

An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges



**About the online version of
*An International Guide to Patent Case
Management for Judges***

An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges provides a comprehensive, accessible and practical guide, organized around the different stages of patent litigation in ten patent heavy jurisdictions.

You can create your own custom guide by clicking on the “Build custom guide” tab in the top banner and selecting any combination of jurisdictions and topics covered in the Guide.

Visit www.wipo.int/patent-judicial-guide



World
Intellectual
Property
Organization

An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International.

The user is allowed to reproduce, distribute, adapt, translate and publicly perform this publication, including for commercial purposes, without explicit permission, provided that the content is accompanied by an acknowledgment that WIPO is the source and that it is clearly indicated if changes were made to the original content.

Suggested citation: WIPO (2025). *An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges*. Geneva: World Intellectual Property Organization. DOI: 10.34667/tind.47926

Adaptation/translation/derivatives should not carry any official emblem or logo, unless they have been approved and validated by WIPO. Please contact us via the WIPO website to obtain permission.

For any derivative work, please include the following disclaimer: "The Secretariat of WIPO assumes no liability or responsibility with regard to the transformation or translation of the original content."

When content published by WIPO, such as images, graphics, trademarks or logos, is attributed to a third-party, the user of such content is solely responsible for clearing the rights with the right holder(s).

To view a copy of this license, please visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Any dispute arising under this license that cannot be settled amicably shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) then in force. The parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of such a dispute.

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WIPO concerning the legal status of any country, territory or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication is not intended to reflect the views of the Member States or the WIPO Secretariat.

The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by WIPO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

© WIPO, 2025

First published 2023
Revised with updates to Chapter 3, 2024
Chapter 12 added, 2025

World Intellectual Property Organization
34, chemin des Colombettes, P.O. Box 18
CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

ISBN: 978-92-805-3516-7 (print)
ISBN: 978-92-805-3515-0 (online)



Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Cover: Getty Images/iStockphoto/
Bill Oxford

Brief Contents

Table of Cases	xxv
Table of Laws and Regulations	xxxvii
About the Contributors	lxi
About the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)	lxxiii
About the WIPO Judicial Institute and the WIPO IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector	lxxiv
Acknowledgments	lxxv
Foreword by WIPO	lxxvi
Foreword by Berkeley Judicial Institute	lxxvii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Australia	12
Chapter 3 Brazil	50
Chapter 4 China	106
Chapter 5 Germany	188
Chapter 6 India	248
Chapter 7 Japan	288
Chapter 8 Republic of Korea	348
Chapter 9 United Kingdom	394
Chapter 10 United States of America	435
Chapter 11 The Boards of Appeal of the European Patent Office	526
Chapter 12 Spain	541
Index	588

Contents

Table of Cases	xxv
Table of Laws and Regulations	xxxvii
About the Contributors	lxi
About the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)	lxxiii
About the WIPO Judicial Institute and the WIPO IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector	lxxiv
Acknowledgments	lxxv
Foreword by WIPO	lxxvi
Foreword by Berkeley Judicial Institute	lxxvii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Patent litigation and the role of the justice system	2
1.1.1 <i>An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges</i> – its purpose	2
1.2 Patent systems and patent institutions	3
1.2.1 Overview of the patent system	3
1.2.2 Patent offices and administrative proceedings	3
1.2.3 Judicial institutions and their specialization	4
1.3 Patent infringement proceedings and case management	4
1.3.1 Early case management	5
1.3.2 Claim construction	5
1.3.3 Preliminary injunction	6
1.3.4 Gathering of information	6
1.3.5 Summary proceedings	7
1.3.6 Evidence	7
1.3.7 Technology tutorials and technology briefing sessions	7
1.3.8 Confidentiality	8
1.3.9 Trial	8
1.3.10 Mediation	8
1.3.11 Remedies	8
1.3.12 Costs	10
1.4 Interplay of multiple patent proceedings in different fora	10
Chapter 2 Australia	12
2.1 Overview of the patent system	13
2.1.1 Evolution of the patent system	13
2.1.2 Patent application trends	14
2.2 Patent institutions and administrative review proceedings	14
2.2.1 Patent institutions	14
2.2.2 Administrative review proceedings	15
2.2.2.1 Avenues of review	15
2.2.2.2 Claim construction	16
2.2.2.3 Role of experts	16
2.2.2.4 Appeals to the Federal Court of Australia, Full Court of the Federal Court and High Court of Australia	17
2.2.2.5 Judicial review and review by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal	18
2.2.2.6 Nature of appeal from an invalidity decision of the Commissioner of Patents	18
2.2.2.7 Innovation patents	19
2.3 Judicial institutions	19
2.3.1 Judicial administration structure	19
2.3.1.1 National judicial structure	19

2.3.1.2	Selection process	20
2.3.2	Judicial education on intellectual property	21
2.4	Patent invalidity	21
2.4.1	Process	21
2.4.2	Role of experts – Federal Court of Australia (invalidity proceedings)	22
2.5	Patent infringement	23
2.5.1	Claim construction	23
2.5.1.1	The role of claim construction	23
2.5.1.2	When claim construction occurs	23
2.5.1.3	Pleadings and claim construction	24
2.5.1.4	How claim construction occurs	24
2.5.1.5	The role of evidence in claim construction	24
2.5.1.6	Patent Office file wrapper	24
2.6	Judicial patent proceedings and case management	25
2.6.1	Venue, jurisdiction and case assignment rules	25
2.6.2	Statements of case	26
2.6.3	Early case management	26
2.6.3.1	Scheduling	28
2.6.4	Provisional measures and preliminary injunctive relief	28
2.6.4.1	<i>Prima facie</i> case (or serious question to be tried)	29
2.6.4.2	Balance of convenience	29
2.6.4.3	Undertaking as to damages	30
2.6.4.4	<i>Quia timet</i> injunctions	30
2.6.5	Discovery and gathering of information	31
2.6.5.1	Circumstances in which discovery will be ordered	31
2.6.5.2	Process of giving discovery	32
2.6.5.3	Refusal to produce documents	32
2.6.5.4	Alternative procedures to discovery	33
2.6.5.5	Pre-action or preliminary discovery	34
2.6.6	Summary proceedings (summary adjudication)	34
2.6.6.1	Availability of summary adjudication	34
2.6.6.2	Basis for summary adjudication – “no reasonable prospect” of success	34
2.6.6.3	Summary adjudication in patent litigation	35
2.6.7	Evidence	35
2.6.7.1	Expert evidence	36
2.6.7.2	Position statements, product descriptions and “primers”	36
2.6.7.3	Conference of experts and joint report	37
2.6.7.4	Concurrent evidence	37
2.6.7.5	Expert evidence in infringement proceedings	37
2.6.8	Case-specific education of decision-makers	37
2.6.9	Confidentiality	38
2.6.10	Alternative dispute resolution	39
2.7	Civil remedies	40
2.7.1	Injunctive relief	40
2.7.2	Separation of quantum and liability	41
2.7.2.1	Damages	41
2.7.2.2	Account of profits	42
2.7.2.3	Additional damages	42
2.7.3	Other remedies	43
2.7.4	Costs	43
2.7.4.1	General approach to costs	43
2.7.4.2	Interlocutory proceedings and other issues	44
2.7.4.3	Security for costs	45
2.7.4.4	Offers of compromise and <i>Calderbank</i> offers	45
2.7.4.5	Assessment of costs	45
2.8	Other patent-related actions	45
2.8.1	Actions for declarations of non-infringement	45
2.8.2	Actions for threats of infringement proceedings	46

2.9	Appellate review	46
2.9.1	Appeal from an invalidity decision of a court	46
2.9.2	Appeal from an infringement decision of a court	47
2.10	Selected topics	47
2.10.1	Compulsory licenses	47
Chapter 3	Brazil	50
3.1	Overview of the patent system	51
3.1.1	Evolution of the patent system	51
3.1.2	Types of patents	53
3.1.3	The granting of a patent	53
3.1.3.1	Drawings	53
3.1.3.2	Specifications	53
3.1.3.3	Claims	54
3.1.3.4	Novelty	55
3.1.3.5	Inventive step	55
3.1.3.6	Industrial application	56
3.1.3.7	Non-patentable inventions and utility models	56
3.1.4	Inventor and ownership	57
3.1.5	Properties of invention patents or utility models developed in labor relationships	58
3.1.6	Patent term and expiration	59
3.1.7	Patent application trends	59
3.2	Patent office and administrative review proceedings	60
3.2.1	National Institute of Industrial Property	60
3.2.2	Patent attorneys	61
3.2.3	Patent application	61
3.2.3.1	Dissemination of the state of the art	62
3.2.3.2	Disclosure of the state of the art by third parties	63
3.2.3.3	Priority date	63
3.2.3.4	Publication	64
3.2.3.5	Disclosure	64
3.2.3.6	Applications of interest to national defense	64
3.2.3.7	Patent term restoration	64
3.2.3.8	Post-issuance corrections and administrative proceedings	64
3.2.4	Administrative review proceedings	65
3.2.4.1	Declaration of patent nullity	67
3.2.4.2	Appeals	68
3.3	Judicial institutions	69
3.3.1	Judicial administration structure, decision-makers and procedures	69
3.3.2	Specialized intellectual property judiciary	69
3.3.3	Relationship between invalidity and infringement proceedings	70
3.3.4	Judicial education on intellectual property	71
3.4	Patent invalidity	72
3.5	Patent infringement	74
3.5.1	Infringement analysis	74
3.5.1.1	Direct patent infringement	74
3.5.1.2	Indirect patent infringement	75
3.5.1.3	Infringement by equivalence	75
3.5.1.4	The reverse doctrine of equivalents	76
3.5.1.5	Extraterritorial infringement	76
3.5.2	Defenses	76
3.5.2.1	Absence of liability	76
3.5.2.2	Consent or license	76
3.5.2.3	First-sale (exhaustion) doctrine	77
3.6	Judicial patent proceedings and case management	77
3.6.1	Venue, jurisdiction and case assignment rules	77
3.6.1.1	Interaction with other types of cases	79

3.6.1.2	Bankruptcy	79
3.6.2	Statements of case	80
3.6.2.1	Complaint	80
3.6.2.2	Answer	81
3.6.2.3	Counterclaim	81
3.6.3	Case management	81
3.6.4	Summary proceedings	85
3.6.5	Evidence	85
3.6.5.1	Expert evidence	85
3.6.5.2	Testimonial evidence	87
3.6.6	Confidentiality	87
3.6.7	Alternative dispute resolution	87
3.7	Civil remedies	88
3.7.1	Injunction	88
3.7.2	Damages	90
3.7.2.1	Compensatory damages	91
3.7.2.2	Attorneys' fees	92
3.7.3	Other remedies	92
3.8	Enforcement of judgments	92
3.8.1	Provisional compliance with the decision	92
3.8.2	Final compliance with the decision	93
3.9	Appellate review	95
3.9.1	Appeal from final judgment	97
3.9.2	Interlocutory appeal	98
3.9.3	Motion for clarification	98
3.9.4	Internal interlocutory appeal	99
3.9.5	Appeals to the Federal Supreme Court and to the Superior Court of Justice	99
3.9.6	Internal interlocutory appeal against a decision rejecting an appeal to the Federal Supreme Court or to the Superior Court of Justice	100
3.9.7	Appeals against divergent decisions	100
3.10	Criminal proceedings	100
3.11	Selected topics	101
3.11.1	Licenses	101
3.11.1.1	Voluntary license	101
3.11.1.2	Offer of license	101
3.11.1.3	Compulsory license	101
3.11.2	Pharmaceutical patents	103
3.11.2.1	Applications filed before the ratification of the treaty – the pipeline system	103
3.11.2.2	Requirement for prior consent by the Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency (ANVISA) repealed	103
3.11.2.3	New use and new therapeutic application	104
3.12	Key challenges and efforts to improve patent case management	105
Chapter 4	China	106
4.1	Outline of China's Patent Law and patent case trials	107
4.1.1	Formulation and evolution of China's Patent Law	107
4.1.1.1	Promulgation of the Patent Law	107
4.1.1.2	Four amendments to the Patent Law	107
4.1.2	Patent application trends	109
4.1.3	Legal basis to hear patent cases	109
4.1.3.1	Laws	109
4.1.3.2	Administrative regulations	110
4.1.3.3	Judicial interpretations	111
4.1.3.4	Departmental rules	112
4.1.3.5	International treaties	112
4.1.4	Guiding case system	114
4.1.5	Reform and development of China's intellectual property case trials	114

4.2	Overview on patent-related civil cases	116
4.2.1	Causes of action	116
4.2.2	Jurisdiction	117
4.2.2.1	Jurisdiction by court level and territorial jurisdiction	117
4.2.2.2	Jurisdiction transfer and designation of jurisdiction	117
4.2.2.3	Objection and submission to jurisdiction	118
4.2.3	Special provisions on jurisdiction	118
4.2.3.1	Jurisdiction over patent-related civil cases by court level	118
4.3	Civil cases of patent infringement	120
4.3.1	Protection scope of invention patents and utility models	120
4.3.1.1	Basis for determination	120
4.3.1.2	Fundamental doctrines and judgment subject for determination	120
4.3.1.3	Specific methods for determination	121
4.3.1.4	Interpretation of functional features	122
4.3.1.5	Use-environment features	124
4.3.1.6	Closed composition claims	124
4.3.1.7	Handling of errors or defects in claims	125
4.3.2	Determination of infringement of invention patents and utility models	126
4.3.2.1	Literal infringement	126
4.3.2.2	Infringement under the doctrine of equivalents	127
4.3.2.3	Judgment on infringement of functional features	128
4.3.2.4	Estoppel	129
4.3.2.5	Issues related to process patent infringement	130
4.3.2.6	Dedication rule	133
4.3.2.7	Impact of declaration of patent invalidity	133
4.3.2.8	Temporary protection of invention patents	134
4.3.3	Joint infringement and aiding and abetting infringement	135
4.3.3.1	Joint infringement	135
4.3.3.2	Aiding and abetting infringement	135
4.3.4	Defenses in patent infringement lawsuits	136
4.3.4.1	Prior art defense	136
4.3.4.2	Conflicting application defense	138
4.3.4.3	Legitimate source defense	138
4.3.4.4	Prior-use rights defense	139
4.3.4.5	Other circumstances not deemed as patent infringement	140
4.4	Civil liabilities for patent infringement	141
4.4.1	Cessation of infringement	141
4.4.2	Compensation for losses	142
4.4.2.1	Calculation method of compensation	142
4.4.2.2	Compensation should have a causal relationship with and be proportional to the act of infringement	142
4.4.2.3	Agreement on the amount or calculation method of compensation for patent infringement in accordance with the law	143
4.4.2.4	Reasonable expenses of the right holder	144
4.4.2.5	Rules of evidence related to compensation	144
4.4.3	Punitive damages	145
4.4.3.1	Time limit for requesting punitive damages	145
4.4.3.2	Determination of intentional patent infringement	145
4.4.3.3	Identification of serious circumstances of patent infringement	145
4.4.3.4	Basis for the calculation of punitive damages	146
4.4.3.5	Determination of the multiple of punitive damages	146
4.5	Other patent-related civil cases	146
4.5.1	Dispute cases over declarations of patent non-infringement	146
4.5.2	Dispute cases over ownership of patent rights (patent application rights)	147
4.5.2.1	Service invention-creations	147
4.5.2.2	Invention-creations made through cooperative or commissioned development	149
4.5.2.3	Patent applications based on unauthorized use of others' technical secrets	149

4.5.3	Dispute cases over patent contracts	150
4.5.4	Civil cases involving standard-essential patents	150
4.5.4.1	Patent-related cases	151
4.5.4.2	Monopoly-related cases	152
4.5.5	Patent-related civil cases involving pharmaceutical products	152
4.5.5.1	Amendments to the Patent Law related to pharmaceutical product patent disputes	153
4.5.5.2	Formulation of relevant judicial interpretations and regulatory documents	153
4.5.5.3	Main issues involved in the early resolution mechanism of pharmaceutical product patent disputes	153
4.6	Procedural issues concerning patent-related civil cases	156
4.6.1	Evidence rules and evidence preservation	156
4.6.1.1	Provisions related to evidence in the Civil Procedure Law and related judicial Interpretations	156
4.6.1.2	Provisions related to evidence in the Patent Law	157
4.6.1.3	The Provisions on Evidence in Civil Procedures involving Intellectual Property Rights	157
4.6.2	Act preservation	157
4.6.2.1	Establishment of an act preservation system in intellectual property disputes	157
4.6.2.2	Main contents of the Provisions on Act Preservation in Intellectual Property Disputes	158
4.6.3	Finding of technical facts	161
4.6.3.1	Technical investigation officer system	161
4.6.3.2	Entrusted technical appraisal	162
4.6.3.3	Persons with specialized expertise	162
4.6.4	Relevant issues in patent cases involving foreign elements	162
4.7	Administrative cases involving invention and utility model patent grant and confirmation	163
4.7.1	Administrative cases	163
4.7.2	Examination of a patent's subject matter	164
4.7.2.1	The subject matter of invention and utility model patents	164
4.7.2.2	Circumstances where no patent shall be granted	164
4.7.3	Interpretation of claims	164
4.7.3.1	Relevant provisions in the Provisions on Patent Grant and Confirmation	165
4.7.3.2	Related typical cases	165
4.7.4	Avoidance of double patenting	166
4.7.5	Novelty	166
4.7.5.1	Prior art	166
4.7.5.2	Criteria for examining novelty	167
4.7.5.3	Grace period concerning novelty	168
4.7.6	Inventiveness	168
4.7.6.1	Assessment of prominent substantive features	168
4.7.6.2	Assessment of obvious progress	170
4.7.7	Practical use	172
4.7.8	Claims shall be clearly defined	172
4.7.9	Sufficient disclosure of the description	172
4.7.9.1	Relevant provisions in the Provisions on Patent Grant and Confirmation	172
4.7.9.2	Relevant typical cases	173
4.7.10	Claims shall be supported by the description	173
4.7.10.1	Relevant provisions in the Provisions on Patent Grant and Confirmation	173
4.7.10.2	Relevant typical cases	174
4.7.11	An independent claim shall state the essential technical features necessary for the solution of the technical problem	174
4.7.12	Amendments may not go beyond the scope of the disclosure contained in the original description and claims	175
4.7.12.1	Assessment	175
4.7.12.2	Amendment of claims in invalidation procedures	175

4.8	Design patents	176
4.8.1	Main features of design patents	176
4.8.2	Grant and confirmation procedures for design patents	176
4.8.2.1	Grant procedures and administrative cases	176
4.8.2.2	Invalidation declaration and confirmation procedures and administrative cases	177
4.8.3	Ordinary consumers	177
4.8.4	Protection scope of a design patent	178
4.8.4.1	Design of the product	178
4.8.4.2	Brief description	179
4.8.4.3	Product category	179
4.8.5	Identifying “prior design” and “priority date”	180
4.8.6	Application of Article 23 of the Patent Law	180
4.8.6.1	Identifying a “prior design”	180
4.8.6.2	Identifying a “conflicting application” (conflicting design)	181
4.8.6.3	Identifying significant differences	181
4.8.7	Infringement of design patent rights	183
4.8.8	Judgment of infringement of design patents	184
4.8.9	Prior design defense	186
4.9	Patent-related criminal cases	186
Chapter 5	Germany	188
5.1	Overview of the patent system	189
5.1.1	Evolution of the patent system	189
5.1.2	Importance of the European Patent Convention and EU law	189
5.1.3	Patent application trends	190
5.2	Patent institutions and administrative review proceedings	190
5.3	Judicial institutions	190
5.3.1	Judicial administration structure	190
5.3.2	Double-track system: patent infringement and patent validity proceedings	191
5.4	Patent invalidity proceedings and invalidity grounds	193
5.4.1	First-instance proceedings	193
5.4.1.1	Court	193
5.4.1.2	Admissibility	193
5.4.1.3	Evidence	198
5.4.1.4	Access to court files	199
5.4.2	Grounds for revocation	199
5.4.2.1	Lack of patentability	199
5.4.2.2	Insufficient disclosure	202
5.4.2.3	Usurpation	202
5.4.2.4	Added matter	202
5.4.3	Appeal proceedings	203
5.4.3.1	Court	203
5.4.3.2	Limited de novo appeal	203
5.4.3.3	Representation	204
5.4.3.4	Course of proceedings	204
5.5	Patent infringement	206
5.5.1	Claim construction	206
5.5.2	Infringement analysis	208
5.5.2.1	Direct patent infringement	208
5.5.2.2	Indirect patent infringement	208
5.5.2.3	Infringement by equivalent means	209
5.5.3	Defenses	210
5.5.3.1	Noninfringement	210
5.5.3.2	Right of prior use	210
5.5.3.3	Exhaustion, license and compulsory license	211
5.5.3.4	Experimental and other privileges	211

5.6	Judicial patent proceedings and case management	212
5.6.1	Key features in patent proceedings and differences to a trial-based system	212
5.6.2	Pre-action and pre-trial	213
5.6.2.1	Cease and desist warnings and requests for right to use	213
5.6.3	Venue, jurisdiction and case assignment rules	214
5.6.3.1	Venue and jurisdictions	214
5.6.3.2	Case assignment	216
5.6.3.3	Parties	216
5.6.3.4	Party representation	217
5.6.4	Statements of case and front-loading proceedings	217
5.6.4.1	Initial phase of the patent infringement action	217
5.6.4.2	Pendency of the action	218
5.6.4.3	Basic requirements regarding the admissibility of the action in connection with the prayers for relief	218
5.6.4.4	The scope of the action and the relief (the accused device and "Streitgegenstand")	219
5.6.4.5	Modifications of the pending claim	219
5.6.4.6	Pleading standards	220
5.6.4.7	Further briefs	221
5.6.5	Provisional measures	221
5.6.5.1	Proceedings for preliminary relief are independent of the proceedings for permanent relief	221
5.6.5.2	<i>Ex parte</i> proceedings: protective writ	221
5.6.5.3	Distinct procedural characteristics of proceedings for preliminary relief compared to permanent relief	222
5.6.5.4	Requirements for preliminary injunctive relief	222
5.6.6	Gathering of information	224
5.6.6.1	Basic pleadings mechanics	224
5.6.6.2	Test buy	224
5.6.6.3	Limited pre-trial discovery (inspection orders)	224
5.6.6.4	28 USC § 1782	226
5.6.7	Evidence	227
5.6.7.1	Experts	227
5.6.7.2	Witnesses	228
5.6.7.3	Documents	229
5.6.8	Confidentiality	229
5.6.9	Oral hearing	230
5.6.10	Decision	232
5.7	Civil remedies	233
5.7.1	Permanent injunction	233
5.7.2	Recall, removal and destruction of patent-infringing products	234
5.7.3	Information and rendering accounts	234
5.7.4	Award of damages	235
5.7.5	Publication of court decision	236
5.7.6	Declaration of non-infringement	236
5.7.7	Costs	237
5.7.7.1	Determination of the value in dispute	237
5.7.7.2	Calculation of statutory court fees	237
5.7.7.3	Reimbursable lawyer's and patent lawyer's fees	238
5.7.7.4	Cost Example	238
5.8	Enforcement of judgments	238
5.8.1	Prerequisites of enforcement	238
5.8.2	Violation of cease and desist order (penalty proceedings)	239
5.8.3	Failure to comply with further obligations (coercive measure proceedings)	239
5.8.4	Provisional termination of compulsory enforcement	240
5.9	Appellate review	240
5.9.1	Limited <i>de novo</i> appeal	240
5.9.1.1	Requirements of the appeal and particulars of appeal	240

5.9.1.2	Cross-appeal	241
5.9.1.3	Appeal process	241
5.9.1.4	Motions for a provisional termination of the enforcement of injunctive relief pending appeal	241
5.9.2	Further appeal on points of law (cassation)	242
5.9.2.1	Admission and grounds for admission for a further appeal on points of law	242
5.9.2.2	Complaint against the refusal of the appellate court to grant leave	243
5.9.2.3	Requirements for a further appeal on law	244
5.9.2.4	Proceedings and decision	244
5.10	Border measures	244
5.11	Selected topics	245
5.11.1	Action for the grant of a compulsory license	245
5.11.1.1	Grounds for applying for a compulsory license	245
5.11.1.2	Scope of a compulsory license	246
5.11.1.3	Procedural aspects	247
Chapter 6	India	248
6.1	Overview of the patent system	249
6.1.1	Evolution of the patent system	249
6.1.2	The Justice N Rajagopala Ayyangar Committee Report	250
6.1.3	The Patents Act, 1970 (pre-TRIPS Agreement)	250
6.1.4	International obligations and commitments	251
6.1.4.1	The TRIPS Agreement	251
6.1.4.2	The Doha Declaration	252
6.1.4.3	The Patent Cooperation Treaty	253
6.1.4.4	Amendments and implementation in India	253
6.1.5	Patent application trends	256
6.2	Patent institutions and administrative review proceedings	257
6.2.1	Patent institutions	257
6.2.1.1	Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks	257
6.2.1.2	The Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade	257
6.2.1.3	National Institute of Intellectual Property Management, Nagpur	257
6.2.1.4	Cell for IPR Promotion and Management, constituted under the National Intellectual Property Rights Policy	258
6.2.1.5	The Department of Science and Technology – Patent Facilitation Programme	259
6.2.1.6	Traditional Knowledge Digital Library	259
6.2.2	Administrative review proceedings	260
6.2.2.1	Intellectual Property Appellate Board	260
6.2.2.2	Pre-grant opposition	260
6.3	Judicial institutions	263
6.3.1	Court system in India	263
6.3.1.1	Hierarchy of courts	263
6.3.1.2	Commercial courts	264
6.3.1.3	Appointment and tenure of judges	264
6.3.2	Judicial education on intellectual property	264
6.4	Challenges to patents	264
6.5	Patent infringement	265
6.5.1	Claim construction	265
6.5.1.1	Procedure	265
6.5.1.2	Principles	265
6.5.2	Infringement analysis	266
6.5.2.1	What is “infringement”?	266
6.5.2.2	Exports as infringement	266
6.5.2.3	Proving infringement	266
6.5.3	Defenses to infringement	267

