- 5.5 Conclusion — 76
- 5.6 References — 76
  - 5.6.1 Legislation — 76
  - 5.6.2 Case law — 76
  - 5.6.3 Secondary sources — 77

Maciej Padamczyk, Duncan Matthews

## **6 Proportionality and patent injunctions — 79**

- 6.1 Introduction: proportionality and enforcement of patent rights — **79**
- 6.2 Injunctions: policy considerations — **80**
- 6.3 Injunctions and proportionality: an outline of the debate — **83**
- 6.4 Injunctions and proportionality in national and international law — **85**
  - 6.4.1 International law — **85**
  - 6.4.2 United States — **87**
  - 6.4.3 United Kingdom — **89**
  - 6.4.4 Germany — **89**
  - 6.4.5 Final injunctions in the UPC — **90**
- 6.5 Preliminary injunctions — **91**
- 6.6 Concluding remarks — **93**

## **Part 2: The European Patent with unitary effect and the Unified Patent Court**

Frantzeska Papadopolou

## **7 The novelty and inventive step requirement in Europe and under the UPP — 97**

- 7.1 Background — **97**
- 7.2 Novelty and inventive step requirement in Europe a fragmented view? — **99**
  - 7.2.1 Novelty requirement in Europe — **99**
  - 7.2.2 Inventive step in Europe — **100**
- 7.3 Unitary patent but disharmonised European patent law? — **103**
  - 7.3.1 The role of the EPO towards a European substantive patent law — **103**
  - 7.3.2 The Unitary Patent, the Unitary Patent Court and the CJEU — **105**
- 7.4 Concluding remarks — **106**

Ana Nordberg

## **8 Exceptions and limitations (27 UPCA) — 109**

- 8.1 Introduction: historical origin of UPCA limitations — **109**
- 8.2 Legal nature and scope of Article 27 UPC — **111**
  - 8.2.1 Legal nature of limitations — **111**
  - 8.2.2 A closed list or does the provision allow for further limitations? — **112**
  - 8.2.3 Analogy and extensive interpretation — **113**
- 8.3 Harmonization and uniformity of patent limitations — **114**
- 8.4 Article 27 limitations to the effects of a patent — **116**
  - 8.4.1 Limitations based on international law — **116**
  - 8.4.2 Limitations based on EU policy (Community Patent Convention) — **117**
    - 8.4.2.1 Acts done privately and for non-commercial purposes — **117**

- 8.4.2.2 Acts done for experimental purposes — **119**
- 8.4.2.3 Extemporaneous preparation of medicines — **121**
- 8.4.3 Limitations based on EU Law — **122**
- 8.4.3.1 Use in the context of regulatory approval procedures:  
‘Bolar exemption’ — **122**
- 8.4.3.2 Plant and animal related patent Limitations — **125**
- 8.4.3.3 Computer-implemented inventions decompilation and interoperability — **126**
- 8.5 Conclusion — **127**

Jacques de Werra

**9 Patent Arbitration under the Agreement on a Unified Patent Court — 129**

- 9.1 Introduction — **129**
- 9.2 The Patent Mediation and Arbitration Centre instituted by the UPCA — **131**
- 9.2.1 Introduction — **131**
- 9.2.2 Substantive scope of the arbitration services offered by the Centre — **134**
- 9.2.3 No exclusivity for arbitration instituted by the Centre — **137**
- 9.2.4 Interactions between arbitration proceedings and court proceedings  
before the Court — **138**
- 9.2.5 No right to revoke or limit patents in arbitration proceedings — **141**
- 9.2.6 Improved enforceability of settlements reached through the use of the facilities  
of the Centre — **144**
- 9.2.7 Double seat of the Centre and provision of ‘facilities’ by the Centre — **146**
- 9.2.8 List of arbitrators — **148**
- 9.3 Concluding remarks — **148**

Justyna Ożegalska-Trybalska

**10 Supplementary Protection Certificates (Article 30) — 153**

- 10.1 Introduction — **153**
- 10.2 General overview of the SPC system in the EU – in fitting with or conflicting  
with unitary protection concept? — **155**
- 10.3 The SPC under UPCA – the present — **156**
- 10.3.1 The subject matter application of Article 30 — **157**
- 10.3.2 The scope of Article 30 — **158**
- 10.3.3 Effects of SPC – unitary or not? — **159**
- 10.4 The SPC under UPCA – the future — **160**
- 10.4.1 Towards a unitary SPC — **161**
- 10.4.4.1 Centralised granting procedure — **162**
- 10.4.4.2 Marketing authorisation for a unitary SPC — **164**
- 10.5 Final remarks — **166**