6.5.4	Counterclaim of invalidity	267
6.6	Judicial patent proceedings and case management	268
6.6.1	Key features in patent proceedings	268
6.6.2	Forum and <i>locus standi</i> to initiate infringement actions	268
6.6.3	Early case management	269
6.6.3.1	Pleadings and overall case schedule	269
6.6.3.2	Case management hearing	270
6.6.4	Provisional measures	270
6.6.4.1	Governing legal standards and burdens	270
6.6.4.2	Other preliminary reliefs	272
6.6.5	Discovery and gathering of information	273
6.6.6	Summary proceedings	274
6.6.7	Evidence	275
6.6.7.1	Oral evidence and trial	275
6.6.7.2	Who leads evidence first? Can a defendant be directed to lead evidence first?	276
6.6.7.3	Filing of affidavits of witnesses in evidence: not treated as evidence till tendered	277
6.6.8	Experts	277
6.6.8.1	Role of experts and expert bodies and institutions	277
6.6.8.2	Expert evidence under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872	278
6.6.8.3	Court-appointed scientific advisers	279
6.6.8.4	Hot-tubbing procedure	279
6.6.9	Alternative dispute resolution: pre- and post-litigation mediation	279
6.7	Civil remedies	280
6.7.1	Permanent injunction	280
6.7.2	Damages or an account of profits	280
6.7.2.1	Punitive damages	281
6.7.2.2	Defenses to avoid damages or an account of profits	281
6.7.3	Other remedies	282
6.7.4	Costs	282
6.8	Other actions	282
6.8.1	Cases involving groundless threats of illegal proceedings	282
6.8.1.1	What constitutes a “threat”?	282
6.8.1.2	Remedies	283
6.8.2	Declaration of non-infringement	283
6.9	Appellate review	284
6.9.1	Power of review of the Controller	284
6.9.2	Review against civil court orders	284
6.9.3	Grounds for review	284
6.9.4	Appeals from review	285
6.10	Selected topics	285
6.10.1	Compulsory licenses and public prejudice	285
6.11	Key challenges and efforts to improve patent case Management	286
6.11.1	Lack of uniformity in decisions and specialized knowledge	286
6.11.2	Delays in disposing of suits	286
6.11.3	The IP Division, Delhi High Court	286
Chapter 7	Japan	288
7.1	History of the patent system	289
7.1.1	History of patent law	289
7.1.2	Japan Patent Office	289
7.1.3	Patent application trends	289
7.1.4	History of specialized intellectual property courts	290
7.1.4.1	Intellectual property divisions of the Tokyo High Court	290
7.1.4.2	Intellectual property divisions of other courts	290
7.1.4.3	Act for Establishment of the Intellectual Property High Court of 2004	291

7.2	The Japan Patent Office and administrative review proceedings	291
7.2.1	The Japan Patent Office	291
7.2.2	Examiners and the examination of patent applications	292
7.2.3	The Trial and Appeal department	292
7.2.3.1	Appeals against examiner decisions	292
7.2.3.2	Resolution of disputes	292
7.2.3.3	Administrative patent judges, executive advisors and consultants	293
7.2.3.4	Appeal of Trial and Appeal department decisions to the Intellectual Property High Court	293
7.2.4	Patent validity and scope: the Japan Patent Office's trial and appeal system	293
7.2.4.1	Common features of the Japan Patent Office's trial and appeal processes	294
7.2.4.2	Appeal against an examiner's decision of refusal	295
7.2.4.3	Opposition to the grant of a patent	295
7.2.4.4	Trial for correction	297
7.2.4.5	Trial for invalidation	299
7.2.4.6	Hantei system	304
7.2.4.7	Statistics	305
7.3	Judicial institutions, jurisdiction and personnel	306
7.3.1	Specialized intellectual property judiciary	306
7.3.2	Tokyo District Court and Osaka District Court	307
7.3.2.1	Jurisdiction	307
7.3.2.2	Key personnel	308
7.3.3	Intellectual Property High Court	308
7.3.3.1	Jurisdiction over administrative lawsuits in relation to Japan Patent Office decisions	309
7.3.3.2	Jurisdiction over patent infringement lawsuits	309
7.3.3.3	Key personnel	309
7.3.3.4	English versions of judgments and case summaries	311
7.3.4	Supreme Court	311
7.3.4.1	Jurisdiction	311
7.3.4.2	Justices and other personnel	312
7.4	Patent validity and scope: review of Japan Patent Office decisions by the Intellectual Property High Court	312
7.4.1	Overview	313
7.4.2	Parties	313
7.4.3	Procedure	314
7.4.4	Subject of examination and grounds for overturning a trial or appeal decision	315
7.4.5	Procedural defects and substantive law defects	316
7.4.5.1	Procedural defects	316
7.4.5.2	Substantive law defect	317
7.4.6	Effect of judgment	320
7.5	Patent infringement: claim construction, doctrine of equivalents and defences	320
7.5.1	Claim construction	320
7.5.1.1	Claim wording	321
7.5.1.2	Interpreting the claims	321
7.5.1.3	Sources for claim construction	321
7.5.1.4	How to use sources	322
7.5.1.5	Product-by-process claims	322
7.5.1.6	Functional claims	322
7.5.2	Doctrine of equivalents	323
7.5.2.1	Five requirements of the <i>Ball Spline Bearing Case</i>	323
7.5.2.2	Burden of proof	324
7.5.2.3	Requirement 1: nonessential part	324
7.5.2.4	Requirement 2: possibility of replacement	325
7.5.2.5	Requirement 3: ease of replacement	325
7.5.2.6	Requirement 4: difficulty of conception	325
7.5.2.7	Requirement 5: no special circumstances	325
7.5.2.8	Other relevant cases	326

7.5.3	Defense of invalidity	326
7.5.3.1	Grounds for invalidity	327
7.5.3.2	Parallel Japan Patent Office trial for invalidation	330
7.5.3.3	Limitations on assertions in retrials	331
7.5.4	Defense of correction	332
7.5.4.1	Four requirements and an exception	332
7.5.4.2	When to assert the defense	333
7.5.4.3	Consent of joint owner and exclusive licensee	333
7.5.4.4	Patentee failure to request correction or trial for correction	333
7.6	Judicial patent proceedings and case management	333
7.6.1	Jurisdiction and case assignment	334
7.6.2	Statements of case (complaint and answer)	335
7.6.3	Early case management (preparatory proceedings)	335
7.6.4	Provisional measures (preliminary injunction against patent infringement)	335
7.6.4.1	Requirements for a preliminary injunction order	336
7.6.4.2	Proof in a preliminary injunction case	336
7.6.4.3	Proceedings of preliminary injunction cases	337
7.6.4.4	Preliminary injunction cases and necessity of security deposit	337
7.6.4.5	Execution of an order for a preliminary injunction	337
7.6.4.6	Appeal against a preliminary injunction case	337
7.6.4.7	Claim for damages against an erroneous order for a preliminary injunction	338
7.6.5	Discovery (limited) and gathering of information	338
7.6.5.1	Order to produce documents	338
7.6.5.2	On-site examination by an expert (inspection system)	339
7.6.6	Infringement determination	340
7.6.6.1	Explanatory session	340
7.6.6.2	Preliminary view and settlement	341
7.6.7	Damages determination	341
7.6.8	Conciliation	342
7.7	Civil remedies	343
7.7.1	Injunction	343
7.7.2	Damages	343
7.7.2.1	Lost profits	343
7.7.2.2	Infringer's profits	344
7.7.2.3	Reasonable royalty	345
7.7.2.4	Matters the court may take into consideration	345
7.7.3	Other remedies	346
7.7.3.1	Measures to restore credibility	346
7.7.3.2	Return of unjust enrichment	346
7.8	Appellate review	346
7.9	Border measures	347
Chapter 8	Republic of Korea	348
8.1	Overview of the patent system	349
8.1.1	Evolution of the patent system	349
8.1.2	Patent application trends	349
8.2	Korean Intellectual Property Office and administrative review Proceedings	349
8.2.1	Korean Intellectual Property Office and the Intellectual Property Trial and Appeal Board	349
8.2.2	Administrative review proceedings	350
8.2.2.1	Patent trial procedures	351
8.2.2.2	Effects of Intellectual Property Trial and Appeal Board decisions: <i>non bis in idem</i>	351
8.2.2.3	Relationship between revocation suits and administrative patent trials	351
8.3	Judicial institutions	352
8.3.1	Judicial administration	352
8.3.1.1	Overview of Korean courts	352

8.3.1.2	Types of patent cases	352
8.3.1.3	Enforcement of concentrated jurisdiction over patent cases	352
8.3.1.4	The Patent Court	353
8.3.2	Specialized intellectual property judiciary	355
8.3.2.1	Specialized patent courts and divisions	355
8.3.2.2	International divisions	355
8.3.2.3	Specialized patent judges	356
8.3.3	Judicial education on intellectual property	356
8.4	Patent invalidity	356
8.4.1	Revocation cases	356
8.4.1.1	Territorial jurisdiction	356
8.4.1.2	Jurisdiction by court level	357
8.4.2	Administrative patent lawsuits	357
8.4.2.1	Characteristics of revocation suits and applicable laws	357
8.4.2.2	Scope of revocation suits	357
8.4.2.3	Litigants to a revocation suit	358
8.4.2.4	Period of filing a revocation suit	358
8.4.2.5	Scope of examination in a revocation suit	358
8.4.2.6	Litigation procedures for revocation suits	359
8.4.2.7	Examination in parallel with an infringement suit	361
8.4.2.8	Evidence collection procedures	361
8.4.2.9	Appeal	361
8.4.2.10	Effect of a decision revoking an Intellectual Property Trial and Appeal Board decision	361
8.5	Patent infringement	362
8.5.1	Claim construction	363
8.5.1.1	Relationship between claims and scope of protection	363
8.5.1.2	Principles of claim construction	363
8.5.2	Infringement analysis	363
8.5.2.1	Comparison of the patented invention with the infringing product or process	363
8.5.2.2	Literal infringement	363
8.5.2.3	Infringement by equivalence	363
8.5.2.4	Indirect infringement	364
8.5.3	Defenses	364
8.5.3.1	Abuse of rights	364
8.5.3.2	Free-to-exploit technology	365
8.5.3.3	Known technology	365
8.5.3.4	Patent exhaustion	366
8.5.3.5	Limited effect or lawful practice of patent right	366
8.6	Judicial patent proceedings and case management	366
8.6.1	Key features in patent proceedings	366
8.6.1.1	Procedure	367
8.6.1.2	Electronic litigation system	367
8.6.2	Venue, jurisdiction and case assignment rules	368
8.6.2.1	Territorial jurisdiction	368
8.6.2.2	Subject matter jurisdiction	370
8.6.2.3	Jurisdiction by court level	371
8.6.3	Statements of case	371
8.6.4	Early case management	372
8.6.5	Preparatory hearings	372
8.6.6	Provisional measures	372
8.6.7	Evidence	373
8.6.7.1	Documentary evidence	374
8.6.7.2	Inspection	374
8.6.7.3	Court-appointed expert evaluation	374
8.6.7.4	Orders promoting evidence production	374
8.6.7.5	Evidence preservation (before or during an infringement action)	375

8.6.7.6	Experts	376
8.6.8	Technology tutorials and technical briefing sessions	377
8.6.8.1	Pre-trial internal technical explanatory session	377
8.6.8.2	Technology review session on the date of trial	377
8.6.9	Protecting trade secrets in litigation	378
8.6.9.1	Limited access to trade secrets	378
8.6.9.2	Confidentiality protective order	378
8.6.9.3	Protecting trade secrets by orders to submit documents and materials	378
8.6.10	Trial	379
8.6.11	Alternative dispute resolution	379
8.6.11.1	Meaning and scope	379
8.6.11.2	Settlement in litigation	379
8.6.11.3	Mediation	380
8.6.11.4	Arbitration	381
8.7	Civil remedies	382
8.7.1	Recovery of goodwill and reputation	382
8.7.2	Compensation for employee inventions	382
8.7.2.1	Overview	382
8.7.2.2	Elements	383
8.7.3	Permanent injunction	384
8.7.3.1	Elements	384
8.7.3.2	Scope	384
8.7.4	Damages	385
8.7.4.1	Elements	385
8.7.4.2	Calculation of damages	386
8.8	Appellate review	388
8.8.1	Appellate-level courts	388
8.8.2	Supreme Court	388
8.9	Criminal proceedings	389
8.9.1	Offense not punishable against the victim's will	389
8.9.2	Jurisdiction	389
8.9.2.1	Territorial jurisdiction	389
8.9.2.2	Subject matter jurisdiction	389
8.9.2.3	Jurisdiction by court level	390
8.9.3	Investigation	390
8.9.3.1	Investigators and initiation of investigation	390
8.9.3.2	Designation of a focal prosecutors' office and establishment of a specialized investigation department	390
8.9.3.3	Patent investigation advisor system	390
8.9.3.4	Disposition by prosecutor	391
8.9.4	Trial and hearing	391
8.9.4.1	Whether the practiced product or process falls within the protected scope of the patent right	391
8.9.4.2	Grounds for patent invalidation in criminal patent infringement cases	392
8.9.4.3	Intent and unlawfulness	392
8.9.4.4	Number of offenses	392
8.9.5	Sentencing	393
8.9.5.1	Forfeiture and joint penal provision	393
8.9.6	Appeals	393
Chapter 9	United Kingdom	394
9.1	Overview of the patent system	395
9.1.1	Evolution of the patent system	395
9.1.1.1	Characteristics of the system	395
9.1.1.2	Sources of law	395
9.1.1.3	The relationship with the European Patent Convention and the European Patent Office	396
9.1.2	Patent application trends	398

9.2	The U.K. Intellectual Property Office and the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks	398
9.3	Judicial institutions	399
9.3.1	Judicial administration structure	399
9.3.1.1	The civil courts and judges of England and Wales	400
9.3.1.2	The Patents Court	400
9.3.1.3	The Intellectual Property Enterprise Court	402
9.3.1.4	Scotland	402
9.3.1.5	Northern Ireland	403
9.3.2	Relationship between invalidity and infringement proceedings	403
9.4	Patent invalidity	403
9.5	Patent infringement	404
9.5.1	Acts of infringement	404
9.5.2	Claim construction	405
9.5.3	Remedies for infringement	406
9.5.4	Claims for declaratory relief	406
9.5.5	Threats actions	407
9.6	Judicial patents proceedings and case management	408
9.6.1	Pre-action	408
9.6.2	Venue, jurisdiction and case assignment rules	408
9.6.2.1	Jurisdiction, standing and service	408
9.6.2.2	Court fees	409
9.6.3	Statements of case	409
9.6.3.1	Formal pleadings	409
9.6.3.2	Requests for further information	410
9.6.3.3	Further statements of case	411
9.6.4	Early case management	411
9.6.4.1	Case management conference	411
9.6.4.2	Time to trial and expedition	411
9.6.5	Interim orders and directions	412
9.6.5.1	Interim applications	412
9.6.5.2	Dividing a large case into multiple trials	413
9.6.5.3	Issues relating to costs	413
9.6.6	Amendment of the patent	414
9.6.7	Disclosure	414
9.6.7.1	Product and process descriptions	414
9.6.7.2	Disclosure on validity	415
9.6.8	Evidence	415
9.6.8.1	Evidence of fact	415
9.6.8.2	Expert evidence	416
9.6.9	Technical primers and statements of agreed common general knowledge	416
9.6.9.1	Technical primers	416
9.6.9.2	Statements of agreed common general knowledge	417
9.6.10	Confidentiality	417
9.6.11	Pre-trial review	418
9.6.12	Alternative procedures	418
9.6.13	Trial	418
9.6.13.1	Types of trial	418
9.6.13.2	Order of events and trial timetable	419
9.6.14	Trial from the judge's point of view	421
9.6.15	Judgment	422
9.6.16	The consequential hearing	423
9.6.17	Alternative dispute resolution	423
9.7	Civil remedies	423
9.7.1	Injunctive relief	423
9.7.2	Financial relief – damages and account of profits	424
9.7.3	Other remedies	425
9.7.3.1	Revocation and declarations of invalidity	425

9.7.3.2	Certificates of contested validity	425
9.7.3.3	Publication and dissemination of the judgment	425
9.7.3.4	Delivery up and destruction	426
9.7.4	Costs award and assessment	426
9.7.5	Detailed assessment of costs	427
9.8	Appellate review	427
9.8.1	Permission to appeal	427
9.8.2	Stays pending appeal	427
9.8.3	Appeals to the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court	428
9.8.3.1	Appeals to the Court of Appeal	428
9.8.3.2	Appeals to the Supreme Court	428
9.9	The Intellectual Property Enterprise Court	428
9.9.1	General	429
9.9.1.1	Jurisdiction	429
9.9.1.2	Judges	429
9.9.1.3	Location and type of hearing	429
9.9.1.4	Representation	429
9.9.2	Pre-action	430
9.9.3	Transfer	430
9.9.4	Statements of case	430
9.9.4.1	The pleadings	430
9.9.4.2	Timing	431
9.9.5	Early case management and preliminary measures	432
9.9.5.1	Interim applications	432
9.9.5.2	Expression of a preliminary, nonbinding opinion on the merits	432
9.9.5.3	Case management	432
9.9.6	Disclosure	432
9.9.7	Evidence	433
9.9.8	Pre-trial review	433
9.9.9	Trial	433
9.9.9.1	Trial length, format and timetable	433
9.9.10	Judgment	433
9.9.11	The consequential hearing	434
9.9.12	Costs	434
9.9.13	Remedies	434
9.9.14	Appeals	434
Chapter 10	United States of America	435
10.1	Overview of the patent system	436
10.1.1	Evolution of the patent system	437
10.1.1.1	Federal governmental and judicial structure	437
10.1.1.2	U.S. patent system history	437
10.1.1.3	Growing concerns with economic power	438
10.1.1.4	Patent codification, revitalization, and compromise: the 1952 Patent Act	439
10.1.1.5	The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	439
10.1.1.6	The Hatch-Waxman Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984	439
10.1.1.7	The Digital Age: the bursting of the dot-com bubble, Supreme Court intervention, and the America Invents Act	439
10.2	Patent office and administrative review proceedings	440
10.2.1	United States Patent and Trademark Office	440
10.2.1.1	Representation at the United States Patent and Trademark Office	442
10.2.1.2	Central Reexamination Unit	442
10.2.1.3	The Patent Trial and Appeal Board	442
10.2.2	Administrative review proceedings	443
10.2.2.1	Patent reissuance	443
10.2.2.2	<i>Ex parte</i> re-examination	443
10.2.2.3	Supplemental examination	443

10.2.2.4	<i>Inter partes</i> review	443
10.2.2.5	Post-grant review	446
10.2.2.6	Derivation proceedings	447
10.2.3	Constitutionality	447
10.3	Judicial institutions	448
10.3.1	Federal judiciary structure	448
10.3.2	Specialized intellectual property judiciary	448
10.3.3	Relationship between invalidity and infringement proceedings	449
10.3.3.1	District court proceedings	449
10.3.3.2	United States International Trade Commission proceedings	450
10.3.3.3	Patent Trial and Appeal Board proceedings	451
10.3.4	Judicial education on intellectual property	452
10.4	Patent invalidity	452
10.5	Patent infringement	452
10.5.1	Claim construction	452
10.5.2	Infringement	453
10.5.2.1	Direct infringement	453
10.5.2.2	Indirect infringement	454
10.5.3	Defenses	454
10.5.3.1	Patent invalidity	454
10.5.3.2	Other defences	454
10.6	Judicial patent proceedings and case management	456
10.6.1	Key features in patent proceedings	456
10.6.2	Pre-trial	457
10.6.3	Venue, jurisdiction and case assignment rules	457
10.6.4	Alternative dispute resolution	458
10.6.5	Statements of case (pleading)	459
10.6.6	Early case management	460
10.6.6.1	Patent local rules	461
10.6.6.2	Claim construction	463
10.6.6.3	Early case management motion practice	464
10.6.7	Preliminary relief	465
10.6.7.1	Preliminary injunction	466
10.6.7.2	Temporary restraining order	468
10.6.8	Discovery	468
10.6.8.1	Initial disclosures	469
10.6.8.2	Document production	469
10.6.8.3	Interrogatories	470
10.6.8.4	Depositions	470
10.6.8.5	Electronic records	470
10.6.8.6	Management of discovery disputes	471
10.6.9	Summary proceedings	471
10.6.9.1	Distinguishing questions of law from questions of fact	471
10.6.9.2	Multi-track approach	472
10.6.9.3	The summary judgment process and hearing	472
10.6.10	Evidence	473
10.6.10.1	Technical and economic expert witnesses	473
10.6.10.2	Patent law expert witnesses	474
10.6.10.3	Inventor and technical employee witnesses	474
10.6.10.4	Motions <i>in limine</i>	475
10.6.11	Technology tutorials	476
10.6.12	Confidentiality	477
10.6.13	Trial	478
10.6.13.1	Procedural issues	478
10.6.13.2	Pre-trial case management	479
10.6.13.3	Motion for judgment as a matter of law	482
10.6.13.4	Verdict forms	482

10.6.13.5	Bench trials	482
10.6.13.6	Post-trial	482
10.7	Civil remedies	484
10.7.1	Injunction	484
10.7.2	Damages	485
10.7.2.1	Actual damages	485
10.7.2.2	Reasonable royalty	486
10.7.2.3	Enhanced damages	488
10.7.2.4	Pre-judgment interest	488
10.7.3	Costs	488
10.7.3.1	Court fees	488
10.7.3.2	Attorneys' fees	488
10.8	Other actions	489
10.9	Enforcement of judgments	489
10.10	Appellate review	490
10.10.1	The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	490
10.10.1.1	Stay of injunction pending appeal	490
10.10.1.2	Remands	491
10.10.2	U.S. Supreme Court	491
10.11	Criminal proceedings	491
10.12	Border measures	491
10.12.1	United States International Trade Commission	491
10.12.1.1	Section 337 authority	492
10.12.1.2	Section 337 substantive requirements	493
10.12.1.3	Defenses to 35 U.S.C. § 271(g)	494
10.12.1.4	Remedies	494
10.12.2	United States International Trade Commission patent investigation process	495
10.12.2.1	United States International Trade Commission personnel	495
10.12.2.2	Procedural rules	497
10.12.2.3	Pleading	497
10.12.2.4	Mechanisms for early disposition of investigation issues	497
10.12.2.5	Early investigation management	498
10.12.2.6	Temporary exclusion order	501
10.12.2.7	Discovery	501
10.12.2.8	Claim construction	502
10.12.2.9	Summary determination and interlocutory USITC review	502
10.12.2.10	Pre-hearing case management	503
10.12.2.11	Hearing	504
10.12.3	Review	506
10.12.3.1	USITC review	506
10.12.3.2	Presidential review	507
10.12.3.3	Federal Circuit review	507
10.12.4	Post-final determination proceedings and enforcement of remedy orders	507
10.12.4.1	Enforcement proceedings	507
10.12.4.2	Cease and desist orders	508
10.12.4.3	Modification or revocation of exclusion orders	508
10.12.4.4	Advisory opinions	508
10.12.5	Interplay with district court enforcement	509
10.12.5.1	Stays	509
10.12.5.2	Effects of prior district court rulings and prior USITC determination	509
10.13	Selected topics	510
10.13.1	Standard-essential patents and FRAND licensing enforcement	510
10.13.1.1	FRAND rate-setting litigation	510
10.13.1.2	Anti-suit injunction litigation	511
10.13.2	Pharmaceutical patent case management	511
10.13.2.1	Hatch-Waxman Act (ANDA) litigation	511
10.13.2.2	BPCIA litigation	518

10.14	Key challenges and efforts to improve patent case management	521
10.15	Appendix	521
Chapter 11	The Boards of Appeal of the European Patent Office	526
11.1	Overview of the patent system	527
11.1.1	Evolution of the European patent system	527
11.1.2	Patent application trends	527
11.2	Patent institutions and opposition proceedings	527
11.2.1	European Patent Organisation	527
11.2.2	Opposition proceedings	528
11.3	Judicial institutions	529
11.3.1	Judicial administration	529
11.3.2	Specialized intellectual property judiciary	529
11.3.2.1	Boards of Appeal as the first and final judicial instance	529
11.3.2.2	Specialization	529
11.3.2.3	Enlarged Board of Appeal	530
11.3.3	Relationship between invalidity and infringement proceedings	530
11.3.4	Judicial education on intellectual property	531
11.4	Patent invalidity proceedings and invalidity grounds	531
11.5	Patent infringement	531
11.6	Judicial patent proceedings and case management	531
11.6.1	Key features in patent proceedings	531
11.6.2	Venue, jurisdiction and case assignment rules	532
11.6.2.1	Venue and jurisdiction	532
11.6.2.2	Case assignment	532
11.6.2.3	Party representation	532
11.6.3	Statements of case	533
11.6.3.1	Appellant's statement setting out the grounds of appeal, and the respondent's reply thereto	533
11.6.3.2	Parties' complete appeal cases	533
11.6.4	Parties' amendments to their cases on appeal – the Boards of Appeal's convergent Approach	533
11.6.4.1	First level of the convergent approach	534
11.6.4.2	Second level of the convergent approach	535
11.6.4.3	Third level of the convergent approach	535
11.6.5	Early case management	536
11.6.5.1	Designation of rapporteur for the preliminary study of appeal	536
11.6.5.2	Acceleration of the appeal proceedings	536
11.6.5.3	Early exchange with the parties	536
11.6.5.4	Annual list of cases	537
11.6.6	Evidence – experts	537
11.6.7	Confidentiality – public file inspection	537
11.6.8	Trial and hearing	538
11.6.8.1	Right to oral proceedings	538
11.6.8.2	Communication issued by the Board of Appeal in preparation for oral proceedings	538
11.6.8.3	Conduct of oral proceedings and languages used	538
11.6.8.4	Oral proceedings by videoconference	539
11.6.9	Decisions of the Board of Appeal	539
11.6.9.1	Decisions announced in oral proceedings	539
11.6.9.2	Written decision within three months	539
11.6.9.3	Reasons given for decision in abridged form	539
11.6.10	Costs	540
Chapter 12	Spain	541
12.1	Overview of the patent system	542
12.1.1	Evolution and current state of the patent system	542
12.1.2	Patent application trends	543