Phillip Johnson

**11 Liability for infringement of EU law — 169**

- 11.1 Introduction — 169
- 11.2 The extent of EU law before the UPC — 170
- 11.3 Compelling compliance — 174
  - 11.3.1 ‘Infraction’ proceedings — 175
  - 11.3.2 Köbler liability — 175
- 11.4 Ways in which the UPC can breach EU law — 177
  - 11.4.1 Failure to give direct effect to an EU law — 178
  - 11.4.2 Incompatible rules — 178
  - 11.4.3 Failure to give conforming interpretation — 180
  - 11.4.4 Failure to request a preliminary reference — 180
- 11.5 How real is the risk? — 181
- 11.6 Conclusion — 183

Paul LC Torremans

**12 Regulation 542/2014 on jurisdiction — 185**

- 12.1 Introduction — 185
- 12.2 The insertion of a common court: a mere clarification in Article 71(a) — 186
- 12.3 The new rules on international jurisdiction: Article 71b — 188
- 12.4 Article 71c: *lis pendens* — 194
- 12.5 Recognition and enforcement — 196
- 12.6 Conclusion — 196

Paul LC Torremans

**13 Exclusive jurisdiction and competence — 197**

- 13.1 Introduction — 197
- 13.2 The exclusive jurisdiction of the UPC: registration and validity — 197
  - 13.2.1 Applying Article 24(4) Brussels I Regulation — 197
  - 13.2.2 The transition period as a complicating factor — 198
  - 13.2.3 Other grounds of jurisdiction — 199
- 13.3 The competence rules — 200
  - 13.3.1 An action for the revocation of a patent — 200
  - 13.3.2 Infringement and other actions — 201
- 13.4 *Lis pendens* — 203
- 13.5 Conclusion — 203

Fernand de Visscher

**14 Constitutional aspects of the Unitary Patent Package (UPP) and the Unified Patent Court (UPC) – question marks remain — 205**

- 14.1 Regulation 1257/2012 — **206**
- 14.2 The UPCA — **213**
- 14.3 What about the Court of Justice? — **216**

Esther van Zimmeren

**15 Trusting the Unified Patent Court: the importance of the institutional design of the UPC and its judges — 221**

- 15.1 Introduction — **221**
- 15.2 The one-of-its kind unique nature of the UPC — **224**
- 15.3 Translating key concepts from the trust literature to the UPC setting — **229**
  - 15.3.1 Defining trust, identifying the trust relationship and understanding the multilevel nature of trust within the context of the UPC — **229**
  - 15.3.2 Trust and uncertainty — **231**
  - 15.3.3 Trust, trustworthiness and the ABI-model — **232**
- 15.4 Concluding remarks — **233**

Stefan Luginbuehl, Matilda Titeca

**16 The EPO within the unitary patent system — 235**

- 16.1 Introduction — **235**
- 16.2 Legal framework — **237**
  - 16.2.1 The Unitary Patent Regulations — **237**
  - 16.2.2 Agreement on a Unified Patent Court (UPCA) — **238**
  - 16.2.3 Secondary legislation — **238**
- 16.3 Role of the EPO from a governance perspective — **239**
  - 16.3.1 Select Committee of the Administrative Council of the European Patent Organisation — **239**
  - 16.3.2 Unified Patent Court (UPC) — **240**
- 16.4 Role of the EPO with regard to the Unitary Patent Procedure — **241**
  - 16.4.1 Additional tasks for the European Patent Office — **241**
  - 16.4.2 Request for Unitary Effect — **242**
  - 16.4.3 Payment of fees — **242**
- 16.5 Correlation of European Patent, Unitary Patent and national patent systems — **243**
  - 16.5.1 From a true Community patent to an alternatively available patent for a group of EU member states — **243**
  - 16.5.2 Co-existing EPO opposition and appeals proceedings before the EPO and the EPO Boards of Appeal, the Unified Patent Court and national courts — **244**