12.2 Spanish Patent and Trademark Office and administrative review procedures	543
12.2.1 Spanish Patent and Trademark Office	543
12.2.2 Administrative review procedures	544
12.3 Judicial institutions	545
12.3.1 Judicial administration structure	545
12.3.2 Courts specialized in industrial property	546
12.3.3 Relationship between invalidity and infringement proceedings	547
12.3.4 Judicial training on industrial property	548
12.4 Patent invalidity	548
12.4.1 Grounds for invalidation	548
12.4.1.1 The requirements for patentability	548
12.4.1.2 Insufficiency of the description	553
12.4.1.3 The addition of subject matter	554
12.4.1.4 The expansion of protection	554
12.4.1.5 Patent registered by a person not entitled to obtain it	555
12.4.2 The effects of invalidity	555
12.4.2.1 Partial invalidity of a patent	555
12.4.2.2 The <i>ex tunc</i> effects of invalidation	555
12.4.3 Standing to bring invalidation proceedings	555
12.4.4 Passive standing	556
12.4.5 Limitation of the patent during invalidation proceedings	556
12.4.6 Jurisdiction for invalidation proceedings	556
12.4.6.1 Appeals against SPTO patent decisions	556
12.4.6.2 Invalidation proceedings before civil courts specialized in commercial matters	556
12.4.7 The burden of proof in invalidation proceedings	556
12.5 Patent infringement	557
12.5.1 Claim construction	557
12.5.2 Patent infringement disputes	558
12.5.3 Opposition by defendants	559
12.5.4 Literal infringement	560
12.5.5 Infringement by equivalence	561
12.5.6 Indirect infringement	562
12.6 Judicial patent proceedings and case management	562
12.6.1 Key features in patent proceedings	562
12.6.2 Pre-action and pre-trial	563
12.6.3 Venue, jurisdiction and case assignment rules	564
12.6.3.1 Infringement and invalidation actions	564
12.6.3.2 Appeals against SPTO decisions	565
12.6.4 Provisional measures	565
12.6.4.1 When provisional measures may be requested	565
12.6.4.2 Hearing with the defendant	565
12.6.4.3 Types of provisional measures and preliminary injunction	566
12.6.4.4 Requirements for the adoption of provisional measures	567
12.6.4.5 Provisional measures and protective letters	567
12.6.4.6 Effects of provisional measures on subsequent judgments on the merits	567
12.6.5 Amendment of the patent	568
12.6.5.1 Patent amendments in judicial proceedings	568
12.6.5.2 Effect on the proceedings of patent amendment outside the process	568
12.6.6 Gathering of information	569
12.6.6.1 Preliminary proceedings	569
12.6.6.2 Exhibition and production of documents during the proceedings	569
12.6.7 Taking of evidence	569
12.6.7.1 Admissible evidence	569
12.6.7.2 Expert opinions	570
12.6.8 Confidentiality	571
12.6.9 Proceedings	572

12.6.9.1	Infringement and invalidity proceedings	572
12.6.9.2	Proceedings against SPTO decisions	573
12.6.10	Alternative dispute resolution	574
12.6.10.1	Mediation and arbitration	574
12.6.10.2	Conciliation in respect of employee inventions	574
12.7	Patent protection through civil proceedings	575
12.7.1.	Actions for the prevention of patent infringement	575
12.7.2	Compensation for damages and prejudice	576
12.7.2.1	Requirements for generating the obligation to compensate	576
12.7.2.2	Extent of compensation	576
12.7.2.3	Criteria for the calculation of lost profits	577
12.7.3	Other actions for the enforcement of patent rights	578
12.7.4	Types of infringement actions	578
12.7.5	Time limits for bringing actions	578
12.7.6	Costs	578
12.8	Other patent-related actions	579
12.8.1	Actions for declaration of non-infringement (negatory action)	579
12.8.2	Action claiming ownership	580
12.8.3	Compensation for damage and prejudice caused by the owner of an invalid patent having acted in bad faith	580
12.9	Enforcement of judgments	580
12.9.1	Provisional enforcement	581
12.9.2	Enforcement of foreign judgments	581
12.10	Appeals	582
12.10.1	Ordinary appeals	582
12.10.2	Appeals in cassation	583
12.11	Criminal proceedings	583
12.12	Border measures	585
12.13	Selected topics	585
12.13.1	Pharmaceutical patents and supplementary protection certificates	585
12.13.2	Compulsory licenses	587
	Index	588

Table of Cases

European

<i>Copad SA v. Christian Dior Couture SA</i> (CJEU, April 23, 2009, Case C-59/08)	5.5.3.3
<i>Gesellschaft für Antriebstechnik v. Lamellen und Kupplungsbau Beteiligungs</i> (CJEU, July 13, 2006, Case C-4/03)	5.6.3.1
<i>Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. v. ZTE Corp.</i> (CJEU, July 16, 2015, Case C-170/13)	5.1.2
<i>Lenzing AG v. U.K., European Commission of Human Rights</i> (First Chamber), Application No. 38817/97, Sept. 9, 1998	11.2.1
<i>Makro Zelfbedieningsgroothandel CV v. Diesel SpA</i> (CJEU, Oct. 15, 2009, Case C-324/08)	5.5.3.3
<i>NovaTex GmbH v. Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg</i> (CJEU, April 28, 2022, C-531/20)	5.7.7.3
<i>Phoenix Contact GmbH & Co. KG v. HARTING Deutschland GmbH & Co. KG and Harting Electric GmbH & Co. KG</i> (CJEU, April 28, 2022, C-44/21)	5.6.5.4.2

Australia (Chapter 2)

<i>Aldi Foods Pty Ltd v. Moroccanoil Israel Ltd</i> [2018] 261 FCR 301	2.9.1
<i>Alphapharm Pty Ltd v. H Lundbeck A/S (No. 2)</i> (2009) 78 IPR 338	2.9.1
<i>Amrad Operations Pty Ltd v. Genelabs Technologies Inc.</i> [1999] FCA 633	2.10
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Alphapharm Pty Ltd</i> [2014] FCA 419	2.7.3
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Medis Pharma Pty Ltd</i> [2014] FCA 549	2.6.9
<i>Australian Competition and Consumer Commissions v. FDRA Pty Ltd</i> [2016] FCA 429	2.6.6.2
<i>Australian Mud Company Pty Ltd v. Coretell Pty Ltd</i> [2011] FCAFC 121	2.5.1.4
<i>Australian Mud Company Pty Ltd v. Coretell Pty Ltd (No. 4)</i> [2015] FCA 1372	2.5.1.2
<i>Australian Mud Company v. Coretell</i> (2011) 93 IPR 188	2.2.2.3.2
<i>Australian Securities and Investments Commission v. Cassimatis</i> (2013) 220 FCR 256	2.6.6.2
<i>Calderbank v. Calderbank</i> [1975] 2 All ER 333	2.7.4.4
<i>Calidad Pty Ltd v. Seiko Epson Corporation (No. 2)</i> [2019] FCAFC 168	2.7.1
<i>Commissioner of Patents v. Rokt</i> [2020] FCAFC 86	2.6.7.1
<i>Commissioner of Patents v. Sherman</i> (2008) 172 FCR 394	2.2.2.6
<i>Danisco A/S v. Novozymes A/S (No. 2)</i> (2011) 91 IPR 209	2.5.1.2
<i>Darcy v. Allin</i> (1602) 77 ER 120	2.1.1
<i>Expo-Net Danmark A/S v. Buono-Net Australia Pty Ltd (No. 2)</i> [2011] FCA 710	2.6.6.3
<i>Fastening Supplies Pty Ltd v. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation</i> (1969) 119 CLR 572	2.10.1
<i>Genetics Institute Inc. v. Kirin-Amgen Inc.</i> (1999) 92 FCR 106	2.2.2.4
<i>Graham Hart (1971) Pty Ltd v. SW Hart and Co. Pty Ltd</i> (1978) 141 CLR 305	2.2.2.3.3
<i>Hearne v. Street</i> (2008) 235 CLR 125	2.6.9
<i>Imperial Chemical Industries plc v. El Dupont de Nemours and Co.</i> [2002] FCAFC 264	2.2.2.4
<i>Jefferson Ford Pty Ltd v. Ford Motor Company of Australia Ltd</i> (2008) 167 FCR 372	2.6.6.3
<i>Jupiters v. Neurizon</i> (2005) 65 IPR 86	2.2.2.3.2

<i>Kimberly-Clark v. Arico</i> (2001) 207 CLR 1	2.2.2.3.2
<i>Kimberly-Clark v. Multigate</i> (2011) 92 IPR 21	2.2.2.3.2
<i>Liberation Developments Pty Ltd v. Lomax Group Pty Ltd</i> [2019] FCA 1180	2.8.2
<i>Meat and Livestock Australia Ltd v. Branhaven LLC</i> [2020] FCAFC 171	2.2.2.6
<i>Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. v. Tyco Electronics Pty Ltd</i> (2002) 56 IPR 248	2.2.2.3.4
<i>Mylan Health Pty Ltd (formerly BGP Products Pty Ltd) v. Sun Pharma ANZ Pty Ltd (formerly Ranbaxy Australia Pty Ltd)</i> [2019] FCA 28	2.7.1
<i>Oxworks Trading Pty Ltd v. Gram Engineering Pty Ltd</i> [2019] FCAFC 240	2.7.2.3
<i>Pilkin v. Sony Australia Limited (No. 2)</i> [2019] FCA 980	2.6.6.3
<i>Product Management Group Pty Ltd v. Blue Gentian LLC</i> (2015) 240 FCR 85	2.5.1.4
<i>Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd v. AstraZeneca AB</i> (2013) 101 IPR 11	2.5.1.4
<i>Robinson Helicopter Company Inc. v. McDermott</i> (2016) 331 ALR 550	2.9.1
<i>Roussel Uclaf v. Pan Laboratories Pty Ltd</i> (1994) 29 IPR 556	2.7.3
<i>Sachtler v. RE Miller</i> (2005) 65 IPR 605	2.2.2.3.2
<i>Samsung Electronics Co Ltd v. Apple Inc</i> [2011] FCAFC 146; 217 FCR 238	2.6.4
<i>Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH v. Alphapharm Pty Ltd</i> (No 3) [2018] FCA 2060	2.6.4.2
<i>Spencer v. Commonwealth</i> (2010) 241 CLR 118	2.6.6.2
<i>Streetworx Pty Ltd v. Artcraft Urban Group Pty Ltd (No. 2)</i> (2015) 322 ALR 557	2.7.3
<i>Vehicle Monitoring Systems Pty Ltd v. Sarb Management Group Pty Ltd (No. 3)</i> [2020] FCA 7	2.6.9
<i>Welcome Real-Time SA v. Catuity Inc.</i> (2001) 51 IPR 327	2.5.1.2
<i>Wissen Pty Ltd v. Kenneth Mervyn Lown</i> (1987) 9 IPR 124	2.10.1
<i>Zetco Pty Ltd v. Austworld Commodities Pty Ltd (No 2)</i> [2011] FCA 848	2.7.2.3

Brazil (Chapter 3)

AI (Interlocutory Appeal) No. 0045503-59.2011.8.19.0000 (Court of Appeals of the State of Rio de Janeiro (TJRJ), 2011)	3.7.2.1
Apelação Cível (AC) (Civil Appeal) No. 1004417-66.2018.8.26.0157 (Court of Appeals of the State of São Paulo (TJSP), 2021)	3.7.2.1
Direct Action of Unconstitutionality No. 5,529/DF (Federal Supreme Court (STF), 2021)	3.1.6
Interlocutory Appeal No. 2200797-60.2020.8.26.0000 (Court of Appeals of the State of São Paulo (TJSP), 2021)	3.7.1
Special Appeal No. 742,428/DF (Superior Court of Justice (STJ), REsp)	3.4
Special Appeal No. 1,132,449/PR (Superior Court of Justice (STJ), REsp, 2012)	3.4, 3.6.1
Special Appeal No. 1,558,149/SP (Superior Court of Justice (STJ), REsp, 2019)	3.6.1
Special Appeal No. 1,843,507/SP (Superior Court of Justice (STJ), REsp, 2020)	3.4, 3.6.1

China (Chapter 4)

<i>Albemarle Corp. v. China National Intellectual Property Administration</i> , ZXZ No. 97 (Sup. People's Ct, 2020)	4.7.5.2
<i>Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. China National Intellectual Property Administration</i> , ZXZ No. 19 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.7.12.2
<i>Anji Xueqiang Bamboo and Wood Products Co. v. Xu Zanyou</i> , MSZ No. 762 (Sup. People's Ct, 2008)	4.6.2.2.4
<i>Arc International v. Yiwu Lanzhiyun Glass Crafts Factory</i> , MSZ Nos. 41, 54 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.8.8
<i>Bai Wanqing v. Chengdu Nanxun Commodity Sales Service Center</i> , Guiding Case No. 55 (Sup. People's Ct, 2015)	4.3.2

<i>Baokou (Xiamen) Sanitary Ware Co. v. Guantao Peilong Water Heating Installation and Maintenance Store</i> , ZMZ No. 118 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.3.4.3
<i>Beijing Baidu Netcom Science and Technology Co. v. Beijing Sogou Technology Development Co.</i> , MZ No. 82 (Sup. People's Ct, 2020)	4.3.4.1
<i>Beijing Baidu Netcom Science and Technology Co. v. China National Intellectual Property Administration</i> , ZXZ No. 1 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.7.5.1
<i>Beijing Huajiesheng Electromechanical Equipment Co. v. Dingsheng Door Control Technology Co.</i> , MZ No. 8 (Sup. People's Ct, 2018)	4.8.4.2
<i>Beijing Jerrat Damping Elastomer Technical Research Center v. Beijing Jinzi Tianhe Buffer Technology Co.</i> , MSZ No. 1146 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.3.2.2
<i>Beijing Qihoo Technology Co. v. China National Intellectual Property Administration</i> , ZXZ No. 588 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.7.5.3
<i>Beijing Yingtelai Technology Co. v. Beijing SinoShield Chuangzhan Doors Co.</i> , MSZ No. 1255 (Sup. People's Ct, 2015)	4.3.4.4
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim GmbH v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , ZXZ No. 86 (Sup. People's Ct, 2011)	4.7.6.2.2
<i>Bridgestone Corp. v. Zhejiang Huntington Bull Rubber Co.</i> , MTZ No. 189 (Sup. People's Ct, 2010)	4.8.9
<i>Cao Guilan v. Chongqing Lifan Automobile Sales Co.</i> , MS No. 1826 (Sup. People's Ct, 2017)	4.3.2.4
<i>China National Intellectual Property Administration v. Baixiang Foods Co.</i> , ZXZ No. 4 (Sup. People's Ct, 2014)	4.8.6.3.4
<i>China National Intellectual Property Administration v. Erasmus University Medical Center</i> , ZXZ No. 127 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.7.6.1.3, 4.7.9.2
<i>China National Intellectual Property Administration v. Shandong Haowo Electric Co.</i> , ZMZ No. 32 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.7.6.1.2
<i>China National Intellectual Property Administration v. Zhang Dijun</i> , XTZ No. 14 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.8.6.3.3
<i>Chongqing Lifan Automobile Sales Co. v. China National Intellectual Property Administration</i> , XZ No. 268 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.7.6.2.4
<i>Cixi Bosheng Plastic Products Co. v. Chen Jian</i> , MSZ No. 188 (Sup. People's Ct, 2015)	4.3.4.2
<i>CSPC Ouyi Pharmaceutical Co. v. Zhang Xitian</i> , MTZ No. 84 (Sup. People's Ct, 2009)	4.3.2.5.4
<i>Cubist Pharmaceuticals v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , ZXZ No. 75 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.7.2.2.3
<i>Dongguan Hongding Home Co. v. Dongguan Kangsheng Furniture Co.</i> , ZMZ No. 181 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.3.3.1
<i>Edan v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , ZXZ No. 6 (Sup. People's Ct, 2014)	4.7.6.1.2
<i>Elecon Asia SA v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XTZ No. 13 (Sup. People's Ct, 2014)	4.7.11
<i>Eli Lilly Co. v. Changzhou Watson Pharmaceuticals Co.</i> , Guiding Case No. 84 (Sup. People's Ct, 2017)	4.3.2.5.5
<i>Eli Lilly Co. v. Hansoh Pharma</i> , MSZZ No. 6 (Sup. People's Ct, 2009)	4.3.2.5.4
<i>Ericsson v. TCL Group Corp.</i> , ZMXZ No. 32 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.5.4.2
<i>Foshan Schunde Fashion Electrical Appliances Mfg. Co. v. Zhejiang iSMAL Hi-Tech Electrics Co.</i> , ZMZ No. 804 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.3.4.1
<i>Friedrich Grohe AG v. Zhejiang Jianlong Sanitary Ware Co.</i> , Guiding Case No. 85 (Sup. People's Ct, 2017)	4.8.6.3.3, 4.8.8
<i>Fujian Jinjiang Qingyang Weiduoli Food Co. v. Zhangzhou Yueyuan Food Co.</i> , MSZ No. 1658 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.8.8
<i>Gree Electric Appliances, Inc. v. GD Midea Holding Co.</i> , XTZ No. 1 (Sup. People's Ct, 2011)	4.8.6.3.1, 4.8.6.3.3
<i>Gu Qingliang v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XS No. 789 (Sup. People's Ct, 2016)	4.7.7
<i>Guangdong Archie Hardware Co. v. Yang Jianzhong</i> , MTZ No. 187 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.3.4.3
<i>Guangzhou Surui Mechanical Equipment Co. v. Shenzhen Helitai Technology Co.</i> , ZMZ No. 25 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.3.4.3
<i>Hebei Xinyu Welding Co. v. Yichang Houwang Welding Co.</i> , MSZ No. 1201 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.3.1.6
<i>Honda Motor Co. v. Shijiazhuang Shuanghuan Automobile Co.</i> , MSZZ No. 1 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.5.1
<i>Honda Technology Research Industry Co. v. China National Intellectual Property Administration</i> , XTZ No. 3 (Sup. People's Ct, 2010)	4.8.3
<i>Honda Technology Research Industry Co. v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XTZ No. 3 (Sup. People's Ct, 2010)	4.8.6.3.1
<i>Hong Liang v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XTZ No. 13 (Sup. People's Ct, 2011)	4.3.1.7
<i>Hua Jiping v. Shanghai Oxylane Trade Co.</i> , MSZZ No. 3 (Sup. People's Ct, 2007)	4.4.2.2, 4.4.2.4

<i>Jiangxi Yintao Pharmaceutical Co. v. Shaanxi Hanwang Pharmaceutical Co.</i> , MSZ No. 1490 (Sup. People's Ct, 2011)	4.3.4.4
<i>Jining Pressureless Boiler Factory v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XZT No. 4 (Sup. People's Ct, 2007)	4.7.4
<i>Lanxi Changcheng Food Co. v. Chen Chunbin</i> , MSZ No. 438 (Sup. People's Ct, 2014)	4.8.8
<i>Letter on Chaoyang Xingnuo Company's Act of Exploiting a Patent</i> , MSTZ No. 4 (Sup. People's Ct, 2008)	4.5.4.1
<i>Linhai Linong Machinery Plant v. Lu Jie</i> , MS No. 1804 (Sup. People's Ct, 2017)	4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.3
<i>Liu Hongbin v. Beijing Jinglianfa Digital Control Technology Co.</i> , MSZ No. 1070 (Sup. People's Ct, 2015)	4.3.3.2
<i>Liu Xiaosheng v. Chaozhou Chaoan Xiangxingfa Electronic Technology Co.</i> , ZXZ No. 422 (Sup. People's Ct, 2020)	4.7.5.1
<i>Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma Corp. v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , ZXZ No. 352 (Sup. People's Ct, 2015)	4.7.9.2
<i>Ningbo Dongfang Movement Plant v. Jianguyin Jinling Hardware Products Co.</i> , MSTZ No.1 (Sup. People's Ct, 2001)	4.3.1.2, 4.3.2.2
<i>Ningbo Zhantong Telecom Equipment Co. v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , ZXZ No. 43 (Sup. People's Ct, 2014)	4.7.6.1.3
<i>OBE - Werk Ohnmacht and Baumgartner GmbH v. Zhejiang Kanghua Glasses Co.</i> , MSZ No. 980 (Sup. People's Ct, 2008)	4.3.2.5.1
<i>Oerlikon Textile GmbH v. Zhejiang Yuejin Intelligent Equipment Co.</i> , ZXZ No. 279 (Sup. People's Ct, 2020)	4.7.6.1.1
<i>Ou Jieren v. Taizhou Jinshen Household Products Co.</i> , MS No. 2649 (Sup. People's Ct, 2017)	4.8.7
<i>Patent Reexamination Board v. Hu Ying</i> , XZT No. 8 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.7.6.2.3
<i>Patent Reexamination Board v. Warner-Lambert Co.</i> , XZT No. 8 (Sup. People's Ct, 2014)	4.7.9.2
<i>Qilu Pharmaceutical Co. v. Beijing Sihuan Pharmaceutical Co.</i> , MS No. 4107 (Sup. People's Ct, 2017)	4.5.4.1
<i>Ren Xiaoping v. Apple Electronic Products Commerce (Beijing) Co.</i> , ZXZ Nos. 406, 407 (Sup. People's Ct, 2020)	4.7.10.2
<i>Seiko Epson Corp. v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , ZXZ No. 53-1 (Sup. People's Ct, 2010)	4.7.3.2
<i>Sensing Electronics Co. v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XZ No. 19 (Sup. People's Ct, 2016)	4.7.10.2
<i>Shaanxi Dongming Agricultural Technology Co. v. Shaanxi Qinfeng Agricultural Machineries (Group) Co.</i> , MTZ No. 10 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.3.2.7
<i>Shanghai Modiluke Locks Manufacturing Plant v. Shanghai Gujian Locks Co.</i> , MTZ No. 113 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.3.1.3
<i>Shanxi Zhendong Taisheng Pharmaceutical Co. v. Hu Xiaoquan</i> , MTZ No. 10 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.3.1.6
<i>Shen Qiheng v. Shanghai Shengmao Traffic Engineering Co.</i> , MSZ No. 239 (Sup. People's Ct, 2009)	4.3.2.4
<i>Shenzhen Weibond Technology Co. v. Li Jianyi</i> , Guiding Case No. 158 (Sup. People's Ct, 2021)	4.5.2.1.2
<i>Shenzhen DJ Lingmou Technology Co. v. China National Intellectual Property Administration</i> , ZXZ No. 183 (Sup. People's Ct, 2020)	4.7.6.1.3
<i>Shenzhen Dunjun Technology Co. v. Shenzhen Jixiang Tengda Technology Co.</i> , Guiding Case No. 159 (Sup. People's Ct, 2021)	4.3.2.5.3
<i>Shenzhen Lanying Hardware and Plastic Products Plant v. Luo Shizhong</i> , MTZ No. 248 (Sup. People's Ct, 2011)	4.3.1.3
<i>Shimano Inc. v. Ningbo Richeng Industry and Trade Co.</i> , MTZ No. 1 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.3.1.5
<i>Shimano v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XZT No. 21 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.7.12.1
<i>SMC Inc. v. Leqing Zhangqi Pneumatic Technology Co.</i> , MZ No. 199 (Sup. People's Ct, 2018)	4.3.3.1
<i>Strix Ltd. v. Ningbo Shenglida Electric Manufacturing Co.</i> , MSJZ No. 51-1 (Sup. People's Ct, 2007)	4.3.4.1
<i>Strix Ltd. v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XZ No. 131 (Sup. People's Ct, 2018)	4.7.6.1.2
<i>Sun Junyi v. Renqiu Bocheng Water Heating Apparatus Co.</i> , MSZ No. 740 (Sup. People's Ct, 2015)	4.3.2.2
<i>Textile Machinery Co. v. Patent Reexamination Board</i> , XZT No. 3 (Sup. People's Ct, 2007)	4.7.5.1
<i>Tianjin Greenpine Pharma Co. v. Huabei Pharmaceutical Hebei Huamin Pharmaceutical Co.</i> , ZMZ No. 871 (Sup. People's Ct, 2020)	4.5.2.3
<i>Tong Kening v. Zhejiang Shuangyu Industrial Co.</i> , ZXZ No. 53 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.7.5.2
<i>Valeo Cleaning System Co. v. Xiamen Lukasi Automotive Parts Co.</i> , Guiding Case No. 115 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.3.1.4, 4.6.2.2.4.1
<i>VMI Holland BV v. Safe-Run Machinery (Suzhou) Co.</i> , ZMZ No. 5 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.5.1

<i>Wang Yeci v. Xuzhou Huasheng Industry Co.</i> , ZMZ No. 89 (Sup. People's Ct, 2019)	4.3.4.1, 4.3.4.4
<i>Weifang Henglian Pulp and Papermaking Co. v. Yibin Changyi Pulp Co.</i> , MSZ No. 309 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.3.2.5.4
<i>Wuxi Guowei Ceramic Electrical Appliances Co. v. Chagnshu Linzhi Electrical Heating Components Co.</i> , MZ No. 111 (Sup. People's Ct, 2018)	4.4.2.2
<i>Wuxi Shenglong Cable Materials Plant v. Xi'an Qinbang Telecommunication Materials Co.</i> , MTZ No. 3 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.3.1.3, 4.3.1.7
<i>Xinghe Industry Co. v. Jiangsu Runde Pipes Industry Co.</i> , MSZ No. 790 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.3.2.1
<i>Xu Yongwei v. Ningbo Huatuo Solar Energy Technology Co.</i> , MTZ No. 64 (Sup. People's Ct, 2011)	4.3.1.3
<i>Yancheng Zetian Machinery Co. v. Yancheng Geruite Machinery Co.</i> , MSZ No. 18 (Sup. People's Ct, 2012)	4.3.4.1
<i>Yiwu Beige Plastic Products Co. v. Air-Paq Composite Material (Shanghai) Co.</i> , MS No. 4149 (Sup. People's Ct, 2018)	4.3.2.5.4
<i>Yongkang Lianyue Industry and Trade Co. v. Cixi Bosheng Plastic Products Co.</i> , ZMZ No. 993 (Sup. People's Ct, 2020)	4.6.2.2.5
<i>Zhang Jianhua v. Shenyang Zhilian Highrise Building Heating Technology Co.</i> , MTZ No. 83 (Sup. People's Ct, 2009)	4.3.2.1
<i>Zhejiang Jin Fei Machinery Co. v. Zhejiang Wanfeng Motorcycle Co.</i> , XTZ No. 5 (Sup. People's Ct, 2010)	4.8.3
<i>Zhejiang Lexueer Household Supplies Co. v. Chen Shundi</i> , MTZ No. 225 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.3.2.5.1
<i>Zheng Yali v. Seiko Epson Corp.</i> , ZXZ No. 53 (Sup. People's Ct, 2010)	4.7.12.1
<i>Zhongshan Longcheng Daily Products Co. v. Hubei Tongba Children's Appliances Co.</i> , MTZ No. 116 (Sup. People's Ct, 2013)	4.4.2.3
<i>Zhongyu Electronics (Shanghai) Co. v. Shanghai Jiuying Electronic Technology Co.</i> , MTZ No. 306 (Sup. People's Ct, 2011)	4.3.2.4