- 16.5.3 Role of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) and impact on the EPO and the European Patent System — **246**
- 16.5.3.1 The impact of rulings of the CJEU on the EPO — **246**
- 16.5.3.2 The interpretation of substantive patent law provided for in the UPC Agreement by the CJEU — **247**
- 16.6 Conclusion — **249**

Hanns Ullrich

## **17 The Role of the Court of Justice of the European Union — 251**

- 17.1 The general role of the Court of Justice — **251**
  - 17.1.1 The provisions of the Treaties — **251**
  - 17.1.2 The role of the Court of Justice under Reg. 1257/2012 and under other EU intellectual property regulations compared. — **252**
    - 17.1.2.1 Review of the grant and of the validity of EU intellectual property rights — **252**
    - 17.1.2.2 Interpretation of the rules of substantive law of EU intellectual property protection — **255**
- 17.2 The role of the Court of Justice in the interpretation of the rules of substantive law of the unitary patent and the European bundle patent — **257**
  - 17.2.1 The law covered by Art. 267 TFEU — **257**
    - 17.2.1.1 Union law — **257**
    - 17.2.1.2 The interdependence of Reg. 1257/2012 and Art. 25 to 27 UPCA — **267**
  - 17.2.2 The relationship between the Court of Justice and the Unified Patent Court — **276**
    - 17.2.2.1 On the application of Art. 267 TFEU by the UPC — **276**
    - 17.2.2.2 A division of labor — **281**
- 17.3 Outlook — **285**

Sam Granata

## **18 Rules of procedure of the UPC, a judge's perspective — 287**

- 18.1 Introduction — **287**
- 18.2 Levels of rules of procedure of the UPC — **288**
  - 18.2.1 Hierarchy between the rules of procedure of the UPC — **288**
  - 18.2.2 The UPCA — **289**
  - 18.2.3 The Statute — **290**
  - 18.2.4 The Rules of Procedure — **292**
- 18.3 The driving principles of 'proportionality' and 'fairness' as a matter of trust in the UPC judge — **293**
- 18.4 Pragmatic versus legalistic approach — **296**
- 18.5 The Judge-Rapporteur — **297**
- 18.6 The UPC as one-stop-shop for patent disputes — **298**
- 18.7 Conclusion — **299**

Guillaume Dubos, Stéphanie Rollin de Chambonas, Thomas Leconte

**19 The user in the UPC — 301**

- 19.1 Opting out and in: beware of the torpedoes — 301
- 19.2 Procedural aspects: the devil is in the details — 303
- 19.3 The UPC as a ‘one-stop shop’ for users — 305
- 19.4 National patents: not (yet?) out of the picture — 306
- 19.5 Forum shopping with the UPC and its impact on its users’ actions — 307
- 19.6 Means of evidence: a large and complete toolbox for users — 309
- 19.7 UPC-style *saisie*: less powerful than the French *saisie-contrefaçon*? — 311
- 19.8 Access to decisions, orders, and written pleadings: some lingering question marks — 313
- 19.9 Conclusion — 313

Klara Polackova Van der Ploeg

**20 Unified Patent Court and international law — 315**

- 20.1 Introduction — 315
- 20.2 UPC as an international court — 317
- 20.3 International law as the UPC’s governing law — 318
- 20.4 UPC’s interpretative autonomy — 326
- 20.5 Patent law and other international law: from regime-conflict to regime-cooperation — 328
- 20.6 Functions and authority of international courts: strengthening the UPC’s decision-making — 331
- 20.7 Obligations of commercial patentees and other businesses — 335
- 20.8 Conclusion: building a new international court — 338

Miłosz Malaga

**21 The patent with unitary effect and competition law — 339**

- 21.1 Introduction — 339
- 21.2 Intellectual property rights in the internal market — 339
- 21.3 EU Competition legal framework — 341
- 21.4 EU Competition law and intellectual property rights — 344
  - 21.4.1 Principles — 344
  - 21.4.2 IPRs and anti-competitive agreements — 345
  - 21.4.3 IPRs and abuse of dominant position — 346
    - 21.4.3.1 Refusal to supply and licence — 347
    - 21.4.3.2 Tying — 347
    - 21.4.3.3 Excessive pricing — 348
    - 21.4.3.4 Regulatory and litigation abuses — 348
    - 21.4.3.5 Patent hold-ups and patent trolling — 349
  - 21.5 The Unitary Patent and EU competition law — 349
  - 21.6 Conclusions — 352



Thomas Jaeger, Johannes Lukan

## **22 A system fit for innovation? Part I: (Dis-)incentives for potential patentees in the UP legal framework — 355**

- 22.1 Introduction — 355
- 22.2 Easy, fast and legally secure access to UPs? — 356
  - 22.2.1 Easy access: the EPO as a central granting authority and the language regime — 356
    - 22.2.1.1 The request for unitary effect as a replacement of national validation — 356
    - 22.2.1.2 Downsides to the language regime? — 357
    - 22.2.1.3 Centralised collection of renewal fees — 358
  - 22.2.2 Value for money: costs and territorial scope of protection — 358
    - 22.2.2.1 What is an ‘average’ EP? — 359
    - 22.2.2.2 Dependence of territorial coverage on the status of ratifications — 360
    - 22.2.2.3 Who will use the system? — 361
    - 22.2.2.4 The compensation scheme — 362
    - 22.2.2.5 Licenses of right — 362
  - 22.2.3 Duration of the granting procedure and temporal scope of protection — 363
    - 22.2.3.1 The EPO’s improved timeliness — 364
    - 22.2.3.2 The importance of patent quality — 364
    - 22.2.3.3 The unheard call for a differentiated approach — 366
    - 22.2.3.4 The UP and SPCs — 367
  - 22.2.4 Uncertainties regarding the law applicable to the UPC as an object of property — 368
    - 22.2.4.1 Disadvantages of the available interpretative options — 369
    - 22.2.4.2 Impact on patent value — 370
    - 22.2.4.3 Which alternatives would have been available? — 370
- 22.3 Interim conclusion — 371

Thomas Jaeger, Johannes Lukan

## **23 A system fit for innovation? Part II: (Dis-)advantages for follow-on inventors in the UP legal framework — 373**

- 23.1 Introduction — 373
- 23.2 Substantive scope of protection and applicable limitations – a functional balance? — 374
  - 23.2.1 No changes with regard to patentability? — 375
  - 23.2.2 A case for a purpose-bound compound protection — 376
    - 23.2.2.1 How could such adaptations be made? — 378
  - 23.2.3 The applicable limitations – more of the same — 379
    - 23.2.3.1 Limitations stemming from the CPCs — 379
    - 23.2.3.2 Limitations stemming from EU directives — 380
    - 23.2.3.3 The breeder’s privilege – why not also exempt new animal breeds? — 381
    - 23.2.3.4 The Bolar- and the general research exceptions: a race to the bottom? — 382

23.2.4	Compulsory licenses and limitations to injunctive relief under the UP legal framework —	<b>388</b>
23.2.4.1	The relation between individual and general limitations to patent holders' rights —	<b>388</b>
23.2.4.2	The link between compulsory licenses and limitations to injunctive relief —	<b>388</b>
23.2.4.3	Compulsory licences left untouched —	<b>389</b>
23.2.4.4	A missed opportunity —	<b>390</b>
23.2.4.5	A proportionality requirement for injunctions —	<b>391</b>
23.2.4.6	Presumed incompatibility with EU law of individual restraints of patent protection —	<b>394</b>
23.3	Overall conclusion: a system fit for innovation? —	<b>395</b>