Germany (Chapter 5)

<i>An Evening with Marlene Dietrich</i> , April 2, 2016, I ZR 43/14 (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.3.3
<i>Besonderer Mechanismus</i> , July 12 2011, X ZR 56/09 (BGH (FCJ))	5.7.6
<i>Blasenfreie Gummibahn II</i> , Sep. 30, 2003, X ZR 114/00, (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.4.6
<i>Blasfolienherstellung</i> , Feb. 21, 2005, X ZR 126/01, (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.4.3
<i>Bordako</i> , July 29, 2010, Xa ZR 118/09 (BGH (FCJ))	5.9.2.2
<i>Cerebro Card</i> , June 14, 2006, 5 U 21/06 (OLG Hamburg (Higher Regional Court of Hamburg))	5.6.5.4.2
<i>Crimpwerkzeug III</i> , June 29, 2010, X ZR 193/03 (BGH (FCJ))	5.4.3.1, 5.9.2.1, 5.9.2.2
<i>Crimpwerkzeug IV</i> , Dec. 14, 2010, X ZR 193/03 (BGH (FCJ))	5.9.2.2
<i>Druckmaschinen-Temperierungssystem</i> , April 6, 2004, X ZR 272/02 (BGH (FCJ))	5.9.2.2
<i>Einkaufskühltasche</i> , Nov. 13. 2013, X ZR 171/12 (BGH (FCJ))	5.7.7.1
<i>Extracoronares Geschiebe</i> , Nov. 22, 2005, X ZR 79/04 (BGH (FCJ))	5.7.2
<i>Formstein</i> , April 29, 1986, X ZR 28/85 (BGH (FCJ))	5.5.2.3
<i>Gemeinkostenanteil</i> Nov. 2, 2000, I ZR 246/98 (BGH (FCJ))	5.7.4
<i>Kurznachrichtendienst</i> , Sep. 16, 2014, X ZR 61/13 (BGH (FCJ))	5.8.4
<i>Lichtbogenschnürung</i> , Nov. 16, 2011, X ZB 37/08 (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.6.3
<i>MP3 Player Import</i> , Sep. 17, 2009, Xa ZR 2/08 (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.3.1
<i>Nichtigkeitsstreitwert I</i> , April 12 2011, X ZR 28/09 (BGH (FCJ))	5.7.7.1
<i>Olanzapin</i> , Dec. 16, 2008, X ZR 89/07 (BGH (FCJ))	5.4.2.1.2, 5.4.2.1.3
<i>Qualcomm v. Apple</i> , Dec. 20, 2018, 7 O 10495/17 (LG München (Regional Court of Munich))	5.6.6.4, 5.6.7.1
<i>Raffvorhang</i> , Jan. 25, 2011, X ZR 69/08 (BGH (FCJ))	5.9.1.2

<i>Raltegravir</i> , Jul. 11, 2017, X ZB 2/17 (BGH (FCJ))	5.5.3.3, 5.11.1.1, 5.11.1.3.2
<i>Rohrmuffe</i> , Dec. 18, 2012, X ZR 7/12 (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.7.3
<i>Rohrreinigungsdüse II</i> , Feb. 21, 2012, X ZR 111/09, 2013 IIC 232 (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.4.4
<i>Rohrschweißverfahren</i> , Feb. 27, 2007, X ZR 113/04 (BGH (FCJ))	5.5.2.2
<i>Schneckenkoeder</i> , Oct. 2, 2018, X ZR 62/16 (BGH (FCJ))	5.7.6
<i>Schneidmesser I</i> , March 12, 2002, X ZR 168/00 (BGH (FCJ))	5.5.2.3
<i>Straßenbaumaschine</i> , March 31, 2009, X ZR 95-05 (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.7.1
<i>Tintenpatrone III</i> , April 17, 2021, X ZR 55/09 (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.3.3.1
<i>Unmittelbarkeitsgrundsatz</i> , July 12, 2013V ZR 85/12 (BGH (FCJ))	5.6.7.2
<i>Wärmetauscher</i> , May 10, 2016, X ZR 114/13 (BGH (FCJ))	5.5.1, 5.7.1

India (Chapter 6)

<i>Aloys Wobben v. Yogesh Mehra</i> , (2014) 15 SCC 360	6.4
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Intas Pharmaceuticals Ltd.</i> , MANU/DE/1939/2020	6.1.1, 6.6.4.1.2
<i>Bajaj Auto Ltd. v. TVS Motor Co. Ltd.</i> , 2010 SCC Online Mad. 5031	6.6.7.2, 6.8.2
<i>Bata India Ltd. v. Vitaflex Mauch GmbH</i> , 222 (2015) DLT 498	6.8.1.1
<i>Bayer Corp. v. Union of India</i> , WP (C) 1971 of 2014	6.5.3
<i>Bayer Intellectual Property GmbH v. Ajanta Pharma Ltd.</i> , CS (COMM) 1648 of 2016	6.6.4.1.2
<i>Bayer Intellectual Property GmbH v. BDR Pharmaceuticals International Pvt. Ltd.</i> , CS (COMM) 107 of 2017	6.6.4.1.2
<i>Bishwanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. HM Industries</i> , AIR 1982 SC 1444	6.1.3
<i>Catnic Components Ltd. v. Hill and Smith Ltd.</i> , (1982) RPC 183	6.5.1.2
<i>Cipla Ltd. v. Novartis AG</i> , 2017 SCC Online Del. 7393	6.6.4.1.2
<i>Cipla Ltd. v. Union of India</i> , (2012) 13 SCC 429	6.2.2.3.1
<i>F Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd. v. Cipla Ltd.</i> , MIPR 2016 (1) 1	6.1.1, 6.5.1.2, 6.5.2.3, 6.6.4.1, 6.6.8.2, 6.7.1
<i>Koninklijke Philips NV v. Amazestore</i> , 260 (2019) DLT 135	6.1.1, 6.7.2.1
<i>LG Electronics India Pvt. Ltd. v. Bharat Bhogilal Patel</i> , 2012 (51) PTC 513 (Del.)	6.8.1.1
<i>Manicka Thevar v. Star Ploro Works</i> , AIR 1965 Mad. 327	6.6.4.1.1
<i>Merck Sharp and Dohme Corp. v. Glenmark Pharmaceuticals</i> , 2015 SCC Online Del. 8227	6.1.1, 6.6.4.1, 6.6.4.1.2, 6.6.4.1.3
<i>Micromax Informatics Ltd. v. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson</i> , MANU/DE/1477/2019	6.6.8.4
<i>Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd.</i> , (2019) 3 SCC 381	6.6.7.2, 6.6.8.1
<i>Novartis v. Union of India</i> , AIR 2013 SC 1311	6.1.1, 6.5.4
<i>Pfizer Products Inc. v. Controller of Patents and Designs</i> , 2020 SCC Online IPAB 19	6.2.2.2.3
<i>Roche Products, Inc. v. Bolar Pharmaceutical Co.</i> , 733 F 2d 858 (Fed Cir. 1984)	6.1.4.4.4, 6.5.3
<i>SCG Contracts India Pvt. Ltd. v. KS Chamankar Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.</i> , 2019 (12) SCC 210	6.6.3.1
<i>Shogun Organics Ltd. v. Gaur Hari Guchhait</i> , 263 (2019) DLT 516	6.1.1
<i>Snehlata C Gupte v. Union of India</i> , 2012 SCC Online Del. 2259	6.4
<i>Ten XC Wireless v. Mobi Antenna</i> , 2011 SCC Online Del. 4648	6.7.4
<i>UCB Farchim v. Cipla Ltd.</i> , 2010 SCC Online Del. 523	6.2.2.3.4, 6.4
<i>UPL Ltd. v. Pradeep Sharma</i> , 2018 SCC Online Del. 7315	6.1.1

Japan (Chapter 7)

<i>Anonymous v. Alcon Research Ltd. and Kyōwa Hakkō Kirin Co. Ltd.</i> , (Sup. Ct [2019])	7.3.4
<i>Commissioner of the Japan Patent Office v. Boehringer Mannheim GmbH (Lipase Case)</i> , (Sup. Ct [1991])	7.4.5.2.2, 7.5.1.1
<i>Commissioner of the Japan Patent Office v. Nihon Kenkō Zōshin Kenkyū-kai Co. Ltd.</i> , (Sup. Ct [1995])	7.4.2
<i>DKSH Japan Co., Ltd. v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co., Ltd. (Maxacalcitol Case)</i> , (Sup. Ct [2016])	7.5.2.2, 7.5.2.3, 7.5.2.7
<i>Haier Group Corporation v. Commissioner of the Japan Patent Office</i> , (Intellectual Prop. High Ct [2011])	7.4.5.1
<i>Irs Australia Pty Ltd. v. Ozdare Academy Pty Ltd.</i> , (Intellectual Prop. High Ct [2010])	7.4.5.1
<i>Komaryo Co., Ltd. v. Pierre Andre Senizergues</i> , (Sup. Ct [2002])	7.4.2
<i>Kyōdō Giken Co., Ltd. v. Nihon Kōkan Co., Ltd. (Structure of Food Packaging Containers Case)</i> , (Sup. Ct [1980])	7.4.4
<i>MTG Co. Ltd. v. Five Stars Co. Ltd (Beauty Instrument Case)</i> , (Intellectual Prop. High Ct [2020])	7.3.3.3.2, 7.7.2.1
<i>Nippon Eli Lilly Co., Ltd. v. Pharmacia AB</i> , (Osaka High Ct [2001])	7.5.2.8
<i>Nippon Synthetic Chemical Industry Co., Ltd. v. Commissioner of the Japan Patent Office (Parameter Patent Case)</i> , (Intellectual Prop. High Ct [2005])	7.4.5.2.4, 7.5.3.1.6
<i>Polarizing Film Manufacturing Process Case</i> , (Intellectual Prop. High Ct)	7.5.3.1.6
<i>Pravastatin Sodium Case</i> , (Sup. Ct [2015])	7.4.5.2.6, 7.5.1.5
<i>Speed Amiki Co., Ltd. v. Bunji Okumura (Knitting Machine Case)</i> , (Sup. Ct [1976])	7.4.4
<i>Tamura Chemical Corporation v. Taiyo Ink Mfg. Co., Ltd. (Solder Resist Case)</i> , (Intellectual Prop. High Ct [2008])	7.4.5.2.7, 7.5.3.1.1
<i>Texas Instruments Inc. v. Fujitsu Co., Ltd. (Kilby Case)</i> , (Sup. Ct [2000])	7.5.3
<i>Tokyo Electron Ltd v. Y.</i> , (Intellectual Prop. High Ct [2009])	7.4.5.1
<i>Tsubakimoto Seiko Co., Ltd. v. THK Co., Ltd. (Ball Spline Bearing Case)</i> , (Sup. Ct [1998])	7.5.2.1
<i>Yokohama Rubber Co., Ltd. v. Yonex Co., Ltd.</i> , (Intellectual Prop. High Ct [2010])	7.5.2.8

Korea (Republic of) (Chapter 8)

92Do3350 decision (Sup. Ct, Feb. 23, 1993)	8.9.4.1
98Da38760 decision (Sup. Ct, Oct. 8, 1999)	8.6.11.2.2
2002Da60610 decision (Sup. Ct, Sep. 23, 2004)	8.5.3.2
2002Do3445 decision (Sup. Ct, April 11, 2003)	8.5.3.4
2003Do6283 decision (Sup. Ct, Feb. 27, 2004)	8.9.4.2
2004Hu1564 decision (Sup. Ct, Jan. 12, 2006)	8.9.4.1
2007Do9659 decision (Sup. Ct, Feb. 14, 2008)	8.9.4.4
2008Do639 decision (Sup. Ct, Jan. 14, 2010)	8.9.4.3
2009Da75178 decision (Sup. Ct, Jul. 28, 2011)	8.7.2.2
2010Da95390 decision (Sup. Ct, Jan. 19, 2012)	8.1.1, 8.5.3.1, 8.9.4.2

United Kingdom (Chapter 9)

<i>Actavis Group PTC EHF v. Icos Corp.</i> [2019] UKSC 15	9.1.1.3
<i>Actavis U.K. Ltd v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> [2017] UKSC 48	6.5.1.2, 9.5.3
<i>Actavis U.K. Ltd v. Merck & Co., Inc.</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 444	9.1.1.3
<i>American Cyanamid Co. v. Ethicon Ltd</i> [1975] AC 396	6.6.4.1, 9.6.5.1
<i>Arrow Generics Ltd v. Merck & Co. Inc.</i> [2007] EWCA 1900 (Pat.)	9.5.4, 9.9.13

<i>Biogen Inc. v. Medeva plc</i> [1995] RPC 25 (CA)	9.3.1.2
<i>Calderbank v. Calderbank</i> [1975] 2 All ER 333	2.7.4.4
<i>Chiron Corp. v. Murex Diagnostics Ltd</i> [1996] RPC 535	9.3.1.2
<i>Coloplast A/S v. Salts Healthcare Ltd</i> [2021] EWHC 107 (Pat.)	9.7.4
<i>Dyson Appliances Ltd. v. Hoover Ltd</i> [2001] EWHC 30 (Pat.)	9.7.1
<i>European Central Bank v. Document Security Systems</i> [2008] EWCA (Civ.) 192	6.5.4, 9.3.2
<i>Evalve Inc. v. Edwards Lifesciences Ltd</i> [2020] EWHC (Pat.)	9.7.1, 9.8.2
<i>Excalibur Ventures LLC v. Texas Keystone Inc.</i> [2015] EWHC (Comm.) 566	9.7.4
<i>Fujifilm Kyowa Kirin Biologics Co. Ltd. v. AbbVie Biotechnology Ltd</i> [2017] EWCA (Civ.) 1	9.5.4
<i>Genentech Inc. v. The Wellcome Foundation Ltd</i> [1989] RPC 147	9.3.1.2
<i>Grimme Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. Scott</i> [2010] EWCA (Civ.) 1110	9.5.1
<i>Halliburton Energy Services Inc. v. Smith International (North Sea) Ltd</i> [2006] EWCA (Civ.) 1599	9.3.1.2
<i>Hospira U.K. Ltd v. Cubist Pharmaceuticals</i> [2016] EWHC 2661 (Pat.)	9.8.1
<i>HTC Corp. v. Nokia Corp. (No. 2)</i> [2013] EWCA (Civ.) 1759	9.8.2
<i>Human Genome Sciences, Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> [2011] UKSC 51	9.1.1.3, 11.3.2.2
<i>Icescape Ltd v. Ice-World International BV</i> [2019] FSR 5	6.5.1.2
<i>InPlayer Ltd v. Thorogood</i> [2014] EWCA (Civ.) 1511	9.6.13.2.1
<i>IPCom GmbH & Co. KG v. HTC Europe Co. Ltd</i> [2013] EWCA (Civ.) 1496	9.1.1.3
<i>Island Records Ltd v. Tring International plc.</i> [1995] FSR 560	9.7.2
<i>Kirin-Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel Ltd</i> [2004] UKHL 46	9.3.1.2, 9.5.2
<i>Lenzing</i> [1997] RPC 245	11.2.1
<i>Medimmune Ltd v. Novartis Pharmaceuticals U.K. Ltd</i> [2011] EWHC 1669 (Pat.)	9.6.8.2
<i>Merck Canada Inc. v. Sigma Pharmaceuticals plc</i> [2013] EWCA (Civ.) 326	9.7.3.4
<i>Merck Sharp Dohme Corp. v. Teva Pharma BV</i> [2013] EWHC 1958 (Pat.)	9.5.1
<i>Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. HN Norton & Co. Ltd</i> [1996] RPC 76 (HL)	11.3.2.2
<i>Neurim Pharmaceuticals (1991) Ltd v. Genetics U.K. Ltd</i> [2020] EWHC 1362 (Pat.)	9.6.5.1
<i>Nokia Corp. v. Interdigital Technology Corp.</i> [2006] EWCA (Civ.) 1618	9.5.4
<i>Nokia GmbH v. IPCom GmbH</i> [2011] EWCA (Civ.) 16	9.6.6
<i>Pfizer Ltd v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG</i> [2019] EWHC 1520 (Pat.)	9.5.4
<i>Pioneer Electronics Capital Inc. v. Warner Music Manufacturing Europe GmbH</i> [1997] RPC 757	9.5.1
<i>Positec Power Tools (Europe) Ltd v. Husqvarna AB</i> [2016] EWHC 1061 (Pat.)	9.3.1.2
<i>Regeneron Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Kymab Ltd</i> [2018] EWCA 1186	9.7.3.3
<i>Samsung Electronics (U.K.) Ltd v. Apple Inc.</i> [2012] EWCA (Civ.) 1339	9.7.3.3
<i>Sea Shepherd U.K. v. Fish & Fish Ltd</i> [2015] UKSC 10	9.5.1
<i>Smithkline Beecham plc v. Apotex Europe Ltd</i> [2004] EWCA (Civ.) 1703	9.4
<i>Teva U.K. Ltd v. Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH</i> [2016] EWCA (Civ.) 1296	9.8.1
<i>Unwired Planet International Ltd v. Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd</i> [2017] EWHC 1304 (Pat.)	9.7.1
<i>Unwired Planet International Ltd v. Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd</i> [2018] EWCA (Civ.) 2344	9.5.4
<i>Virgin Airways Ltd v. Zodiac Seats U.K. Ltd</i> [2013] UKSC 46	9.1.1.3
<i>Warner-Lambert Company LLC v. Generics (U.K.) Ltd</i> [2018] UKSC 56	9.5.1, 9.6.6

United States (Chapter 10)

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Andrx Pharm., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1331, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	10.6.7.1
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 500 F.Supp.2d 846, 849 (N.D. Ill. 2007)	10.6.7.1.5
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Torpharm, Inc.</i> , 503 F.3d 1372, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	10.9
<i>A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.L. Chaides Constr. Co.</i> , 960 F.2d 1020, 1041 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	10.5.3.2
<i>Acer Am. Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1252, 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	10.6.3
<i>Acorda Therapeutics Inc. v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , 817 F.3d 755, 760-64 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	10.13.2.1.5.1
<i>Adams v. Burke</i> , 84 U.S. 453 (1873)	10.1.1.3
<i>Additive Controls & Measurement Sys., Inc. v. Flowdata, Inc.</i> , 154 F.3d 1345, 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	10.9
<i>Allied Corp. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 850 F.2d 1573, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	10.12.4.4
<i>Amado v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 517 F.3d 1353, 1361-62 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10.7.2.2.1, 10.10.1.1
<i>American Seating Co. v. USSC Grp, Inc.</i> , 514 F.3d 1262, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10.7.2.1
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 794 F.3d 1347, 1354-57 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10.13.2.2.2
<i>Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 757 F.3d 1286, 1331-32 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	10.7.1
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 735 F.3d 1372, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	10.6.7.1, 10.7.1
<i>Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Semiconductors Materials Am., Inc.</i> , (N.D. Cal. April 25, 1995)	10.6.10.2
<i>Aria Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.</i> , 726 F.3d 1296, 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	10.6.7.1
<i>Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.</i> , 377 U.S. 476, 488 (1964)	10.5.2.2
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	10.15
<i>Association of Mexican-American Educators v. California</i> , 231 F.3d 572, 611-14 (9 th Cir. 2000)	10.6.11
<i>AstraZeneca Pharms. LP v. Apotex Corp.</i> , 669 F.3d 1370, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10.13.2.1.4.1
<i>Atl. Works v. Brady</i> , 107 U.S. (17 Otto) 192, 200 (1883)	10.1.1.3
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	10.15
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	10.6.6.3, 10.6.9.1
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Rhone-Poulenc Rorer, Inc.</i> , 326 F.3d 1226, 1238 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	10.6.10.2
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 543 F.3d 683, 704 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10.7.1
<i>California Artificial Stone Paving Co., v. Molitor</i> , 113 U.S. 609, 618 (1885)	10.9
<i>California Dental Ass'n v. FTC</i> , 224 F.3d 942, 947 (9 th Cir. 2000)	10.13.2.1.6
<i>Cancer Research Tech. Ltd v. Barr Labs, Inc.</i> , 625 F.3d 724, 729 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	10.5.3.2
<i>Certain Electronic Imaging Devices, Inv.</i> , No. 337-TA-726, Order No. 18 (March 8, 2011)	10.12.2.9
<i>Cincinnati Car Co. v. New York Rapid Transit Corp.</i> , 66 F.2d 592, 593 (2d Cir. 1933)	10.7.2.2
<i>City of Milwaukee v. Activated Sludge, Inc.</i> , 69 F.2d 577 (7 th Cir. 1934)	10.7.1
<i>ClearCorrect Operating LLC v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 810 F.3d 1283, 1293-99 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10.12.1.2.1
<i>Cornell Univ. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 609 F.Supp. 2d 279 (N.D.N.Y 2009)	10.7.2.2
<i>Cray Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	10.6.3
<i>Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. Tritech Microelectronics Int'l, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1336, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	10.7.2.1
<i>Cuno Eng'g Corp. v. Automatic Devices Corp.</i> , 314 U.S. 84, 91 (1941)	10.1.1.3
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993)	10.6.10, 10.6.11, 10.12.2.10.4, 10.15
<i>Dawson Chem. Co. v. Rohm & Haas Co.</i> , 448 U.S. 176, 184 (1980)	10.5.2.2
<i>Dimick v. Schiedt</i> , 293 U.S. 474, 486 (1935)	10.6.13.1.1
<i>Duro-Last, Inc. v. Custom Seal, Inc.</i> , 321 F.3d 1098, 1105-09 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	10.6.13.3
<i>eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC</i> , 547 U.S. 388 (2006)	10.1.1.7, 10.3.3.2, 10.6.7.1, 10.7.1, 10.12.1.4
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 496 U.S. 661, 677 (1990)	10.13.2.1.3
<i>EMC Corp.</i> , 501 F.App'x 973, 975-76 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	10.6.3
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201, 1226 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	10.7.2.2
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , (E.D. Tex. Jan. 11, 2021)	10.13.1.2
<i>Exergen Corp. v Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1312, 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10.5.3.2
<i>F & G Scrolling Mouse L.L.C. v. IBM Corp.</i> , 190 F.R.D. 385 (M.D.N.C. 1999)	10.6.13.1.1
<i>Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. v. Third Dimension (3D) Semiconductor, Inc.</i> , 564 F.Supp. 2d 63, 66 (D. Me. 2008)	10.6.7.2
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 764 F.3d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	10.13.2.1.4.1

<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kabushiki Co.</i> , 535 U.S. 722, 740-1 (2002)	10.5.2.1
<i>Fonar Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co.</i> , 107 F.3d 1543, 1552 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	10.7.2.2
<i>Foster v. Hallco Mfg. Co.</i> , 947 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	10.12.5.2.1
<i>FTC v. Actavis, Inc.</i> , 570 U.S. 136 (2013)	10.13.2.1.6
<i>FTC v. Enforma Natural Products, Inc.</i> , 362 F.3d 1204, 1213-15 (9 th Cir. 2004)	10.6.11
<i>Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.</i> , 333 U.S. 127 (1948)	10.1.1.3
<i>Futurewei Techs., Inc. v. Acacia Research Corp.</i> , 737 F.3d 704, 708 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	10.3.3.1
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , 108 F.3d 1361, 1364 (Fed. Civ. 1997)	10.6.7.1.5
<i>General Motors Corp. v. Devex Corp.</i> , 461 U.S. 648, 657 (1983)	10.7.2.4
<i>Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp.</i> , 318 F.Supp 1116 (S.D.N.Y. 1970)	6.7.2, 10.7.2.2, 10.7.2.2.1
<i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 563 U.S. 754, 766 (2011)	10.5.2.2
<i>Granny Goose Foods, Inc. v. Bhd. of Teamsters Local 70</i> , 415 U.S. 423, 439 (1974)	10.6.7.2
<i>Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co.</i> , 339 U.S.605, 607-08 (1950)	10.5.2.1
<i>Gyromat Corp. v. Champion Spark Plug Co.</i> , 735 F.2d 549, 556-57 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	10.7.2.4
<i>Halo Electronics, Inc. v. Pulse Electronics, Inc.</i> , 579 U.S. 93 (2016)	10.7.2.3
<i>Henry v. A.B. Dick Co.</i> , 224 U.S. 1 (1912)	10.1.1.3
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Repeat-O-Type Stencil Mfg. Co.</i> , 123 F.3d 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	10.5.3.2
<i>Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.</i> , 370 F.3d 1131, 1139 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10.6.13.3
<i>Hotchkiss v. Greenwood</i> , 52 U.S. 248 (1850)	10.1.1.2
<i>HTC Corp.</i> , 889 F.3d 1349, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	10.13.2.1.5.1
<i>Innovad Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 260 F.3d 1326, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	10.12.5.2.2
<i>Insituform Techs., Inc. v. Cat Contracting, Inc.</i> , 161 F.3d 688, 695 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	10.5.2.2
<i>Intel Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , 542 U.S. 241 (2004)	5.6.6.4
<i>Johnson & Johnston Assocs. Inc. v. R.E. Serv. Co.</i> , 285 F.3d 1046 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10.5.2.1
<i>Jungersen v. Ostby & Barton Co.</i> , 335 U.S. 560, 572 (1949)	10.1.1.3
<i>Katz v. Lear Siegler, Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1459, 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	10.3.3.1
<i>Kingsdown Med. Consultants, Ltd v. Hollister, Inc.</i> , 863 F.2.d 867, 877 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	10.5.3.2
<i>Kinik v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 362 F.3d 1359, 1362-63 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10.12.1.3
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	10.1.1.7
<i>Laser Dynamics Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10.7.2.2
<i>Le Roy v. Tatham</i> , 55 U.S. (14 How.) 156 (1853)	10.1.1.2
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i> , 395 U.S. 653, 674 n.19 (1969)	10.6.13.6.3
<i>Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Techs., Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 915 (2014)	10.6.6.3
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10.1.1.7, 10.7.2.2
<i>Lumenis, Inc.</i> , 89 F.App'x (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10.6.7.1.5
<i>Madey v. Duke Univ.</i> , 307 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10.5.3.2
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments</i> , 517 U.S. 370, 372 (1996)	1.3.2, 5.6.1, 6.5.1.1, 10.5.1, 10.6.1, 10.6.6.1, 10.12.2.8
<i>Massachusetts Inst. of Tech. v. Abacus Software</i> , 462 F.3d 1344, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	10.6.13
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 566 U.S. 66 (2012)	5.4.2.1.1, 10.6.6.3
<i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 549 U.S.118, 127 (2007)	10.5
<i>Merial Ltd v. Cipla Ltd.</i> , 681 F.3d 1283, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10.3.3.1
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd P'ship</i> , 564 U.S. 91, 108-13 (2011)	10.5.3.1
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Motorola Inc.</i> , 871 F.Supp. 2d 1089 (W.D. Wash, 2012)	10.13.1.2
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Motorola Inc.</i> , No. C10-1823-JLR (2013)	10.13.1.1
<i>Midwest Indus., Inc. v. Karavan Trailers, Inc.</i> , 175 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	10.12.2.7
<i>Mikohn Gaming Corp. v. Acres Gaming, Inc.</i> , 165 F.3.d 891, 894 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	10.6.7
<i>Monolithic Power Sys., Inc. v. O2 Micro Int'l Ltd</i> , 558 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10.6.11
<i>Monsanto Co. v. McFarling</i> , 363 F.3d 1336, 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10.5.3.2
<i>Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg Co.</i> , 243 U.S. 502 (1917)	10.1.1.3, 10.5.3.2

<i>Nintendo Co.</i> , 589 F.3d 1194, 1197-98 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10.10.1
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., Ltd.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10.6.6.2.1
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd v. Monolithic Power Sys.</i> , 467 F.3d 1355, 1365-66 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	10.6.6.1
<i>Octane Fitness, LLC v. Icon Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 545, 554 (2014)	10.7.3.2
<i>Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Grp, LLC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018)	10.2.3
<i>Oplus Techs., Ltd v. Vizio, Inc.</i> , 782 F.3d 1371, 1375-76 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10.7.3.2
<i>O'Reilly v Morse</i> , 56 U.S. 62 (1853)	10.1.1.2
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	10.2.2.4.3.3, 10.3.3.3, 10.5.1, 10.15
<i>Polymer Techs., Inc. v. Bridwell</i> , 103 F.3d 970, 973 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	10.6.7.1
<i>Proveris Sci. Corp. v. Innovsystems, Inc.</i> , 739 F.3d 1367, 1370-71 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	10.9
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharm. Inc.</i> , 410 F.3d 690, 695 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	10.5.3.2
<i>Razor USA LLC v. ASA Prods., Inc.</i> (Fed. Cir. Nov. 22, 2000)	10.6.7.1.5
<i>Regents of the Univ. Of Minn. v. LSI Corp.</i> , 926 F.3d 1327, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	10.15
<i>Reilly v. United States</i> , 863 F.2d 149 (1 st Cir. 1988)	10.6.11
<i>RF Del., Inc. v. Pacific Keystone Tech., Inc.</i> , 326 F.3d 1255, 1261 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	10.12.5.2.2
<i>Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelly Co.</i> , 56 F.3d 1538, 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	10.7.2.1
<i>Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.</i> , 659 F.3d 1142, 1152-54 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	10.6.7.1, 10.7.1
<i>Roche Products, Inc. v. Bolar Pharmaceutical Co.</i> , 733 F.2d 858 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	3.11.2.2, 4.3.4.5, 5.5.3.4, 6.1.4.4.4, 6.5.2.2, 6.5.3
<i>Sandoz Inc. v. Amgen Inc.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1664, 1669 (2017)	10.13.2.2
<i>Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 294 F.Supp. 2d 353, 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2007)	10.13.2.1.4.4
<i>Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 470 F.3d 1368, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	10.6.7.1.5
<i>Spansion, Inc. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 629 F.3d 1331, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	10.3.3.2
<i>Standard Haven Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus.</i> , 897 F.2d 511, 512 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	10.10.1.1
<i>State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.</i> , 149 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	10.1.1.7
<i>Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 802 F.3d 1283, 1300-01 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10.7.2.2.1
<i>TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Grp. Brands LLC</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1514 (2017)	10.6.3, 10.13.2.1.5.1
<i>TechSearch LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 286 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10.6.6.2, 10.6.11
<i>Tegal Corp. v. Tokyo Electron Am. Inc.</i> , 257 F.3d 1331, 1339-41 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	10.13.2.1.4.4
<i>Telcordia Techs., Inv. v. Cisco Sys.</i> , 612 F.3d 1365, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	10.7.2.2.1
<i>Telemac Corp. v. Teledigital, Inc.</i> , 450 F.Supp. 2d 1107, 1111 (N.D. Cal. 2006)	10.3.3.3
<i>Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 574 U.S. 318 (2015)	10.5.1, 10.6.6.2
<i>Tex. Instruments, Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.</i> , 90 F.3d 1558, 1558-69 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	10.3.3.2
<i>Texas Instruments, Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.</i> , 90 F.3d 1558, 1568-69 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	10.12.5.2.3
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 649 F.3d 1276, 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	10.5.3.2
<i>TiVo Inc. v. EchoStar Corp.</i> , 646 F.3d 869, 882 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	10.9
<i>TS Tech USA Corp.</i> , 551 F.3d 1315, 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10.6.3
<i>Underwater Devices Inc. v. Morrison-Knudsen Co.</i> , 717 F.2d 1380, 1389 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	10.7.2.4
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 632 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	10.1.1.7, 10.7.2.2
<i>United States v. Arthrex, Inc.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1970 (2021)	10.2.3, 10.15
<i>Unitherm Food Sys., Inc. v. Swift-Eckrich, Inc.</i> , 546 U.S. 394, 398 (2006)	10.6.13.3
<i>Universal Elecs., Inc. v. Universal Remote Control, Inc.</i> , 943 F.Supp. 2d 1028, 1030-31 (C.D. Cal. 2013)	10.3.3.3
<i>U.S. Bancorp Mortg. Co. v. Bonner Mall P'ship</i> , 513 U.S. 18, 26, 29 (1994)	10.6.13.6.3
<i>Va. Panel Corp. v. MAC Panel Co.</i> , 133 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	10.5.3.2
<i>Vacuum Packaging Machines, Inv. No. 334-TA-496</i> (Dec. 16, 2003)	10.12.2.6
<i>Valeant Pharm. N. Am. LLC v. Mylan Pharms.</i> , 978 F.3d 1374, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	10.13.2.1.5.1
<i>Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.</i> , 520 U.S. (1997)	10.5.2.1
<i>Water Techs. Corp. v. Calco, Ltd.</i> , 850 F.2d 660, 668 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	10.5.2.2
<i>Western Union Co. v. MoneyGram Payment Sys.</i> , 626 F.3d 1361, 1367-68 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	10.6.13.3

<i>Whittemore v. Cutter</i> , F Cas. 1123, 1124 (C.C.D. Mass 1813)	10.1.1.2
<i>Winans v. Denmead</i> , 56 U.S. 330 (1854)	10.1.1.2
<i>Young Engineers, Inc. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 721 F.2d 1305, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	10.12.5.2.1
<i>Zubulake v. UBS Warburg</i> , LLC, F.R.D. 309 (S.D.N.Y. 2003)	10.6.8.5

Spain (Chapter 12)

Judgment of the Constitutional Court 214/1991 of November 11, 1991, ECLI:ES:TC:1991:214	12.7.2.3
Judgment of the Provincial Court of Barcelona 77/2018 of February 6, 2018, ECLI:ES:APB:2018:949	12.8.3
Judgment of the Provincial Court of Barcelona 1610/2021 of July 27, 2021, ECLI:ES:APB:2021:8276	12.4.1.1.2.1, 12.4.1.1.2.2
Judgment of the Provincial Court of Barcelona 513/2023 of December 14, 2023, ECLI:ES:APB:2023:15254	12.4.1.1.2.3, 12.4.1.3, 12.4.1.4, 12.4.2.1, 12.4.7
Judgment of the Provincial Court of Madrid 196/2019 of April 10, 2019, ECLI:ES:APM:2019:9686	12.3.1, 12.4.1.3
Judgment of the Supreme Court 309/2011 of May 10, 2011, ECLI:ES:TS:2011:4270	12.5.5
Judgment of the Supreme Court (First Chamber) 598/2014 of November 7, 2014, ECLI:ES:TS:2014:4845	12.5.2, 12.5.4
Judgment of the Supreme Court 223/2015 of April 29, 2015, ECLI:ES:TS:2015:1940	12.5.2
Judgment of the Supreme Court 182/2015 of April 14, 2015, ECLI:ES:TS:2015:1703	12.4.1.1.2, 12.4.1.1.2.3
Judgment of the Supreme Court 325/2015 of June 18, 2015, ECLI:ES:TS:2015:3194	12.4.1.1.2, 12.4.1.1.2.3
Judgment of the Supreme Court 263/2017 of May 3, 2017, ECLI:ES:TS:2017:1653	12.4.1.1.1, 12.4.1.1.2, 12.7.2.1
Judgment of the Supreme Court 389/2019 of July 3, 2019, ECLI:ES:TS:2019:2244	12.4.1.1.1, 12.5.2, 12.5.4, 12.5.5
Judgment of the Supreme Court 505/2021 of July 7, 2021, ECLI:ES:TS:2021:2713	12.4.1.2
Judgment of the Supreme Court 124/2022 of February 16, 2022, ECLI:ES:TS:2022:531	12.4.1.1.1, 12.4.1.1.2, 12.4.1.1.2.3
Order of the Provincial Court of Barcelona of May 29, 2019, ECLI:ES:APB:2019:7520A	12.2.2

Table of Laws and Regulations

International Instruments

Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure	3.2.3, 4.1.3.5, 6.1.4
Locarno Agreement establishing an International Classification for Industrial Designs	4.1.3.5
Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property	2.1.1, 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.11.2.1, 4.1.3.5, 6.1.4, 7.1.1
Art 4	3.1.3.4, 3.2.3.3, 3.11.2.1
Art 4 <i>bis</i>	3.1.6
Art 19	11.1.1
Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)	2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 3.1.7, 3.2.1, 3.2.3.3, 4.1.1.2, 4.1.2, 4.1.3.5, 5.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.4.3, 6.1.4.4, 6.1.5, 7.1.1, 7.1.3, 8.1.2, 9.1.1.3, 9.1.2, 10.2.1, 12.1.1
Art 45	11.1.1
Patent Law Treaty	3.4
Art 10	3.4
Strasbourg Agreement concerning the International Patent Classification	4.1.3.5
WTO General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade	6.1.1, 6.1.4, 10.12.1.1
WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights	2.1.1, 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.11.2.1, 4.1.1.2, 4.1.3.5, 6.1.1, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.4.1, 6.1.4.2, 6.1.4.4.3, 6.1.4.4, 6.1.4.4.5, 10.12.1.1
Annex	2.10
Art 6	6.1.4.2
Art 7	6.1.1
Art 8	6.1.4.2
Art 25	4.8.6
Art 27	6.1.4.1, 6.1.4.4.4
Art 28	3.5.1.1, 6.5.2.1
Art 30	6.1.5
Art 31	2.10.1, 6.10.1
Art 31 <i>bis</i>	6.1.4.2, 6.10.1
Art 33	6.1.4.4.4
Art 34	4.3.2.5.4, 6.6.1
Art 65	6.1.4.4.3
Art 70	6.1.4.1, 6.1.4.4.3
S 5	6.1.4.1

European Instruments

Agreement on a Unified Patent Court	12.1.1
Art 32	11.3.3
Art 65(2)	11.3.3
Convention for the European Patent for the Common Market (Community Patent Convention)	9.1.1.3, 9.5.1
Art 25	9.5.1
Art 26	9.5.1
Convention on the Grant of European Patents (European Patent Convention (EPC))	5.1.2, 5.4.2, 5.5.1, 5.6.3.3.2, 5.6.4, 9.1.1.3, 9.4, 9.5.2, 11.1.1, 11.2, 11.3.2, 11.3.3, 11.6, 12.1.1
Art 1	11.6.2.2
Art 2	11.6.2.2, 12.1.1
Art 3	11.6.2.2
Art 4	11.2.1

Art 14	11.6.8.3
Art 15	11.2.1
Art 16	11.6.10
Art 21	11.3.2.2, 11.6.2.1
Art 23	11.3.2.1
Art 26	11.2.1
Art 54	5.4.2.1.2, 12.4.1.1.1
Art 55	5.4.2.1.2
Art 56	5.4.2.1.3
Art 61	5.6.4.2
Art 64	5.1.2, 11.3.3, 12.1.1
Art 68	11.2.2
Art 69	5.5.1, 5.6.3.3.2, 5.6.4.4, 9.5.2, 12.5.2
Art 99	11.2.2, 11.3.3
Art 100	5.4.2.4, 9.4, 11.2.2, 11.3.3, 11.4, 11.6.5.3
Art 101	11.2.2, 11.4
Art 104	11.6.10
Art 106	11.2.1, 11.2.2
Art 107	11.2.2
Art 108	11.6.3.1
Art 112	11.3.2.3
Art 114	11.2.2
Art 116	11.2.2, 11.6.8.1
Art 117	11.6.6
Art 123	5.4.2.4, 11.2.2, 11.4, 12.4.1.3
Art 128	11.6.7
Art 133	11.6.2.3
Art 134	11.6.2.3
Art 138	5.4.2.4, 11.3.3, 11.4, 12.6.5
Art 142	11.1.1
Art 144	11.6.7
R 4	11.6.8.3
R 12	11.3.1, 11.6.2.2
R 14	5.6.4.2
R 99	11.6.3.1
R 102	11.6.9.2
R 115	11.6.5.2, 11.6.8.3
R 125	11.6.9.2
R 126	11.6.9.2
R 127	11.6.9.2
R 144	11.6.7
R 152	11.6.2.3
S 130(7)	9.1.1.3
Convention on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (Lugano Convention)	5.6.3.1, 9.6.2.1
Council Regulation (EEC) No 1768/92 concerning the creation of a supplementary protection certificate for medicinal products	12.13.1
Directive 2001/82/EC on the Community code relating to veterinary medicinal products	5.5.3.4
Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use	5.5.3.4
Directive 2004/48/EC on the enforcement of intellectual property rights	5.1.2, 5.6.5.4.2, 5.6.6.3, 5.7.5, 9.7.2, 12.7, 12.7.1
Art 13	12.7.2.3
Guidelines for Examination in the European Patent Office (EPO), Part G, Chapter VII	
S 4	12.4.1.1.2
S 5.1	12.4.1.1.2.1
S 5.3	12.4.1.1.2.3

Regulation (EC) No 1610/96 concerning the creation of a supplementary protection certificate for plant protection products	9.1.1.2, 12.13.1
Regulation (EC) No 816/2006 on compulsory licensing of patents relating to the manufacture of pharmaceutical products for export to countries with public health problems	12.13.2
Regulation (EC) No 469/2009 concerning the supplementary protection certificate for medicinal products	9.1.1.2, 12.13.1
Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (recast) (Brussels Ia Regulation)	5.6.3.1, 5.6.4.2, 12.9.2
Regulation (EU) No 608/2013 concerning customs enforcement of intellectual property rights	5.10, 12.12
Regulation (EU) No 2019/933 concerning the supplementary protection certificate for medicinal products	12.13.1

Australia (Chapter 2)

Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977 (Cth), s 5	2.2.2.5
Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977 (Cth), s 5	2.2.2.5
Commonwealth	2.1.1
Constitution, s 51 (xviii)	2.1.1
Competition and Consumer Act 2010	2.10.1
Federal Court of Australia Act 1976 (Cth)	2.3.1, 2.6.2, 2.6.4, 2.6.6.2, 2.6.9, 2.6.10, 2.7.2.1, 2.9.1
Federal Court of Australia, Central Practice Note: National Court Framework and Case Management (CPN-1)	2.6.3, 2.6.5, 2.6.10
Federal Court of Australia, Costs Practice Note (GPN-COSTS)	2.7.4
Federal Court of Australia, Expert Evidence Practice Note (GPN-EXPT)	2.4.2, 2.6.7.1
Federal Court of Australia, Freezing Orders Practice Note (GPN-FRZG)	2.7.3
Federal Court of Australia, Intellectual Property Practice Note (IP-1)	2.5.1, 2.6.1, 2.6.3, 2.6.4, 2.6.5
Federal Court of Australia, Search Orders Practice Note (GPN-SRCH)	2.7.3
Federal Court of Australia, Subpoenas and Notices to Produce Practice Note (GPN-SUBP)	2.6.5.4
Federal Court of Australia, Usual Undertaking as to Damages Practice Note (GPN-UNDR)	2.6.4.3
Federal Court Rules 2011 (Cth)	2.2.2.6, 2.3.1, 2.4.1, 2.6.2, 2.6.5, 2.6.10, 2.7.4, 2.9.1
Intellectual Property Laws Amendment (Productivity Commission Response Part 1 and Other Measures) Act 2018 (Cth)	2.1.1
Intellectual Property Laws Amendment (Productivity Commission Response Part 2 and Other Measures) Act 2020 (Cth)	2.1.1, 2.10.1
Intellectual Property Laws Amendment (Raising the Bar) Act 2012 (Cth)	2.1.1, 2.2.2, 2.5.1
Patents Act 1903 (Cth)	2.1.1
Patents Act 1952 (Cth)	2.1.1, 2.10
Patents Act 1990 (Cth)	2.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1
S 7	2.2.2.3
S 18	2.1.1, 2.2.2.3
S 19	2.7.3
S 27	2.2.2.3
S 28	2.2.2.3
S 42	2.6.1
S 49	2.2.2
S 97	2.6.1
S 100	2.2.2.1
S 101	2.2.2.7, 2.6.1
S 116	2.5.1.6
S 120	2.6.1
S 122	2.7
S 125	2.6.1, 2.8
S 128	2.6.1, 2.8.2
S 131	2.8.2
S 133	2.10

S 136	2.10
S 138	2.6.1
S 154	2.2.2, 2.6.1
S 155	2.2.2
S 156	2.2.2.4
S 158	2.2.2.4
S 159	2.2.2.6
S 160	2.2.2.6
S 165	2.6.1
S 169	2.6.1
S 171	2.6.1
S 192	2.6.1
S 205	2.2.1
S 224	2.2.2.5
Patents Regulations 1991 (Cth)	2.1, 2.2.2.1
Reg 5.4	2.2.2.1
Reg 9.2	2.2.2.1
Reg 12.1	2.10
Reg 22.12	2.2.2.3
Reg 22.13	2.2.2.3
Reg 22.26	2.2.2.5
Reg 34.31	2.2.2.6

Brazil (Chapter 3)

Constitution

Art 5(XXIX)	3.1.1
Art 92	3.3.1
Art 93	3.3.4
Art 109	3.3.1
Decree No. 1,355, of December 30, 1994 (Promulgation of the Final Act of the Uruguay Round)	3.1.1
Decree No. 2,553, of April 16, 1998 (Implementation of Articles 75, 88 to 93 of Law No. 9,279 of May 14, 1996 on Industrial Property)	3.2.3.5
Decree No. 8,854, of September 22, 2016 (Approval of the Regimental Structure and Demonstrative Framework of the Commission Positions and the Trust Functions of the National Institute of Industrial Property-INPI)	3.2.1
Federal Law No. 3,689, of Oct. 13, 1941 (Code of Criminal Procedure)	3.10
Federal Law No. 5,648, of December 11, 1970 (National Institute of Industrial Property - INPI)	3.2.1
Federal Law No. 6,404, of December 15, 1976 (Corporation Law)	3.3.2
Federal Law No. 8,955, of December 15, 1994 (Franchising Law)	3.3.2
Federal Law No. 9,279, of May 14, 1996 (Law on Industrial Property (LPI))	3.1.1, 3.11.2
Art 2	3.2.1
Art 6	3.1.4, 3.5.1.1
Art 7	3.1.4
Art 8	3.1.2, 3.1.3.7
Art 9	3.1.2, 3.1.3.7
Art 10	3.1.3.7
Art 11	3.1.3.4, 3.1.3.7, 3.2.3
Art 12	3.1.3.4, 3.2.3, 3.5.2
Art 13	3.1.3.5, 3.1.3.7
Art 14	3.1.3.7
Art 15	3.1.3.6, 3.1.3.7
Art 16	3.1.3.4, 3.2.3.3, 3.2.4
Art 17	3.1.3.4
Art 18	3.1.3.7
Art 19	3.2.3

Art 20	3.2.3, 3.2.4
Art 22	3.2.3
Art 23	3.2.3
Art 24	3.1.3.2, 3.1.3.3, 3.1.3.7, 3.2.3, 3.2.3.5, 3.2.4.1
Art 25	3.1.3.7, 3.2.3, 3.2.4.1
Art 26	3.2.3
Art 29	3.1.4, 3.2.4
Art 30	3.2.3.5, 3.2.4
Art 31	3.2.3.8
Art 32	3.2.3.8
Art 33	3.2.4
Art 34	3.2.4
Art 35	3.2.4
Art 36	3.2.4
Art 37	3.2.4
Art 38	3.1.6
Art 39	3.1.6
Art 40	3.1.6
Art 41	3.1.3.3, 3.5
Art 42	3.1.4, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.1.2
Art 43	3.1.4, 3.5.1.1, 3.5.2
Art 44	3.1.4, 3.7.2
Art 45	3.5.1.1, 3.5.2
Art 46	3.1.4, 3.4
Art 47	3.2.4.1, 3.4
Art 48	3.4
Art 49	3.1.4, 3.1.6, 3.4
Art 50	3.1.4, 3.2.4.1
Art 51	3.2.4.1
Art 56	3.4
Art 57	3.2.4.1, 3.3.1
Art 61	3.11.1
Art 62	3.11.1
Art 63	3.11.1
Art 64	3.11.1
Art 67	3.11.1
Art 68	3.2.3.3, 3.5.1.5, 3.11.1
Art 69	3.11.1
Art 70	3.11.1
Art 71	3.11.1
Art 72	3.11.1
Art 73	3.11.1
Art 74	3.11.1
Art 75	3.2.3.5, 3.2.3.6
Art 76	3.1.2
Art 77	3.1.2
Art 80	3.2.3.3
Art 87	3.2.3.7
Art 88	3.1.5
Art 89	3.1.5
Art 90	3.1.5
Art 91	3.1.5
Art 92	3.1.5
Art 183	3.5.1.3
Art 184	3.5.1.1, 3.5.1.3
Art 185	3.5.1.2, 3.5.1.3

Art 186	3.5.1.3, 3.5.1.3
Art 199	3.10
Art 201	3.7.3
Art 203	3.7.3
Art 204	3.7.3
Art 205	3.10
Art 206	3.6.6
Art 207	3.7.2
Art 208	3.7.2
Art 209	3.7.1, 3.7.2
Art 210	3.7.2
Art 212	3.2.4
Art 214	3.2.4.2
Art 215	3.2.4.2
Art 216	3.2.2
Art 217	3.2.2
Art 218	3.2.4.2
Art 219	3.2.4.2
Art 220	3.2.4.2
Art 221	3.2.4
Art 222	3.2.4
Art 223	3.2.4
Art 224	3.2.4
Art 225	3.7.2
Art 226	3.2.3.4
Art 227	3.2.1
Art 229	3.11.2
Art 240	3.11.2
Arts 3-93	3.2.1
Arts 50-55	3.2.3.8
Arts 61-74	3.11.1
Arts 201-204	3.7.3
Arts 208-209	3.7.2
Arts 212-220	3.2.4.2
Arts 212-244	3.2.1, 3.2.4
Federal Law No. 9,307, of September 23, 1996 (Arbitration Law)	3.3.2
Federal Law No. 9,456, of April 25, 1997 (Plant Variety Protection Law)	3.1.1
Federal Law No. 10,196, of February 14, 2001	3.2.1, 3.11.2
Federal Law No. 11,101, of February 9, 2005 (Bankruptcy Law)	3.6.1.2
Art 6	3.6.1.2
Federal Law No. 13,105, of March 16, 2015 (Civil Procedure Code (CPC))	3.1.1, 3.2.4, 3.3, 3.5
Art 2	3.6.2
Art 3	3.6.7
Art 5	3.6.3
Art 6	3.6.3
Art 46	3.6.1
Art 53	3.6.1
Art 55	3.6.1
Art 56	3.6.1
Art 58	3.6.1
Art 59	3.6.1
Art 64	3.6.1
Art 67	3.12
Art 68	3.12
Art 69	3.12
Art 85	3.7.2.2

Art 113	3.6.2.2
Art 139	3.6.3
Art 141	3.6.2.1, 3.6.3, 3.9
Art 189	3.6.6
Art 190	3.6.3
Art 191	3.6.3
Art 219	3.9
Art 278	3.6.3
Art 300	3.4, 3.7.1, 3.8.1
Art 301	3.7.1, 3.8.1
Art 302	3.7.1, 3.8.1
Art 303	3.7.1
Art 304	3.7.1
Art 305	3.7.1
Art 306	3.7.1
Art 307	3.7.1
Art 308	3.7.1
Art 309	3.7.1
Art 310	3.7.1
Art 311	3.7.1
Art 313	3.4, 3.6.1.1
Art 314	3.6.1.1
Art 318	3.6.4
Art 319	3.6.2.1
Art 320	3.6.2.1
Art 329	3.6.2.1
Art 334	3.6.3, 3.6.7
Art 335	3.6.2.3
Art 336	3.6.2.2
Art 341	3.6.2.2
Art 343	3.6.2.3
Art 347	3.6.2.1
Art 357	3.6.3, 3.6.5.2
Art 373	3.6.2.2, 3.6.3, 3.9.2
Art 434	3.6.2.1
Art 459	3.6.5.2
Art 465	3.6.5
Art 470	3.6.5
Art 473	3.6.2.1
Art 475	3.6.5
Art 485	3.4, 3.9
Art 513	3.8.1
Art 515	3.8.1
Art 517	3.8.1
Art 519	3.8.1
Art 520	3.8.1
Art 523	3.8.2
Art 525	3.8.2
Art 526	3.8.2
Art 536	3.8.2
Art 537	3.8.2
Art 538	3.8.2
Art 994	3.9
Art 995	3.9
Art 996	3.9
Art 1000	3.9