Maximilian Haedicke

**24 Patent mediation — 397**

24.1	Introduction —	<b>397</b>
24.1.1	Definition and legal basis —	<b>397</b>
24.1.2	Guiding principles —	<b>398</b>
24.1.2.1	Confidentiality —	<b>399</b>
24.1.2.2	Voluntariness —	<b>399</b>
24.1.2.3	Openness —	<b>399</b>
24.1.2.4	All-partiality / neutrality —	<b>399</b>
24.1.2.5	Legal information —	<b>399</b>
24.1.3	The course of IP mediation proceedings —	<b>400</b>
24.1.3.1	First contact —	<b>400</b>
24.1.3.2	Preparation —	<b>400</b>
24.1.3.3	Opening – Phase I —	<b>401</b>
24.1.3.4	Exploration of facts and identification of issues – Phase II —	<b>402</b>
24.1.3.5	Working through the areas of conflict – Phase III —	<b>402</b>
24.1.3.6	Negotiation and problem solving – Phase IV —	<b>403</b>
24.1.3.7	Drafting a final agreement – Phase V —	<b>404</b>
24.1.3.8	Enforcement of mediation settlements —	<b>404</b>
24.1.4	The role of the mediator —	<b>405</b>
24.1.4.1	General —	<b>405</b>
24.1.4.2	The mediator's techniques for conflict resolution —	<b>405</b>
24.1.4.3	Special requirements for mediators in patent disputes —	<b>406</b>
24.1.5	Opportunities and challenges of mediation in general —	<b>406</b>
24.2	Patent conflicts suitable for mediation —	<b>407</b>
24.2.1	Licence agreements —	<b>407</b>
24.2.2	International and complex disputes —	<b>408</b>
24.2.3	Disputes requiring confidentiality —	<b>408</b>
24.2.4	Further advantages of mediation —	<b>409</b>
24.3	Conclusion —	<b>410</b>

Alan Johnson

**25 Litigation strategies and bifurcation — 411**

- 25.1 Introduction — 411
- 25.2 Forum shopping within the UPC — 413
  - 25.2.1 The claimant perspective — 414
  - 25.2.2 The non-patentee defendant perspective — 417
  - 25.2.3 The patentee defendant perspective — 417
  - 25.2.4 Conclusions on the ‘balance of power’ — 418
- 25.3 Forum shopping between national and UPC jurisdictions in the transitional period — 418
- 25.4 Anti-suit injunctions — 420
- 25.5 Conclusions – a more uncertain world for European patent litigation — 422

Matthias Lamping, Christoph Rademacher

**26 Patent litigation strategies in Germany: maneuvering the evolving landscape of bifurcation — 423**

- 26.1 Bifurcation of proceedings — 423
  - 26.1.1 Germany — 423
    - 26.1.1.1 Basic structure, legal basis and effect — 423
    - 26.1.1.2 Requirements for a stay of the infringement procedure — 425
    - 26.1.1.3 Communication between Patent Court and infringement courts — 427
  - 26.1.2 Unified Patent Court — 431
    - 26.1.2.1 Institutional structure of the UPC — 431
    - 26.1.2.2 Jurisdiction of the UPC — 432
  - 26.1.3 Japan — 436
- 26.2 Implications for litigation — 439
  - 26.2.1 General remarks — 439
  - 26.2.2 Litigating in Germany — 440
    - 26.2.2.1 Timing of revocation and infringement actions — 440
    - 26.2.2.2 Stay of infringement proceedings — 441
    - 26.2.2.3 Compensation for injury caused by enforcement — 442
  - 26.2.3 Litigating before the UPC — 442
    - 26.2.3.1 Infringement actions brought by licensees — 443
    - 26.2.3.2 Parallel revocation and counterclaim — 444
    - 26.2.3.3 Compensation for injury caused by enforcement — 444
- 26.3 Concluding remarks — 445

## Part 3: Co-existence and alternatives

Marc Mimler

### **27 The co-existence between EPC and patents with unitary effect — 449**

- 27.1 Introduction — 449
- 27.2 Main body — 450
  - 27.2.1 Historical background — 450
  - 27.2.2 Occurrence — 452
    - 27.2.2.1 European Patents with unitary effect (i.e. UPs) — 453
    - 27.2.2.2 Classical European Patents falling within the jurisdiction of the UPC — 454
    - 27.2.2.3 European Patents which do not fall within the jurisdiction of the UPC — 454
    - 27.2.2.4 National patents — 458
  - 27.2.3 Adjudication and substantive law — 459
    - 27.2.3.1 The UPC's exclusive competence — 459
    - 27.2.3.2 Competence of national courts and applicable law — 460
- 27.3 Conclusion — 461

Karen Walsh

### **28 Institutional coexistence: the necessity of judicial dialogue and cooperation in the UPC — 463**

- 28.1 Introduction — 463
- 28.2 The UPC — 464
- 28.3 Harmonisation and the UPC — 468
- 28.4 The necessity of judicial dialogue and cooperation in the UPC — 471
- 28.5 Conclusion — 474