Art 1001	3.9
Art 1003	3.9
Art 1007	3.9
Art 1008	3.9
Art 1009	3.9
Art 1010	3.9.1
Art 1012	3.9.1
Art 1013	3.9.1
Art 1014	3.9.1
Art 1015	3.9.2
Art 1016	3.9.2
Art 1019	3.9.2
Art 1020	3.9.2
Art 1021	3.9.4
Art 1022	3.9.3
Art 1023	3.9.3
Art 1024	3.9.3
Art 1026	3.9.3
Art 1029	3.9.5
Art 1035	3.9.5
Art 1042	3.8.1, 3.9.6
Art 1043	3.9.7
Art 1044	3.9.7
Arts 42-53	3.6.1
Arts 300-311	3.7.1
Arts 335-342	3.6.2.2
Arts 450-463	3.6.5.2
Arts 513-522	3.8
Arts 523-538	3.8
Arts 1009-1014	3.9.1
Arts 1015-1020	3.9.2
Arts 1022-1027	3.9
Arts 1029-1040	3.9.5
Federal Law No. 13,140, of June 26, 2015 (Mediation Law)	3.6.7
INPI Internal Rules	
Article 140	3.2.1
Article 141	3.2.1
INPI Normative Rulings	
No. 30, of March 18, 2013	3.2.1, 3.2.3
No. 31, of December 4, 2013	3.2.1, 3.2.3
No. 48, of February 18, 2016	3.2.1
Ordinance No. 11 of January 27, 2017 (Approval of the Internal Regulation of the National Institute of Industrial Property-INPI)	3.2.1
Resolution No. 350, of October 27, 2020, of the National Justice Council	3.12
China (Chapter 4)	
Administrative Procedure Law 2017	4.1.3, 4.6.4, 4.7.1
Art 63	4.1.3, 4.7.1
Ch IX	4.6.4
Civil 3 rd Requestion for Instruction No. 4 Reply dated July 12, 2002 (SPC)	4.5.1
Civil Code	4.1.3.1, 4.3.3, 4.4, 4.5.2, 4.5.3, 4.5.5.3.6
Art 123	4.1.3.1, 4.4

Art 132	4.5.5.3.6
Art 178	4.3.3
Art 179	4.4
Art 847	4.5.2
Art 849	4.5.2.1.4
Art 859	4.5.2.2
Art 860	4.5.2.2
Art 1168	4.3.3
Art 1169	4.3.3.2
Art 1185	4.1.3.1, 4.4, 4.4.3
Book III(XX) (“Technology Contracts”)	4.5.3
Civil Procedure Law 2017	4.1.3.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.5.5.3, 4.6
Art 13	4.5.5.3.6
Art 35	4.2.2
Art 36	4.2.2
Art 37	4.2.2.2
Art 59	4.6.4
Art 63	4.6.3.2
Art 76	4.6.3.2
Art 79	4.6.3.3
Art 81	4.6.1.2
Art 100	4.6.2
Art 101	4.6.2
Art 105	4.6.2.2.4
Art 164	4.2.3.1
Art 264	4.6.4
Arts 17-20	4.2.2
Ch II	4.2.2
Ch IX	4.5.5.3.5
Ch VI	4.6.1
Pt 4	4.6.4
Copyright Law	4.8.1
Criminal Law	4.9
Arts 213-220	4.9
Criminal Procedure Law 2018	4.1.3.1
Foreign Investment Law,	4.5.3
Art 22	4.5.3
Guidelines on Anti-monopoly in the Field of Intellectual Property Rights	4.5.4.2
Guidelines for Building a Powerful Country with Intellectual Property Rights (2021-2035)	4.1.5
Guidelines on the Definition of Relevant Markets	4.5.4.2
Guidelines for Patent Examination	4.1.3, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.1.6, 4.7
Art 26.4	4.3.1.4
Pt II	4.3.1.4
Guiding Opinions on the Selection of Technical Investigation Officers	4.6.3.1
Implementation Measures for Pharmaceutical Product Patent Disputes	4.5.5.3
Interim Measures for the Amended Patent Law	4.1.3.2
Interim Provisions on Technical Investigation Officers	4.6.3.1
Interpretation of the Civil Procedure Law	4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.5.5.3.5, 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.6.3.2
Art 2	4.2.2, 4.2.3
Art 98	4.6.1.2
Art 122	4.6.3.3
Art 123	4.6.3.3
Art 522	4.6.4

Arts 152-173	4.6.2
Ch 7	4.5.5.3.5
Ch 22	4.6.4
Pt 1	4.2.2
Interpretation of Criminal Infringement of Intellectual Property Rights	
Art 4	4.9
Art 10	4.9
Interpretation (II) of Patent Infringement Dispute Cases	4.1.3.3, 4.3.1.1, 4.3.1.3, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.1.6, 4.3.1.7, 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.5.4.1, 4.8.9
Art 1	4.3.1.1
Art 2	4.3.2.7, 4.3.3.2
Art 4	4.3.1.7
Art 5	4.3.2.1
Art 6	4.3.1.3
Art 7	4.3.1.6
Art 8	4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.3, 4.7.3.1
Art 10	4.3.2.5.2
Art 11	4.3.2.5
Art 12	4.3.2.2
Art 13	4.3.2.4
Art 18	4.3.2.8
Art 20	4.3.2.5.3
Art 22	4.3.4.1, 4.8.9
Art 24	4.4.1, 4.5.4.1
Art 25	4.3.4.3, 4.4.1
Art 26	4.4.1
Art 28	4.4.2.3
Art 29	4.3.2.7
Interpretation of Patent Infringement Dispute Cases	4.1.3.3, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.4.2, 4.5.1, 4.8.3, 4.8.4, 4.8.6
Art 1	4.3.1.1, 4.3.2.1
Art 2	4.3.1.2, 4.3.2.1, 4.7.3.1
Art 3	4.3.1.3, 4.7.3.1
Art 4	4.3.1.4
Art 5	4.3.2.6
Art 6	4.3.2.4
Art 7	4.3.2
Art 8	4.8.4.3, 4.8.8
Art 9	4.8.4.3
Art 10	4.8.3
Art 11	4.8.6.3.4, 4.8.8
Art 12	4.8.6.3.4, 4.8.7
Art 13	4.3.2.5.3
Art 14	4.3.4.1, 4.8.9
Art 15	4.3.4.4
Art 16	4.4.2.2
Art 17	4.3.2.5.4
Art 18	4.5.1
Interpretation of Punitive Damages in Intellectual Property Civil Cases	4.1.3.3, 4.4.3
Art 3	4.4.3.2
Art 4	4.4.3.3
Interpretation of Technology Contracts	4.1.3.3, 4.5.2.1
Law on Anti-unfair Competition	4.8.1
Law on the Laws Applicable to Foreign-Related Civil Relations	4.6.4
Art 48	4.6.4
Art 49	4.6.4

Art 50	4.6.4
Law on the Organization of the People's Court	
Art 18	4.1.3.3, 4.1.4
Art 51	4.6.3.1
Legislation Law 2000	4.1.3.1
Art 42	4.1.3.1
Patent Law 1984	4.1.1, 4.1.3.2, 4.8.5
Patent Law 1992	4.1.1.2, 4.1.3.2, 4.8.5
Patent Law 2000	4.1.1.2, 4.1.3.2, 4.8.6.3
Patent Law 2008	4.1.1.2, 4.1.3.4, 4.3.4.1, 4.7.2, 4.7.5.1, 4.8.5, 4.8.8, 4.8.9
Patent Law 2020	
Art 2	4.7.2, 4.8
Art 5	4.7.2, 4.8.2.2
Art 6	4.5.2.1
Art 9	4.3.4.4, 4.7.4, 4.8.2.2
Art 11	4.3.2.5.3, 4.3.2.8, 4.4.1, 4.5.4.1, 4.5.5.3.2, 4.5.5.3.5, 4.8.7
Art 13	4.3.2.8
Art 15	4.5.2.1.4
Art 16	4.5.2.1.4
Art 20	4.5.5.3.6
Art 22	4.3.4.1, 4.3.4.2, 4.7.5, 4.7.6, 4.7.7, 4.7.9.1, 4.8.5, 4.8.6
Art 23	4.8.2.2, 4.8.4.3, 4.8.5, 4.8.6
Art 24	4.7.5.3
Art 25	4.7.2, 4.8.2.2
Art 26	4.7.8, 4.7.9, 4.7.10, 4.7.11
Art 27	4.8.2.2, 4.8.4
Art 29	4.8.5
Art 31	4.8.4.2
Art 33	4.7.12, 4.8.2.2
Art 42	4.5.5.1, 4.8.5
Art 45	4.8.2.2
Art 46	4.8.2.2
Art 47	4.3.2.7, 4.5.5.3.6, 4.6.2.2.4
Art 59	4.3.1.2, 4.8.4.3, 4.8.8
Art 61	4.3.2.5.4, 4.6.2.1
Art 64	4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.7.3, 4.8.4
Art 66	4.3.2.5.4, 4.6.1.2, 4.6.2
Art 67	4.5.5.3.2, 4.8.9
Art 68	4.9
Art 69	4.3.4.4
Art 71	4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.6.1.2
Art 73	4.6.1.2
Art 75	4.3.4.4, 4.3.4.5, 4.5.5.3.2
Art 76	4.2.3.2.3, 4.5.5
Art 77	4.3.4.3
Arts 45-46	4.3.1.7
Provisions on Act Preservation in Intellectual Property Disputes	4.1.3.3, 4.5.5.3.5, 4.6.2
Art 3	4.6.2.2
Art 6	4.6.2.2
Art 7	4.6.2.2.3
Art 8	4.6.2.2.3
Art 9	4.6.2.2.3
Art 10	4.6.2.2.3
Art 16	4.6.2.2.4
Provisions on Case Guidance Work	4.1.4

Art 2	4.1.4
Provisions on Cases of Monopoly Disputes	4.5.4.2
Art 3	4.5.4.2
Provisions on the Causes of Action in Civil Cases	4.1.3.3, 4.2.1
Provisions on Evidence in Civil Procedures involving Intellectual Property Rights	4.1.3.3, 4.3.2.5.4, 4.4.2, 4.6.1, 4.6.3.2, 4.6.4
Art 3	4.3.2.5.4
Art 31	4.4.2.5
Art 32	4.4.2
Arts 8-10	4.6.4
Pt 4	4.6.1
Provisions on the Intellectual Property Court	4.1.3.3, 4.2.3, 4.5.5.3
Art 1	4.2.3
Art 2	4.2.3, 4.5.5.3
Provisions on the Jurisdiction of the Intellectual Property Courts	4.1.3.3
Provisions on Patent Grant and Confirmation	4.1.3.3, 4.7, 4.8
Art 1	4.7.1
Art 2	4.7.3.1
Art 3	4.7.3.1
Art 4	4.7.3.1
Art 6	4.7.9.1, 4.7.10
Art 7	4.7.8
Art 8	4.7.10
Art 10	4.7.9.1
Art 13	4.7.6.1.2
Art 14	4.8.3
Art 15	4.8.3, 4.8.4
Art 16	4.8.6
Art 17	4.8.6.1, 4.8.6.3
Art 19	4.8.6.2
Art 20	4.8.3, 4.8.6.3.2
Arts 17-21	4.8.4.3
Provisions on the Patent Rights of Drugs	4.1.3.3, 4.2.3.2.3, 4.5.5
Art 1	4.1.3.3, 4.2.3.2.3, 4.5.5.3
Art 5	4.5.5.3.7
Art 10	4.5.5.3.5
Art 12	4.5.5.3.6
Provisions on the Pre-litigation Cessation of Patent Infringement	4.6.2
Provisions on Technical Investigation Officers	4.6.3.1
Provisions on the Trial of Cases by Internet Courts	
Art 11	4.6.1
Art 13	4.6.1
Arts 14-19	4.6.1
Provisions on the Trial of Patent Disputes	4.1.3.3, 4.2.1, 4.2.3, 4.3.1.2, 4.3.2, 4.4.2, 4.9
Art 1	4.2.1, 4.9
Art 2	4.2.3.2
Art 3	4.2.3.2
Art 13	4.3.1.2, 4.3.2
Art 14	4.4.2
Art 15	4.4.2
Regulations on the Implementation of the Law on Chinese-Foreign Equity Joint Ventures	4.5.3
Regulations on Patent Commissioning	4.1.3.2
Regulations on Technology Import and Export Administration	4.5.3
Regulatory Measures on National Standards involving Patents (Interim)	4.5.4.1
Reply on Compensation for a Plaintiff's Abuse of Rights	4.1.3.3, 4.4.2.4

Rules for the Implementation of the Patent Law	4.1.3, 4.3.1, 4.3.2.8, 4.5.2.1, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9
Art 11	4.8.5
Art 12	4.5.2.1
Art 13	4.5.2.1.4
Art 20	4.7.11
Art 21	4.3.1
Art 28	4.8.4.2
Art 43	4.8.2.2
Art 44	4.7.1, 4.8.2
Art 47	4.8.4.3
Art 53	4.7.1
Art 65	4.7.1
Art 69	4.7.12.2
Art 84	4.9
Art 85	4.3.2.8
Arts 76-78	4.5.2.1
Rules for the Implementation of the Provisions on Case Guidance	4.1.4
Arts 9-11	4.1.4
Rules of Online Litigation of People's Courts	4.6.1
Temporary Regulations for the Protection of Invention Right and Patent Right 1950	4.1.1

Germany (Chapter 5)

Basic Law (Constitution)	5.1, 5.3.1, 5.5.3.4
Art 5	5.5.3.4
Art 103(1)	5.9.2.1
Civil Code	
S 242	5.8.3
S 259	5.8.3
S 823 <i>et seq</i>	5.6.3.1
Code of Civil Procedure	5.4.1.2.8, 5.4.1.3, 5.4.3.2, 5.5.3, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10, 5.11
S 3	5.7.7
S 78	5.6.3.4
S 128	5.6.9
S 138	5.5.3, 5.6.4.3, 5.6.4.6, 5.6.6.1
S 139	5.5.3, 5.6.9
S 142	5.5.3.3, 5.6.7.3
S 144	5.6.7.3
S 148	5.5.3.3, 5.6.1
S 156	5.6.9, 5.6.10
S 159	5.6.9
S 195	5.6.5.2
S 220	5.6.9
S 253	5.6.4, 5.7.7
S 256	5.6.2.1, 5.6.3.3, 5.7.6
S 261	5.6.4
S 263	5.6.4.5, 5.9.1
S 264	5.6.4.5
S 271	5.6.4.1
S 274	5.6.4.1
S 275	5.6.4.1
S 276	5.6.4
S 278	5.6.9
S 283	5.6.9
S 286	5.6.7

S 294	5.6.5.3, 5.6.5.4
S 296	5.6.9
S 300	5.6.10
S 306	5.6.10
S 307	5.6.10
S 310	5.6.9, 5.6.10
S 312	5.6.10
S 322	5.6.4.4, 5.6.4.5
S 330	5.6.10
S 331	5.6.10
S 355	5.4.1.3
S 358a	5.6.7
S 373	5.4.1.3.2, 5.6.7.2
S 377	5.6.7.2
S 383	5.6.7.2
S 384	5.6.7.2
S 402	5.4.1.3, 5.6.7.1
S 404	5.6.7.1
S 411	5.6.7.1
S 420	5.6.7.3
S 421	5.6.7.3
S 422	5.6.7.3
S 423	5.6.7.3
S 485	5.6.6.3
S 511	5.9.1
S 513	5.9.1
S 517	5.9.1
S 519	5.9.1
S 520	5.9.1
S 524	5.9.1
S 525	5.9.1.3
S 529	5.9.1
S 531	5.9.1
S 533	5.9.1
S 538	5.9.1
S 545	5.9.2.3
S 546	5.9.2.3
S 547	5.9.2.3
S 548	5.9.2.3
S 549	5.9.2.3
S 551	5.9.2.3
S 555	5.9.2.4
S 561	5.9.2.4
S 562	5.9.2.4
S 563	5.9.2.4
S 567	5.8.2
S 570	5.8.2
S 704	5.8.1
S 707	5.8.4
S 708	5.8.1
S 709	5.8.1
S 717	5.9.1.3
S 719	5.8.4, 5.9.1.4
S 724	5.8.1
S 725	5.8.1

S 750	5.6.10, 5.8.1
S 758a	5.6.6.3
S 793	5.8.2
S 794	5.8.1
S 888	5.8.3
S 890	5.8.2
S 891	5.8.2, 5.8.3
S 916	5.6.5
S 920	5.6.5.3, 5.6.5.4
S 921	5.6.5.3
S 922	5.6.5.2
S 924	5.6.5
S 928	5.6.5.3
S 929	5.6.5
S 936	5.6.5.2
S 937	5.6.5
S 945	5.6.5
Court Costs Act	
S 12	5.7.7.2
S 51	5.7.7
Courts Constitution Act	5.6, 5.6.8, 5.6.9
S 75	5.6.9
S 169	5.6.8, 5.6.9
SS 172-174	5.6.8, 5.6.9
Criminal Code	5.6.8
S 353d	5.6.8
Judicial Remuneration and Compensation Act	5.4.1.3.1
Lawyers' Fees Act	5.7.7.3
Patent Act	5.1, 5.3.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.9, 5.10, 5.11
S 1	5.4.2
S 2	5.4.2
S 3	5.4.2
S 4	5.4.2
S 5	5.4.2
S 8	5.4.2.3
S 9	5.5.2, 5.6.3.3.2
S 10	5.5.2.2
S 11	5.5.3.4
S 12	5.5.3.2
S 14	5.5.1, 5.6.3.3.2
S 15	5.5.3.3
S 17	5.6.3
S 21	5.4.1.2.6, 5.4.2
S 22	5.4.1.2.6, 5.4.2
S 24	5.5.3.3, 5.11.1
S 25	5.4.1.2.2
S 32	5.6.3.1, 5.6.3.2
S 69	5.4.1.2.7
S 80	5.4.1.2.2
S 81	5.4.1.2, 5.6.3, 5.11.1.3
S 82	5.4.1.2.3
S 83	5.3.1, 5.4.1.2.4, 5.4.1.2.6
S 84	5.4.1.2.8, 5.11.1.3

S 87	5.4.1.2.3
S 88	5.4.1.3
S 91	5.4.1.2.7, 5.5.2.1
S 92	5.4.1.2.7
S 94	5.4.1.2.7
S 97	5.4.1.2.2, 5.6.3.4
S 99	5.4.1.2.3, 5.4.1.2.5
S 111	5.4.3.2, 5.4.3.4
S 112	5.4.3.4
S 113	5.6.3.4
S 116	5.4.3.2
S 117	5.4.3.2
S 126	5.4.1.2
S 128a	5.4.1.3.1
S 139	5.7.1
S 140a	5.7.2, 5.8.3
S 140b	5.8.3
S 140c	5.6.1, 5.6.6.3, 5.6.7.3
S 140e	5.7.5
S 142a	5.10
S 143	5.6.3.2, 5.7.7.3
S 145	5.6.4.6, 5.6.6.3, 5.6.8, 5.9.1.2
Protection of Trade Secrets Act	5.6.6.3, 5.6.8
SS 16-20	5.6.6.3, 5.6.8
Stock Corporation Act 1965	5.4.1.2.2

India (Chapter 6)

Code of Civil Procedure 1908 (Civil Procedure Code)	6.6.4, 6.6.5, 6.6.6, 6.6.9, 6.7, 6.9.2, 6.11
Commercial Courts Act 2015	6.3.1.2, 6.6.2, 6.6.3, 6.6.6, 6.6.7, 6.6.9, 6.11.2
Constitution	6.1.1, 6.3.1
Copyright Act 1957	6.5.3
Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules 2018	6.6.5, 6.6.8.4
Designs Act 2000	6.2.1
Evidence Act 1872	6.6.7.2, 6.6.7.3, 6.6.8.2
High Court of Delhi Rules Governing Patent Suits (2022)	6.5.1.1, 6.6.5, 6.6.8.3, 6.11.3
National Intellectual Property Rights Policy 2016	6.2.1.4
Patents Act 1970	6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.10, 6.11
Ch XVIII	6.5
S 2	6.2.2.3.3
S 3	6.1.4.4.3
S 4	6.1.4.4.3
S 5	6.1.4.1, 6.1.4.4.3
S 8	6.2.2.2, 6.5.4
S 13	6.4
S 24	6.1.4.4
S 25	6.2.2.2, 6.2.2.3, 6.4
S 29	6.2.2.2
S 47	6.5.3
S 48	6.5.2, 6.5.3
S 54	6.1.4.4.4

S 64	6.4, 6.5.4
S 66	6.4, 6.10.1
S 84	6.4
S 92	6.4
S 102	6.4
S 104	6.6.1, 6.6.2, 6.6.7.2
S 105	6.8.2
S 107	6.1.4.4.4, 6.5.3
S 108	6.7
S 109	6.6.2
S 110	6.6.2
S 115	6.6.8.3
Patents (Amendment) Act 1999	6.1.4.4.3
Patents (Amendment) Act 2002	6.1.4.4, 6.4
Patents (Amendment) Act 2005	6.1.4.1, 6.1.4.4.3, 6.1.4.4.5, 6.2.2.2, 6.4
Patents and Designs Act 1911	6.1.1, 6.1.2
Patents Rules 1972	6.1.2
Patents Rules 2003	6.1.4.4, 6.2.2.2, 6.6.8.3
Specific Relief Act 1963	6.7.1
Trade Marks Act 1999	6.2.1, 6.5.3

Japan (Chapter 7)

Act for the Establishment of the Intellectual Property High Court 2004	7.1.4.3, 7.8
Act for Partial Revision of the Code of Civil Procedure, etc. 2004	7.1.4.1
Administrative Case Litigation Act	7.4.6
Art 33	7.4.6
Civil Conciliation Act 1951	7.6.8
Civil Execution Act	7.6.4.5
Civil Provisional Remedies Act	
Art 12	7.6.4.3
Art 13	7.6.4.1, 7.6.4.2
Art 14	7.6.4.4
Art 23	7.6.4
Art 24	7.6.4
Art 37	7.6.4.6
Art 43	7.6.4.5
Code of Civil Procedure	7.1.4.1, 7.2.4.5.7, 7.3.1, 7.3.2.1, 7.3.3, 7.4.6, 7.5.3.3, 7.5.4.2, 7.6.1, 7.6.4, 7.6.5, 7.6.6, 7.6.7, 7.8
Art 6	7.6.1, 7.6.4.3, 7.8
Art 92-2	7.3.3.3.3, 7.3.3.3.4, 7.6.6.1
Art 92-8	7.3.3.3.4
Art 114	7.4.6
Art 115	7.4.6
Art 143	7.6.7
Art 157	7.5.4.2
Art 188	7.6.4.2
Art 220	7.6.5.1
Art 224	7.6.5.1.3
Art 285	7.6.1
Art 310-2	7.8
Art 313	7.6.1
Art 338	7.5.3.3

Court Act 1947	7.3.1
IP High Court, Guidelines for Proceedings of Suits against Appeal/Trial Decision Made by the JPO	7.5.4
IP High Court, Rules of Practice	7.3.2.1, 7.3.3.1
Patent Act	7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6
Art 1	7.5.1
Art 2	7.4.5.2, 7.5.3.1
Art 17-2	7.2.4.5.1, 7.5.3.1
Art 25	7.2.4.5.1
Art 29	7.2.4.5.1, 7.4.5.2, 7.5.3.1
Art 32	7.2.4.5.1
Art 36	7.2.4.5.1, 7.4.5.2, 7.5.1, 7.5.3.1
Art 38	7.2.4.5
Art 49	7.2.3, 7.5.3.1
Art 50	7.2.3
Art 70	7.2.4.1.5, 7.5.1.1, 7.5.1.3
Art 71	7.2.3.2
Art 74	7.2.4.5.1, 7.5.3.1.8
Art 100	7.6.4
Art 101	7.2.4.6, 7.5.2.8, 7.7.1
Art 102	7.6.7, 7.7.2
Art 103	7.7.2
Art 104	7.5.3, 7.6.3
Art 105	7.6.5.1, 7.6.5.2, 7.6.7
Art 106	7.6.4
Art 113	7.2.3.1, 7.2.4.3
Art 114	7.2.4.3
Art 115	7.2.4.3
Art 118	7.2.4.3
Art 119	7.2.4.3
Art 120	7.2.4.3, 7.2.4.5.1
Art 121	7.2.3.1, 7.2.4.2
Art 123	7.2.3.2, 7.2.4.5
Art 125	7.2.4.3
Art 126	7.2.3.2, 7.2.4.4, 7.2.4.5.1, 7.4.5.2, 7.5.4.1
Art 127	7.2.4.4, 7.5.4.3
Art 131	7.2.4.5.4
Art 132	7.2.4.4, 7.4.2
Art 134	7.2.4.5, 7.4.5.2, 7.5.4.1
Art 136	7.2.4.1.2
Art 145	7.2.4.5.6
Art 150	7.2.4.1.2
Art 153	7.2.4.5.5
Art 157	7.2.4.5.7
Art 164	7.2.4.5.7
Art 178	7.3.3, 7.4.1
Art 179	7.4.2
Art 181	7.4.5, 7.4.6
Art 186	7.5.1.3
Ch. III	7.2
Patent Law Enforcement Regulation	7.5.1.2
Art 24	7.5.1.2
Patent Monopoly Act 1885	7.1

Tokyo District Court, Proceedings Model for Patent Infringement Suit (Stage for Examination on Damages)	7.6
Tokyo District Court, Proceedings Model for Patent Infringement Suit (Stage for Examination on Infringement)	7.6

Korea (Republic of) (Chapter 8)

Administrative Litigation Act	8.4.2
Art 3	8.4.2.1
Art 9	8.4.2
Administrative Procedure Act	8.4.1
Art 8	8.4.1
Arbitration Act	8.6.11
Civil Act	8.5, 8.7.4
Civil Execution Act	8.6.2.1.3
Civil Procedure Act	8.4.1, 8.4.2.1, 8.5, 8.6.2, 8.6.7, 8.6.9
Constitution	8.1
Art 22	8.1
Court Organization Act	
Art 7	8.3.1, 8.6.2.2, 8.9.2.2
Art 28-4	8.6.2
Art 32	8.3.1, 8.6.2.2, 8.6.2.3, 8.9.2, 8.9.6
Art 62-2	8.3.2.2
Criminal Procedure Act	8.9.3, 8.9.4
Art 197	8.9.3
Art 245	8.9.3
Design Protection Act	8.6.2, 8.7.2
Invention Promotion Act	8.6.1, 8.7.2
Art 15	8.6.1, 8.7.2
Judicial Conciliation of Civil Disputes Act	8.6.11.4
Patent Act	8.1, 8.2.2, 8.3.1, 8.4.1.1, 8.4.1.2, 8.4.2, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7.3, 8.7.4, 8.9
Art 1	8.1
Art 94	8.5
Art 96	8.5.3.5, 8.6.1
Art 98	8.5.3.5
Art 100	8.5
Art 101	8.5
Art 102	8.5
Art 103	8.5.3.5
Art 104	8.5.3.5
Art 105	8.5.3.5
Art 106	8.5.3.5
Art 107	8.5.3.5
Art 122	8.5.3.5
Art 126	8.5, 8.6.1, 8.7.3
Art 127	8.5.2.4, 8.6.1, 8.7.4
Art 128	8.5, 8.6.1, 8.7.4
Art 129	8.6.1
Art 130	8.6.1, 8.7.4.2.4
Art 131	8.5
Art 132-2	8.2.2, 8.6.1, 8.6.9.3
Art 132-17	8.2.2
Art 133	8.2.2

Art 135	8.2.2
Art 136	8.2.2
Art 138	8.5.3.5
Art 146	8.2.2.1
Art 154	8.2.2.1
Art 163	8.2.2.2
Art 181	8.5.3.5
Art 182	8.5.3.5
Art 183	8.5.3.5
Art 186	8.3.1.4, 8.4.1.1, 8.4.1.2, 8.4.2, 8.6.2
Art 188	8.4.2.6
Art 189	8.4.2.10
Art 190	8.4.2
Art 203	8.4.2
Art 224	8.9
Art 225	8.5, 8.9
Art 226	8.9
Art 227	8.9
Art 228	8.9
Art 229	8.9
Art 230	8.9.5.1
Art 231	8.9.5.1
Art 347	8.6.9.3
Ch XII (penalty provisions)	8.3.1.2, 8.9
Patent Court, Bylaws on Case Assignment	8.3.1.4
Patent Court, Practice Directions for Civil Appellate Trial	8.6.1.1, 8.6.7.6, 8.8.1
Patent Court, Practice Directions for Revocation Trial	8.4.2.6, 8.4.2.7
Prosecutors' Office Act	8.9.3
Seoul Central District Court, Procedural Guidelines for Intellectual Property Litigation	8.6.1.1, 8.6.7.6
Supreme Court, Regulations on Establishment and Operation of the International Division	8.3.2.2
Trademark Act	8.6.2
Unfair Competition Prevention and Trade Secret Protection Act	8.6.9.2
Art 14-4	8.6.9.2
US martial law, Order no. 91	8.1.1
Utility Model Act	8.6.2, 8.7.2
United Kingdom (Chapter 9)	
Act of Sederunt (Rules of the Court of Session 1994)	9.3.1.4
Civil Jurisdiction and Judgments Act 1982	9.1.1.2
Civil Justice Council, Guidance for the Instruction of Experts in Civil Claims (Aug. 2014)	9.6.8.2
Civil Procedure Rules (CPR)	9.1.1.2, 9.3.1.2, 9.6-9.8
Part 63, Practice Direction 63	9.1.1.2, 9.3.1.2, 9.9.1.1, 9.9.4.1, 9.9.5, 9.9.12
Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, Patents Court Guide (2022)	9.1.1.2, 9.3.1.2, 9.6.4.1, 9.6.10, 9.6.13.2, 9.6.16, 9.9.1.1
HM Courts and Tribunals Service, Chancery Guide (2022)	9.1.1.2, 9.9.1.1
HM Courts and Tribunals Service, Intellectual Property Enterprise Court Guide (2022)	9.1.1.2, 9.9.1.1, 9.9.4.1, 9.9.4.2, 9.9.6
Intellectual Property (Enforcement, etc.) Regulations 2006	9.1.1.2, 9.3.1.4, 9.7.2
SI 2006/1028	9.1.1.2, 9.3.1.4, 9.7.2

Patents Act 1977	9.1.1.2, 9.1.1.3, 9.2, 9.4
Schedule 4A	9.1.1.2
S 14	9.1.1.3
S 60	9.1.1.3, 9.5
S 61	9.5, 9.7.3
S 70	9.5.5
S 71	9.5.4
S 72	9.1.1.3, 9.2, 9.4
S 75	9.4, 9.6.6
S 97	9.2
S 125	9.1.1.3, 9.5.2
S 128B	9.1.1.2
SS 1-6	9.1.1.3
Patents (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019	9.1.1.2
Patents Court, Patents Court Guide, Annex D: Practice Statement: Listing of cases for trial in the Patents Court	9.3.1.2
Patents Rules 2007	9.1.1.2, 9.2
Senior Courts Act 1981	
S 37	9.7.1
S 70	9.3.1.2
United States (Chapter 10)	
Administrative Procedure Act (APA)	10.2.2.4, 10.12.2.5.4, 10.12.2.10.4, 10.12.3, 10.15
America Invents Act 2011 (AIA)	10.1.1.2, 10.1.1.7, 10.2.1, 10.2.2, 10.3.3.3, 10.4, 10.6.13.2
18	10.2.1
135	10.2.1
Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act (BPCIA)	10.6.13.5, 10.13.2, 10.13.2.2, 10.15
Constitution	10.1, 10.2.3, 10.6.13
Seventh Amendment	10.1.1, 10.2.3, 10.3.2
Federal Courts Improvement Act 1982	10.1.1.5
Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act	10.1.1.6
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP)	10.6.5, 10.6.6.1, 10.6.6.2, 10.6.6.3, 10.6.7.2, 10.10.1.1, 10.12.2, 10.15
6(b)	10.6.13.6
9(b)	10.5.3.2, 10.6.5
12(b)	10.6.6.3, 10.15
12(c)	10.6.6.3
13(a)	10.6.5
16	10.6.6, 10.6.13.2.3
24	10.12.2.5.8, 10.15
26	10.6.6, 10.6.8, 10.6.10.3, 10.6.12
30(a)	10.6.8.4
33(a)	10.6.8.3
42(b)	10.6.13.1
48	10.3.2, 10.6.13.2.3
49(b)	10.6.13.4
50	10.6.13.3, 10.6.13.6
52	10.6.13.5
53	10.3.2, 10.6.11
54(d)	10.7.2.4
56(a)	10.6.9, 10.15
59(b)	10.6.13.6
60(b)	10.6.13.6
65	10.6.7

Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE)	10.3.2, 10.6.4, 10.6.6.2, 10.6.10, 10.6.11, 10.15
408	10.6.4, 10.6.6.2, 10.6.10
702	10.6.10, 10.15
704	10.6.10.2
705	10.6.10.2
706	10.3.2, 10.6.11
1006	10.6.10.3
Hatch-Waxman Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act 1984	10.1.1.6, 10.6.13.5, 10.13.2, 10.15
Intellectual Property and Communication Omnibus Reform Act 1999	10.2.1
Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act 1988	10.12.1
Patent Act 1790	10.1.1.2
Patent Act 1793	10.1.1.2
Patent Act 1836	10.1.1.2
Patent Act 1870	10.1.1.2
Patent Act 1952	10.1.1.2, 10.1.1.4
Sherman Antitrust Act 1890	10.1.1.3
Tariff Act 1930, s 337	10.12
Title 19 of the U.S. Code (Customs and International Trade)	10.12.1.1, 10.12.1.3, 10.12.2.2
Title 35 of the U.S. Code (Patents)	10.1.1.2, 10.2.1, 10.2.2, 10.5.2, 10.5.3, 10.6.5, 10.6.7, 10.6.10.4, 10.6.13.1, 10.7, 10.12.1.3, 10.12.2.6, 10.15
6	10.2.3
24	10.15
101	10.6.6, 10.6.6.3
102-03	10.2.2.5, 10.15
103	10.1.1.4
134	10.2.2.2
135	10.2.1.3, 10.2.2.6
141	10.2.2.4.4, 10.3.1, 10.15
145	10.3.1
251	10.2.2.1
251-252	10.2.1
257	10.2.1, 10.2.2.3
271	10.5.3.2, 10.6.6.3, 10.12.1.2.3, 10.12.1.3, 10.13.2.1.4.1, 10.13.2.2.2
282	10.6.10.2, 10.6.10.4
283	10.6.7.1.5, 10.12.2.6
284	10.7.2.2
287	10.6.5
301-02	10.2.2.2
303	10.2.2.2
304	10.2.2.2
305	10.2.2.2
306	10.2.2.2
301-07	10.2.1
311	10.2.2.4
311-19	10.2.1, 10.2.1.3
314	10.2.2.4, 10.2.2.4.2, 10.3.3.3
315	10.2.2.4.1, 10.2.2.4.3.5, 10.2.2.4.5
316	10.2.2.4.3.7
321	10.2.1.3, 10.2.2.5
321-29	10.2.1
324	10.2.2.5

Trade Act 1974	10.12.1.1
Uruguay Round Amendments Act 1994	10.12.1.1

The Boards of Appeal of the European Patent Office (Chapter 11)

Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal 2020

Art 1	11.6.2.2, 11.6.5.4
Art 5	11.6.5.1
Art 6	11.6.9.2
Art 10	11.6.5.1, 11.6.5.2
Art 12	11.6.1, 11.6.3.1, 11.6.3.2, 11.6.4
Art 13	11.6.3.2, 11.6.4
Art 15	11.6.8.1, 11.6.8.2, 11.6.8.3, 11.6.8.4, 11.6.9.1, 11.6.9.2, 11.6.9.3
Art 16	11.6.10
Art 17	11.6.5.3
Art 21	11.3.2.3

see also European Instruments, Convention on the Grant of European Patents (European Patent Convention (EPC))

Spain (Chapter 12)

Law No. 11/1986, of March 20, 1986, on Patents	12.1.1
Art 112	12.4.2.1
Law No. 29/1998, of July 13, 1998, regulating the Administrative Courts	
Art 46	12.4.6.2
Law No. 1/2000, of January 7, 2000, on Civil Procedure (LEC)	
Art 218	12.4.1.1.2.1
Art 241	12.7.6
Art 249	12.6.1
Art 250	12.6.1
Art 335	12.4.1.1.1, 12.5.2
Art 404	12.6.9.1.2
Art 447bis	12.6.1, 12.6.9.2
Art 726	12.6.4.3, 12.6.4.4
Art 728	12.6.4.4, 12.6.4.4.1, 12.6.4.4.2
Art 730	12.6.4.1
Arts 455 <i>et seq.</i>	12.10.1
Arts 477 <i>et seq.</i>	12.10.2
Law No. 34/2002, of July 11, 2002, on Information Society Services and Electronic Commerce	12.7.1
Law No. 24/2015, of July 24, 2015, on Patents	12.1.1
Art 2	12.5.1
Art 4	12.4.1.1
Art 5	12.4.1.1
Art 6	12.4.1.1.1, 12.4.1.1.2, 12.5.1
Art 10	12.4.1.5, 12.4.3, 12.8.2
Art 12	12.4.1.5, 12.8.2
Art 15	12.6.10.2
Art 17	12.6.10.2
Art 21	12.6.10.2
Art 27	12.4.1.2
Art 28	12.5.1
Art 30	12.4.1.1.1
Art 48	12.4.1.3, 12.4.1.4
Art 54	12.4.6.1
Art 59	12.5.4, 12.7, 12.11
Art 60	12.5.4, 12.5.6, 12.11

Art 67	12.11
Art 68	12.5.1, 12.5.2, 12.5.5
Art 69	12.6.7.1
Art 70	12.11
Art 71	12.5.4, 12.7.3
Art 72	12.7.1, 12.7.2.1
Art 73	12.9
Art 74	12.7.2.2, 12.9
Art 78	12.7.5
Art 81	12.4.1.1.2
Art 102	12.4, 12.4.1.2, 12.4.1.3, 12.4.1.4, 12.4.1.5, 12.4.2.1, 12.4.7, 12.5.3
Art 103	12.4.2.1, 12.4.3, 12.4.4, 12.4.5
Art 104	12.4.2.1, 12.4.2.2, 12.4.6.2, 12.8.3, 12.9
Art 116	12.4.6.2
Art 118	12.5.2, 12.6.3.1
Art 119	12.6.9.1.2
Art 120	12.5.3, 12.6.5.2, 12.6.9.1.2
Art 121	12.8.1
Art 122	12.6.8
Art 123	12.6.6.1
Art 128	12.6.4.3
Art 129	12.6.4.4.3
Art 130	12.6.4.1
Art 132	12.6.4.5
Art 137	12.5.1
Art 153	12.1.1
Art 155	12.1.1
Art 172	12.1.1
Arts 71 <i>et seq.</i>	12.5.4
Arts 90 <i>et seq.</i>	12.13.2
Arts 123 <i>et seq.</i>	12.6.2
Arts 116-136	12.6.1
Arts 127-132	12.6.4
Law No. 29/2015, of July 30, 2015, on International Legal Cooperation in Civil Matters	12.9.2
Law No. 1/2019, of February 20, 2019, on Trade Secrets	12.6.8
Organic Law No. 6/1985, of July 1, 1985, on the Judiciary	12.3.1
Art 80	12.4.6.1
Organic Law No. 10/1995, of November 23, 1995, of the Criminal Code	12.11
Art 273	12.11
Art 276	12.11
Art 277	12.11
Art 288	12.11
Organic Law No. 8/2003, of July 9, 2003, for the Reform of Insolvency Proceedings	12.3.2, 12.6.3.1
Organic Law No. 15/2003, of November 25, 2003, on the Criminal Code	12.11
Organic Law No. 7/2022, of July 27, 2022, on the Spanish Judiciary, with respect to the Commercial Courts	12.3.2, 12.6.3.2
Royal Decree No. 6/2023, of December 19, 2023, approving urgent measures for the implementation of the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan in matters of public justice service, civil service, local government regime and patronage	12.7.6
Royal Decree No. 260/1882, of September 14, 1882, approving the Law on Criminal Procedure	12.11
Art 795	12.11
Royal Decree No. 316/2017, of March 31, 2017, approving the Regulations for the Implementation of Law on Patents	
Art 7	12.5.1

Introduction (Chapter 1)

Ms. Eun-Joo Min is Director of the WIPO Judicial Institute. Prior to her current position, she headed the policy and international cooperation work of the WIPO Building Respect for IP Division, and the legal development section of the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center. Ms. Min was a member of the Expert Advisory Group of the Medicines Patent Pool from 2011 to 2018, and is the author of a number of publications on IP enforcement and dispute resolution, including a chapter on cross-border intellectual property enforcement in *The Oxford Handbook of Intellectual Property Law* (Oxford University Press, 2018). Ms. Min holds a Ph.D. in law from Yonsei University in the Republic of Korea, and was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Michigan Law School, USA. She taught law at Yonsei University prior to joining WIPO, and was an Adjunct Professor at Sogang Law School in 2013 and 2014.

Australia (Chapter 2)

Justice Annabelle Bennett (ret.) studied science at the University of Sydney, where she completed a PhD in cell biology, before studying law at the University of New South Wales. Justice Bennett went on to practice as a barrister, later specializing in intellectual property. Between 2003 and 2016, Justice Bennett served as a Judge of the Federal Court of Australia, sitting on many intellectual property cases at first instance and on appeal. She has also served as President of the Copyright Tribunal of Australia. Justice Bennett chaired the WIPO's Advisory Board of Judges from 2018 to 2022. Justice Bennett has returned to the Bar and practices as a barrister (advisory only), a mediator, and an arbitrator. Justice Bennett is a Fellow of both the Australian Academy of Science and the Australian Academy of Law.

Justice Stephen Burley was appointed to the Federal Court of Australia in 2016. As a Judge in the Intellectual Property National Practice Area, he hears many intellectual property cases at first instance and on appeal. Justice Burley practiced at the Bar from 5 Wentworth Chambers, Sydney, from 1993 until 2016. He was appointed Senior Counsel in 2007. While at the Bar, Justice Burley practiced commercial law, specializing in patent, copyright, trademark, design, and confidential information cases. Many of Justice Burley's patent cases involved pharmaceutical, telecommunications, or other high-tech subject matter. Justice Burley regularly contributes to publications and events hosted by WIPO and frequently presents and publishes on intellectual property subjects in Australia and abroad.

Mr. Robert Clark's broad practice from 5 Wentworth Chambers spans intellectual property, general commercial litigation, tax, and administrative law. He has appeared in the Federal Court and High Court and Courts and Tribunals in New South Wales, South Australia and Western Australia. Mr. Clark has been recognized in Best Lawyers in Australia for his expertise in both litigation and IP law. Mr. Clark completed a Bachelor of Civil Law at the University of Oxford, graduating with a distinction average, and he received the Law Faculty Prize for International Intellectual Property. Prior to this, he completed a Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Laws (LLB) from the University of Sydney with first-class honors and received the Minter Ellison Prize for IP. Mr. Clark previously worked as a solicitor in the intellectual property teams at Allens Linklaters and as an associate to Honorable Justice Cowdroy AO on the Federal Court of Australia.

Ms. Cynthia Cochrane specializes in patent cases at 5 Wentworth Chambers, with expertise in vaccines and biological medicines, and commercial cases, including competition law. Ms. Cochrane appears regularly in the Federal Court, at trial and on appeal, and at the Patent Office. Her High Court experience spans over 15 years, and she recently addressed a six-member bench in relation to the patentability of computer-implemented inventions. She appears in the New

South Wales Supreme Court and conducts examinations for the competition regulator regarding potential cartel conduct. Ms. Cochrane is recognized in Chambers Asia-Pacific, Best Lawyers, Doyles, and Legal 500. She was a solicitor at Allens Linklaters, articulated to Prof. Bob Baxt AO in competition law, and, prior to her law career, was an investment banker at Macquarie Bank.

Mr. Julian Cooke specializes in intellectual property law, including trade practices, from 5 Wentworth Chambers. His expertise spans patents, trademarks, copyright, designs, confidential information and consumer protection. Mr. Cooke frequently represents clients in the pharmaceutical, chemical, telecommunications, mining, media, and consumer goods industries. He has appeared in a number of leading intellectual property cases in the High Court and the Federal Court of Australia.

Ms. Anna Elizabeth's broad commercial practice from 5 Wentworth Chambers has considerable experience in complex commercial disputes and her clients include the mining and energy industries. In addition to Commerce and Law degrees, Ms. Elizabeth holds a Master of Energy and Resource Law from the University of Western Australia, where she finished with the highest mark in her course and received the Johnson Winter and Slattery Prize in Law and the Clayton Utz Postgraduate Award for Energy and Resources Law. She is a member of the Energy & Resources Law Association and a reporter for the *Australian Resources Law Reports*. Prior to commencing at the Bar, Ms. Elizabeth was a litigator in the commercial disputes team at Arnold Bloch Leibler and served as an Associate to Foster J in the Federal Court of Australia for 18 months.

Mr. Joseph Elks has a broad practice from 5 Wentworth Chambers and specializes in all areas of intellectual property, complex commercial disputes, sports law, defamation and competition law. Mr. Elks appears in the Federal Court as well as in the New South Wales Supreme Court and lower courts and tribunals. He is recognized in Doyle's Guide as a "recommended" junior counsel in intellectual property litigation. Prior to being called to the Bar, Mr. Elks was a Senior Associate at Herbert Smith Freehills in Sydney and a Senior Associate at a leading firm in New York. He obtained his Bachelor of Laws (Hons I) and Bachelor of Commerce from UQ, receiving the Freehills Prize in. He also has a Master of Laws from New York University (NYU), where he attended as a Hauser Global Scholar, graduating first in NYU's Competition Law and IP program.

Mr. Andrew Fox's practice from 5 Wentworth Chambers focuses on intellectual property and commercial litigation. His intellectual property experience spans the full spectrum, including patents, trademarks, copyright, designs, confidential information and consumer protection. His court appearances include a number of leading cases in the High Court, and the Federal Court of Australia, and in patent and trademark oppositions held at IP Australia. Mr. Fox's patent experience spans a range of technology fields and his general commercial litigation practice has brought him before the Supreme Court of New South Wales, the District Court of New South Wales, and interstate courts. Mr. Fox is recognized in Chambers and Partners Asia Pacific as a leading barrister in IP; Doyle's Guide to Australian Leading Lawyers; Best Lawyers in Australia; The World's Leading Trademark Professionals; and The Legal 500 – Australian Bar – IP. He is also admitted to practice as a barrister in New Zealand.

Ms. Sue Gilchrist is the leader of the Herbert Smith Freehills IP group in Australia, a member of the HSF Global board, and chair of the HSF Global Pro Bono & Responsible Business Council. Ms. Gilchrist is a senior IP litigation partner, ranked one of the top practitioners by the leading legal directories, including Chambers & Partners, Legal 500, Benchmark Litigation, IAM Patent 1000, and Managing IP: IP STARS. She is one of only six practitioners in Australia to be recognized in the Top 100 Women in Litigation (2021 and 2022) Benchmark Litigation Asia-Pacific. Ms. Gilchrist has a particular focus on representing clients in high-tech patent litigation and leads HSF's global High Tech Patent focus group. Sue is also a member and previous chair of the IP Committee of the Law Council of Australia, a body that engages with the government on intellectual property policy issues.

Mr. Timothy Gollan is a solicitor in the Intellectual Property Disputes team at Herbert Smith Freehills. He has been involved in working on a range of intellectual property disputes involving patents, trademarks and copyright across a range of fields, including pharmaceuticals, telecommunications, mining, and mechanical devices. Previously, Mr. Gollan worked as an Associate to Justice Stephen Burley in the Federal Court of Australia. He has a Bachelor of Law and a Bachelor of Engineering from the University of Sydney.

Mr. Samuel Hallahan practices commercial litigation from 5 Wentworth Chambers, with particular expertise in intellectual property. Before coming to the Bar, he practiced as a solicitor for seven years in intellectual property and general commercial litigation, where his work included matters for large pharmaceutical and commercial clients. At the Bar, Mr. Hallahan has appeared in first instance and appeal proceedings in the Federal Court of Australia, and in the Federal Circuit Court, the Supreme Court of New South Wales, the Local Court of New South Wales, the New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT), and in opposition proceedings at IP Australia. In 2020, 2021, and 2022, Mr. Hallahan was listed in Doyle's Guide "Leading Intellectual Property Law Junior Counsel – New South Wales." In 2021, he was listed in Doyle's Guide "Leading Intellectual Property Law Junior Counsel – Australia."

Ms. Irini Lantis is a senior lawyer in Gilbert + Tobin's Tech and IP practice. She has extensive experience in patent litigation proceedings before the Federal Court and the High Court of Australia. Ms. Lantis has litigated patents across a range of industries, including mining and resources, gaming, ecommerce, and life sciences. She also has extensive experience in the commercialization and transactional aspects of intellectual property.

Mr. David Larish received his LLB from the University of New South Wales (UNSW) (Hons Class I, University Medal) and his LLM from New York University (Frank T. Diersen prize). His practice from 5 Wentworth Chambers focuses primarily on intellectual property and commercial disputes. He has been briefed in a number of the leading intellectual property cases in the High Court and the Federal Court. He regularly appears in the Federal Court, Supreme Court and at IP Australia. Mr. Larish is recognized in Doyle's Guide as a 'pre-eminent' junior counsel in intellectual property in Australia and a 'leading' junior counsel in Technology, Media & Telecommunications. He is also recognized in Chambers and Partners Asia Pacific, Best Lawyers in Australia and The Legal 500. Before coming to the Bar, Mr. Larish was a Judge's Associate at the Federal Court and a solicitor at King & Wood Mallesons.

Mr. John Lee is a partner in Gilbert + Tobin's Tech + IP group and leads the firm's Patent practice. He has both legal and technical qualifications and has many years' experience dealing with all aspects of intellectual property law. Mr. Lee has a particular focus on patent litigation and trade secrets across a range of industries, including life sciences, resources and digital technologies.

Ms. Angela McDonald practices from 5 Wentworth Chambers, in all aspects of intellectual property, including patents, trademarks, copyright, designs and consumer protection. She has been featured in Doyle's Intellectual Property List since 2021. Ms. McDonald regularly appears in the Federal Court of Australia, including the Full Court, various state Supreme Courts, the Patent Office, and the Trade Mark Office. Prior to coming to Bar, she was a solicitor in two specialist intellectual property firms. She was also an Associate to Justice Nicholas of the Federal Court of Australia. Ms. McDonald graduated with first-class honors in law from the University of New South Wales. She is also on the Editorial Panel for the Australian Intellectual Property Law Bulletin, a co-author of the LexisNexis Australia Copyright & Designs chapter on International Copyright, and the author of a number of publications on intellectual property law.

Mr. Benjamin Mee specializes in intellectual property law from 5 Wentworth Chambers, and holds a BSc (Biochemistry)-LLB (Hons I, University Medal) and an LLM in Commercial Law (Hons I) from Cambridge University. Prior to being called to the Bar in 2014, he practiced as a solicitor with Allens in intellectual property and competition and consumer law, and was an Associate to former Chief Justice RS French AC of the High Court. At the Bar, Mr. Mee has developed a busy trial and appellate practice, with particular strength in patent matters in the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and information technology/software sectors, as well as appellate work. He regularly appears led and unled in the Federal Court, Patent Office, and Trade Marks Office. He is recognized in Chambers and Partners, Doyle's Guide, and Best Lawyers Australia.