Tamar Khuchua

### **29 The role of the CJEU in European patent law from a procedural perspective — 477**

- Introductions — 477
- 29.1 EU legislation in patent law and the CJEU's current role in the patent field — 478
- 29.2 Avenues leading to CJEU judgments on patent enforcement and available case law — 480
- 29.3 Guaranteeing an EU-law compliant patent enforcement procedure within national courts based on the Enforcement Directive — 483
  - 29.3.1 CJEU rulings on interim and provisional measures in patent enforcement — 485
  - 29.3.2 The issue of reimbursement of legal costs in patent proceedings clarified by the CJEU — 489
  - 29.3.3 CJEU providing guidance on procedural guarantees in patent enforcement in the light of EU competition law — 491
- 29.4 The future role of the CJEU in procedural aspects of patent enforcement at the UPC — 493
- 29.5 Conclusion — 495

Naomi Hawkins

**30 Gene patents in the EPC and the European Patent with unitary effect — 497**

- 30.1 Introduction — 497
- 30.1.1 Definition of gene patents — 498
- 30.1.2 Current technical landscape — 499
- 30.2 Patents on genes – the historical concerns — 502
- 30.3 Gene patents in European patent law – current pressing questions — 504
- 30.3.1 Ethics and morality – the application of the morality exclusion — 504
- 30.3.2 Addressing access concerns — 508
- 30.3.3 Divergence of approaches – does the UPC offer possibilities for increased harmonisation? — 511
- 30.3.3.1 A single forum — 513
- 30.3.3.2 The role of the CJEU — 513
- 30.3.3.3 Persuasive standards — 514
- 30.4 Conclusion — 515

Aisling McMahon

**31 Decision-Makers, institutional influences and the role of ethical issues in the patenting of biotechnological inventions in Europe: enter the unitary patent system — 517**

- Introduction — 517
- 31.1 Patenting biotechnological inventions in Europe: the embedding of ethical considerations within the Biotechnology Directive 98/44/EC — 519
- 31.1.1 Drafting of the Biotechnological Directive and ethic — 520
- 31.1.2 Ethical provisions and the Directive — 521
- 31.2 Applying the Directive's ethical provisions in Europe: interpretative communities, institutional overlaps & influences — 522
- 31.2.1 Ethical provisions within the Directive & practical interpretation – pre-UPC — 522
- 31.2.2 Institutional overlaps & ethical considerations – enter the UPC — 523
- 31.2.3 Interpretative communities and the UPC's role in interpreting ethical provisions within the Directive — 525
- 31.2.3.1 Ethical issues, discretion & the interpretative role of decision-makers in the European patent system — 526
- 31.2.3.2 Institutional influences and overlapping EPO, CJEU and UPC functions: interpretating ethical provisions in the Directive — 527
- 31.3 Technological developments and the need for a renewed conversation on the role ethical issues should play within the European patent system — 529
- 31.4 Concluding thoughts — 530

Gail E Evans

**32 The UPC and the FRAND injunction — 533**

- 32.1 The discretion of the UPC to grant a final injunction — **536**
- 32.1.1 The English courts and the discretionary grant of an injunction — **537**
- 32.2 The FRAND undertaking and the court's discretion to grant a final injunction — **539**
- 32.2.1 Use of the FRAND injunction to defeat hold-out strategies — **541**
- 32.3 The discretion to award damages as an alternate and adequate remedy — **543**
- 32.4 Withholding an injunction based on the FRAND defence of abuse of dominance — **545**
- 32.4.1 Huawei v ZTE: a 'safe harbour' from abuse of dominance — **547**
- 32.4.2 The importance of giving the implementer notice of patent infringement — **548**
- 32.4.3 Assessing 'abuse of dominance' — **549**
- 32.4.3.1 Offering a global licence — **550**
- 32.4.3.2 Bundling SEPs and non-SEPs — **550**
- 32.4.3.3 The reasonableness of the royalty rate — **551**
- 32.5 No entitlement to an injunction where the defendant is a willing licensee — **552**
- 32.5.1 Proof of an implementer's 'willingness' to enter into a FRAND licence — **553**
- 32.6 Conclusion: FRAND injunctions, consistency of decision-making and arbitration — **555**

**Index — 557**