Ms. Anna Spies' practice from 5 Wentworth Chambers includes consumer law, confidential information, restraints of trade, media and defamation, commissions and inquiries, and a focus on intellectual property litigation. Her experience in complex cases spans copyright, patent and trademark law at the Bar and as a solicitor. Before coming to the Bar in 2016, Ms. Spies was a Senior Associate in King & Wood Mallesons' IP litigation team and an Associate to Justice Annabelle Bennett at the Federal Court of Australia. Doyle's Guide lists Ms. Spies as 'Recommended' junior counsel in New South Wales for intellectual property and for Technology, Media & Telecommunications. She received the Christopher Gee QC Memorial Prize for evidence

and advocacy for the August 2016 Bar Practice Course. Ms. Spies received her LLM in Media and Technology (with excellence) and LLB (with first class honors) from the University of New South Wales.

Mr. Edward Thompson practices from 5 Wentworth Chambers, principally in intellectual property matters but has experience in a broad range of commercial disputes. He has degrees in law and arts from the University of Melbourne (2008) and a Master of Laws from University College London (2011), graduating as the top student in the LLM program. Before commencing at the Bar, Mr. Thompson was an Associate to Justice John Nicholas at the Federal Court of Australia, and a solicitor for over seven years in the intellectual property department of a national law firm. He was also a lecturer in corporation law at the University of Melbourne.

Mr. Byron Turner is a solicitor in the Intellectual Property Disputes team at Herbert Smith Freehills (HSF) and advises clients on trademark, patent and copyright disputes in the Federal Court. He has further experience advising clients on consumer law issues, as well as legal issues arising from new technologies, including digital assets. Mr. Turner has a Bachelor of Mathematics Advanced degree from the University of Wollongong, majoring in applied statistics and risk management & insurance. He is Byron is a member of HSF's High Tech Patent focus group, and of HSF's Digital Law Group, and was a recipient of the HSF Digital Scholar Fellowship (2021), reflecting his interest and skills in the high tech field.

Brazil (Chapter 3)

Judge Regis de Castilho Barbosa Filho sits on the 41st Civil Court of the Central Forum of the Capital of São Paulo. He graduated in law from the University of São Paulo.

Judge Luís Felipe Bedendi serves as the Assistant Judge of the 1st and 2nd Business and Arbitration Courts of São Paulo. He received his Master's Degree in Commercial Law from the University of São Paulo and graduated in law from the University of São Paulo.

Judge Maria Rita Rebello Pinho Dias sits on the 3rd Bankruptcy and Judicial Recovery Court of the Capital of São Paulo State Court. She received her Master in Constitutional Law from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo and PhD in Civil Procedure from the University of São Paulo. She graduated in law from the University of São Paulo.

Judge Eduardo Azuma Nishi sits on the São Paulo State Court, and is a member of the First Specialized Business Law Chamber. Judge Azuma Nishi received his Master in Business Law from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo. He also graduated in law from the University of São Paulo and in Business Administration from the Getúlio Vargas Foundation in São Paulo, Brazil.

Judge João de Oliveira Rodrigues Filho sits on the 1st Court of Bankruptcy and Judicial Reorganizations of the Capital of São Paulo. He received his specialization in Business Law from the Paulista School of Magistrates (Escola Paulista da Magistratura (EPM)) and is a professor of the postgraduate course in Bankruptcy and Judicial Recovery at the Faculdade Autônoma de Direito (FADISP).

Judge Leandro Galluzzi dos Santos sits on the Criminal Court of Jaboticabal in the state of São Paulo. He graduated in law from the University of São Paulo.

China (Chapter 4)

Judge Du Weike is a Senior Judge and has served on the Intellectual Property Rights Division of the Supreme People's Court of China since 2010. Prior to his appointment, he worked as a patent examiner at the Board of Reexamination of the State Intellectual Property Office of China from 2004 to 2009, handling over 150 patent administrative cases. Judge Du has rendered a number of landmark intellectual property cases in China and has published more than twenty articles on intellectual property law. Judge Du holds a BA in Electric Engineering and Law from Huazhong University of Science and Technology, a Juris Master Degree from Xiamen University, and an LLM Degree from Temple University, which he attended as a DuPont Scholar.

Judge He Juan was appointed as a Senior Judge of the Intellectual Property Court of the Supreme People's Court of China in 2020. Judge He conducted her postdoctoral research at Tsinghua University and the University of Turku, Finland. From 2013 to 2020, she served in the following roles at Tsinghua University: lecturer, associate professor, and Deputy Director of Social Science and Management at the Shenzhen International Graduate School, and Deputy Director of the Office of Technology Licensing. She has also led a number of research projects in the area of intellectual property, and authored numerous publications on intellectual property topics, including monographs, books (as editor-in-chief or co-translator) and journal articles. Judge He holds a Bachelor of Engineering degree from the Hefei University of Technology, and degrees in law from Tsinghua University (Bachelor and Master of Law) and Peking University (PhD).

Germany (Chapter 5)

Dr. Thorsten Bausch is a German and European patent attorney. He is a partner in HOFFMAN EITL's Chemistry and Biotech practice group and focuses on European Patent Office Opposition and Appeal Proceedings, as well as German revocation and infringement proceedings. Dr. Bausch represents clients through all strata, from startups to Fortune 500 companies, as well as some of the most prestigious universities and research institutions in the world. He has particular expertise in the fields of pharmaceuticals, immunology, and polymers. Many pharmaceutical patents of major commercial value have been entrusted to him and his team at HOFFMANN EITL. In addition to his client service, Dr. Bausch has edited the book series "Nichtigkeitsrechtsprechung in Patentsachen," a collection of decisions in patent nullity matters from the German Federal Patent Court and Federal Court of Justice. In his personal time, Dr. Bausch regularly blogs on www.kluwerpatentblog.com on patent policy issues and interesting decisions.

Justice Klaus Grabinski was appointed President of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court in 2022, and serves as the chairperson of the Presidium. Prior to this role, he served on the German Federal Court of Justice's 10th Civil Division, including as the Deputy Presiding Justice of the Division. Before joining the German Federal Court of Justice, he held a number of judicial roles, including as a judge at the Düsseldorf Higher Regional Court, and Presiding Judge of a patent litigation division at the Düsseldorf District Court. Justice Grabinski studied law at the Universities of Trier, Geneva, and Cologne and was a university assistant in Trier. He co-authored a commentary on the European Patent Convention (Benkard, *Europäisches Patentübereinkommen*, 3rd ed., 2019) and a commentary on the German Patent Law (Benkard, *Patentgesetz*, 10th ed., 2015). He has authored many articles concerning patent law, civil procedure, and international private law.

Dr. Marcus Grosch is the managing partner of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, in Germany. Dr. Grosch has more than 20 years of experience in patent litigation, in which he has represented clients from various technical fields before all major German courts, the German Patent and Trademark Office, as well as the European Patent Office. He holds degrees from the University of Mannheim (PhD in Law and JD equivalent) and Yale University School of Law (LLM). Dr. Grosch has authored books, treatises, and articles on patent law and civil procedure.

Mr. Klaus Haft As a German qualified attorney (Rechtsanwalt) and physicist (Master's degree), Mr. Klaus Haft is a trial lawyer in the field of intellectual property law with particular emphasis on patent litigation. In addition, he advises on license agreements, research and development agreements, the law on employee inventions, and trade secrets. Mr. Haft studied in Würzburg and Munich. He wrote his diploma thesis at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), in Geneva. Mr. Haft has served as a member of the Board of the European Patent Lawyers Association (EPLAW) for seven years, the last two as its President, and currently serves as a member of the advisory board. In addition, he is President of the Licensing Executives Society (LES) Germany and a member of the Executive Board of the Munich IP Dispute Resolution Forum.

Dr. Julia Nobbe is Of Counsel at the Mannheim office of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, and has developed an expertise in German patent litigation. She represents clients in patent infringement and nullity proceedings before the courts of first instance and before the courts of appeal. Dr. Nobbe graduated from the University of Konstanz, where she also worked as a research assistant at the Chair of Professor Dr. Karl-Heinz Fezer, before starting her legal clerkship at the Higher Regional Court of Karlsruhe. She obtained her doctorate degree (summa cum laude) from Munich University and has published on the subject of patent litigation in

Germany. Dr. Nobbe's varied practice includes working in international law firms, in a law firm that exclusively represents clients before the German Federal Court of Justice, and as in-house legal counsel in the intellectual property department of an international chemical company.

Judge Peter Tochtermann was appointed in 2022 as Judge of the Court of First Instance (local division Mannheim) of the Unified Patent Court and a member of its Presidium. Prior to this appointment, he served on the Regional Court of Mannheim, including as Presiding Judge of the Patent Chamber, and as a Mediator Judge. He also sat on the Patent Senate of the Higher Regional Court of Karlsruhe and served as a clerk of the German Federal Court of Justice. Judge Tochtermann has worked as a Research Fellow and Visiting Scholar at a number of institutions such as the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. He holds a PhD in law from the University of Heidelberg, where he serves as a lecturer for IP law and is the recipient of several academic achievement awards.

India (Chapter 6)

Justice Madan B. Lokur (ret.), a graduate of Delhi University, was enrolled as a lawyer in 1977 and, in 1997, was designated a Senior Advocate. He was appointed Additional Solicitor General of India and a Judge of the Delhi High Court (1999). His judicial appointments include Acting Chief Justice of the Delhi High Court, Chief Justice of the Gauhati and Andhra Pradesh High Courts, the Supreme Court of India (2012–2018) and the Supreme Court of Fiji (2019). Justice Lokur served as: chairperson of the Supreme Court Mediation & Conciliation Project Committee; judge of the Supreme Court E-Committee for the computerization of the Indian courts; a one-man committee to improve the working of homes and organizations under the Juvenile Justice Act and Rules; and Executive Chairman of the Supreme Court Legal Services Committee and National Legal Services Authority. Currently, he has a professional chamber practice and is an independent arbitrator.

Justice Gautam Patel was appointed a judge of the Bombay High Court in 2013. Before taking judicial office, he practiced civil, commercial law and environmental law at the Bombay High Court and in the Supreme Court. In 2015, he was one of the three persons from India cited among the 50 most influential persons in IP law by *Managing IP*. For nearly three years, he handled the bulk of the intellectual property work in the Bombay High Court and has delivered judgments on copyright, trademark, designs and patent law.

Justice Manmohan Singh (ret.) was the Chairman of the Intellectual Property Appellate Board in New Delhi until his retirement in 2019. He was appointed judge of the High Court of Delhi in 2008 and served until his retirement in 2016. Justice Singh began his career as an advocate in 1980 and practiced trademark, copyright, and patent matters in the Delhi High Court and Supreme Court of India. He has attended many national and international seminars and presented a number of papers on intellectual property issues.

Justice Prathiba M. Singh was elevated as Permanent Judge of the High Court of Delhi in 2017. She joined the Bar in 1991 and appeared before the Supreme Court of India, High Court of Delhi, Telecom Disputes Settlement and Appellate Tribunal (TDSAT), IP Appellate Board (IPAB), and Indian Patent Office. Her advisory work includes streamlining the Copyright Office (*amicus curiae*, High Court of Delhi), streamlining patent examination processes (member, High-Level Committee), and intellectual property legislative amendments (Parliamentary Committees). Her honors include awards for best IP lawyer, Managing IP's Asia Women in Business Law Award, and the 30 Most Powerful Business Women in India in 2018. After obtaining her LLB from the University Law College, Bangalore, Justice Singh received her LLM (ODASSS scholarship) from the University of Cambridge, where the Prathiba M. Singh Scholarship for LLM students was created in 2013. She serves on their Circle of Advisors for India.

Japan (Chapter 7)

Mr. Jonathan Dobinson is an Australian lawyer and adjunct researcher at the Research Center for the Legal System of Intellectual Property, Waseda University, Tokyo. He obtained Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Law degrees from the University of Wollongong, Australia; a Master's degree in intellectual property from Hongik University, Republic of Korea; and is admitted as

a lawyer in Australia. For over 25 years, he has provided legal policy, communications, and international relations advice to organizations in Australia and Asia, including as a senior lawyer, director of research and director of communications for Australian government agencies; as a consultant to Republic of Korea government agencies; and as a project manager, researcher, and editor for Japanese universities. His publications include *History of Design and Design Law: An International and Interdisciplinary Perspective* (Springer 2022), as a co-editor and co-author.

Mr. Makoto Hattori was admitted to the Japanese Bar and joined Abe, Ikubo & Katayama in 1998. In 2001, he was seconded to the Intellectual Property Policy Office in the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI). From 2002 to 2004, after completing an LLM at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, he worked as a visiting researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law. He was admitted to the New York Bar in 2003. Mr. Hattori's areas of expertise include litigation and contracts concerning patents, copyright, trademarks, and unfair competition law. His other roles include adjunct instructor at the Graduate School of Science and Technology, Keio University, from 2007 to 2018; visiting professor at the Graduate School of Law, Kobe University, since 2016; and Chairperson of the Intellectual Property Center of the Japan Federation of Bar Associations (JFBA) in 2021.

Ms. Izumi Hayashi is a founding partner of Sakurazaka Law Offices. She graduated from Waseda University Faculty of Law, and after passing the bar exam in 1983, worked as a public prosecutor before registering as an attorney with the Tokyo Bar Association. After working at a Tokyo-based law firm with an international practice and a U.S. law firm in San Francisco, she was a partner at Eitai Sogo Law Office (Tokyo) from 1993 to 2014. Ms. Hayashi has served as the President of the Japan Intellectual Property Arbitration Center (2011–2012) and the Chairperson of the Intellectual Property Committee of the Japan Federation of Bar Associations (2013–2014). She is also the Executive Director of IP Lawyers Network Japan, an outside director of several listed companies, a member of the Regulatory Reform Council of the Cabinet Office, and a member of the Intellectual Property Strategy Headquarters of the Cabinet Office.

Ms. Mami Hino is a Japanese patent attorney and a partner at Abe Ikubo & Katayama. She is admitted to practice in New York and has represented the world's leading technology companies for many years in litigation and transactions. Ms. Hino's practice is focused on invalidity trials and resultant IP High Court appeals, cross-border infringement litigation, strategic patent prosecution, client counseling, and opinions. Due to her background as a registered pharmacist, Ms. Hino has extensive experience representing innovative pharmaceutical companies to protect their patents, including by filing patent term extension applications, defending patents in invalidity trials and IP High Court appeals, and filing preliminary injunction requests and patent infringement suits against generic drug companies. She obtained a Bachelor of Science degree in pharmaceutical sciences from Kyoto University and a JD from Seton Hall University School of Law.

Mr. Yoshinori Horigome is a founding partner of Sakurazaka Law Offices. He has extensive experience advising on intellectual property matters, including patent, copyright, trademark and unfair competition law. He also practices in the areas of corporate and commercial law (specifically with respect to employment and contract law issues) as well as litigation. Mr. Horigome has represented various companies and individuals in Japan in a variety of industries, including trading, computer software, communications, chemicals, construction and art. He has a Bachelor of Mathematics from the Tokyo Institute of Technology, one of Japan's most prestigious national universities of science, and holds an LLM degree from Duke University School of Law (2004).

Mr. Eiji Katayama is an experienced practitioner of patent litigation in Japan. He received a Bachelor of Engineering from Kyoto University in 1973 and a Bachelor of Law from Kobe University in 1982. He joined Abe, Ikubo & Katayama in 1984 and has been a partner since 1991. He is admitted to practice in Japan and in New York. He has worked with the pharmaceutical industry and represented clients in many patent infringement cases concerning various technical fields. Mr. Katayama has served as President of the International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI) Japan, the Chairman of the Intellectual Property Committee of the Japan Bar Association, and the President of the Tokyo IP American Inns of Court. He is a professor at the Munich Intellectual Property Law Center (MIPLC) where he teaches Japanese patent law.

Judge Takafumi Kokubu graduated from the Faculty of Law, University of Kyoto. He served as a judge of the Tokyo District Court (Intellectual Property Division, 2005–2007) and of the Intellectual Property High Court (2019–2020). Since 2020, he has been the Presiding Judge of the Intellectual Property Division of the Tokyo District Court and a member of the Trademark System Subcommittee of the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI). While serving as a judge, he was posted to Hanoi, Viet Nam, as a long-term expert on the Japan International Cooperation Agency project and assisted the legal and judicial development of Viet Nam for two years.

Mr. Toru Matsuoka graduated from the University of Tokyo and joined the Japan Patent Office (JPO) in 2003. From 2003 to 2022, he worked in various roles, including Patent Examiner and Administrative Patent Judge in the field of Polymer chemistry, Electrochemistry, Biotechnology; Deputy Director, Legislative Affairs Office (Patent Act, etc.); Deputy Director, Examination Standards Office (Patent Examination Guidelines etc.); and Deputy Director, Trial and Appeal Division. Since April 2022, he has been the Associate Managing Examiner, Material Processing Division, and has been responsible for examination management issues in the JPO.

Professor Christoph Rademacher is at Waseda University School of Law. He teaches graduate- and undergraduate-level courses in the field of business law and intellectual property law, in both Japanese and English. His research focuses on the protection of technical innovation by means of patents and other rights. His publications include *Patent Enforcement in the USA, Germany and Japan* (Oxford University Press, 2015) as a co-author; *Japanese Design Law and Practice* (Wolters Kluwer, 2021); and *History of Design and Design Law: An International and Interdisciplinary Perspective* (Springer, 2022) as a co-editor and co-author. He was the recipient of the 2019 Waseda University Research Award for High-Impact Publications. He is admitted to practice in New York and in the Republic of Ireland. He obtained his first degree in business and law and his doctorate degree in law from the University of Siegen, Germany, and an LLM from Stanford Law School.

Ms. Yuriko Sagara studied at the University of Tokyo Faculty of Law (LLB) and the Legal Training Institute, and on graduation passed the Japanese Bar Examination. She went on to be admitted to the New York State Bar after additional studies at Duke University School of Law. Ms. Sagara has been a partner at Nakamura & Partners since 2013. She has experience in a wide variety of intellectual property legal areas, especially intellectual property litigation and contracts. She is a member of various organizations and committees, such as the Intellectual Property Center of the Japan Federation of Bar Associations (JFBA), the Copyright Law Association of Japan, the Japan Trademark Association, and the Asia Patent Attorneys Association, among others. She has also served as a panelist at the Judicial Symposium on Intellectual Property several times.

Mr. Yasufumi Shiroyama is a partner at Anderson Mori & Tomotsune, a general practice law firm in Tokyo comprising over 420 lawyers and patent attorneys. He graduated from the University of Tokyo, Faculty of Law in 1992 and was admitted to the bar in 1994. He also obtained an LLM from University of California Davis Law School. Mr. Shiroyama has focused on domestic and global intellectual property dispute resolution in various forms, including patent, trademark, copyright and trade secrets. His practice also includes the transactional aspects of intellectual property, such as licensing and assignment. In addition, from 2004 to 2022, Mr. Shiroyama taught courses, including on intellectual property law, at the University of Tokyo School of Law, and in 2017, he served as Chairperson of the Intellectual Property Committee of the Japan Federation of Bar Associations (JFBA).

Chief Judge Ryuichi Shitara (ret.) graduated from the Faculty of Law, University of Tokyo. He served as a judge of the Tokyo District Court (Intellectual Property Division, 1979–1983, 1986–1990, 1993–1997) and Tokyo High Court (Intellectual Property Division, 2001–2004). From 2004 to 2007, Judge Shitara was the Presiding Judge of the Intellectual Property Division of the Tokyo District Court, and from 2011 to 2014, Presiding Judge of the Tokyo High Court and the Intellectual Property High Court. From 2014 to 2017, he served as Chief Judge of the Intellectual Property High Court. While serving as Presiding Judge and Chief Judge, he adjudicated four Grand Panel cases, including the famous standard essential patent and doctrine of equivalents cases. After retiring from the Court, he was an attorney-at-law (Mori Hamada & Matsumoto, 2017–2018) and is currently Joint Partner & Chairman (SOEI Patent & Law Firm, from 2018–present).

Judge Aya Takahashi graduated from the Faculty of Law, University of Tokyo, and holds an LLM from Harvard Law School. She served as a judge of the Tokyo District Court (Intellectual Property Division) from 2013 to 2016, and as a judge of the Intellectual Property High Court from 2018 to 2021. During her time at the Intellectual Property High Court, she served as a member of the panel in a Grand Panel case concerning the calculation of the amount of damages in patent infringement cases. Judge Takahashi currently serves as a presiding judge of the medical division of the Sendai District Court.

Mr. Hideki Takaishi is an attorney at law and patent attorney at Nakamura & Partners (since 2002) and focuses on industrial property rights law, trademark law, design law, unfair competition prevention law, copyright law, antimonopoly law (antitrust), contract law, joint development and development consignment, corporate legal affairs and international transaction law. He graduated from the Faculty of Engineering at the Tokyo Institute of Technology and went on to complete his graduate studies there. Later, he studied at the Duke University School of Law, where, upon completion of his program, he passed the California Bar Exam. He also passed the U.S. Patent Exam. Mr. Takaishi is a member of various domestic and international organizations, including the International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI) Japan, the Japan Academic Society for Ventures and Entrepreneurs (JASVE), and Japan Customs as an expert advisor.

Judge Koichi Tanaka graduated from the Faculty of Law, University of Tokyo. He was appointed a judge of the Tokyo District Court in 1995 and later as a judge of the Tokyo District Court (Intellectual Property Division) (2000–2003 and 2012–2013) and the Intellectual Property High Court (2006–2009). From 2013 to 2017, he was a Judicial Research Official of the Supreme Court (Civil/Intellectual Property). From 2019 to 2022, Judge Tanaka was the Presiding Judge of the Intellectual Property Division of the Tokyo District Court. He has adjudicated cases at the Tokyo High Court (Civil Division), Morioka District/Family Court, Saku Branch of Nagano District/Family Court and Naha Family/District Court. He was a visiting scholar at the State Court of New Jersey, United States of America (7 months) and the Max Planck Institute in Germany (6 months).

Mr. Koichi Tsujii graduated from the Faculty of Law, Chuo University (1979) and Cornell Law School (LLM, 1989). He is admitted to the bar in Japan and the State of New York. He has experience in a wide range of intellectual property areas, including patents, trademarks, copyright, and unfair competition, and he represents clients in matters relating to the enforcement of intellectual property rights. In particular, he has a wide range of experience in international patent litigation. Mr. Tsujii has been a partner at Nakamura & Partners since 1993. Since June 2019, he has been the President of the International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI) Japan; and since October 2020, he has been a member of the Intellectual Property Mediation Panel appointed by the Tokyo District Court.

Mr. Masayuki Yamanouchi is a partner at Anderson Mori & Tomotsune, a general practice law firm in Tokyo comprising over 420 lawyers and patent attorneys. He holds a Master's degree in science, and specializes in intellectual property matters and legal issues relating to cutting-edge technologies. Mr. Yamanouchi has been engaged in a number of patent infringement lawsuits and other intellectual property related matters for more than ten years. His main focus is the pharmaceutical industry, patent infringement actions, licensing negotiations, joint development projects and technology transfer projects. He has expertise and experience in other forms of intellectual property, including trademarks, copyright and trade secrets. In addition, with his experience in the U.S. (both at a law school and at a law firm focusing on patent matters), Mr. Yamanouchi provides advice to clients involved in patent lawsuits in the U.S.

Mr. Takashi Yamashita joined the Japan Patent Office (JPO) in 1988 after obtaining a Master's degree in science in physics from the University of Tokyo. He worked as a Patent Examiner and Administrative Patent Judge in technological fields such as physics, optics, and semiconductors. He has also worked on various policy issues and international affairs projects related to intellectual property, including patent law revisions, and WIPO and WTO negotiations. Mr. Yamashita for WIPO as Director of Patent Cooperation Treaty International Cooperation from 2010 to 2013. Afterwards, he took on various roles at the JPO: Senior Director, Applied Optics Division; Director, Trial and Appeal Division; Director General, Patent Examination Department in Electronics and ICT; and Director General, Trial and Appeal Department. He now works as a patent attorney after leaving the JPO in 2021.

Republic of Korea (Chapter 8)

Mr. Sang-Wook Han is a senior attorney at Kim & Chang. He is one of the most experienced intellectual property lawyers in the Republic of Korea. For over thirty years, Mr. Han has advised multinational companies in worldwide patent disputes, IP portfolio management and major licensing negotiations. His expertise has been repeatedly recognized by Chambers, Who's Who Legal and Managing Intellectual Property. He served as the president of the Korean Intellectual Property Lawyers Association and was a member of the National Intellectual Property Committee. He co-authored "Future of Intellectual Property Right" with Professor Nobuhiro Nakayama (published in the Republic of Korea and Japan in 2011). Mr. Han earned an LLB and an LLM from Seoul National University, as well as an LLM from Harvard Law School. He is a member of the Korean Bar and the New York Bar.

Judge Kwangnam Kim is currently at the Seoul High Court and was at the Patent Court until early 2021. During his years at the Patent Court, he also served as the Director of the International IP Law Research Center. He first took the bench in 2010 at the Daegu District Court and then the Suwon District Court. Judge Kim earned a Bachelor's degree in law from Yonsei University and received an LLM Certificate in Law & Technology from Berkeley Law School. He also did fellowships as a visiting judge in the California Superior Court and the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. His published articles include *The Challenges and Innovation of Patent Law in the AI Era* (2021). He currently serves in the advisory committee of the Korean Intellectual Property Office.

Judge Kyuhong Lee is a Presiding Judge of the Seoul High Court. After taking the bench in 1995, he served as a judge at the Seoul High Court (Intellectual Property Division) and as a Presiding Judge at the Patent Court, among others. He also worked as a constitutional researcher at the Constitutional Court and taught judges at the Judicial Research and Training Institutes. He received two Bachelor's degrees (Economics and Law) and his PhD in Intellectual Property Law from Yonsei University. He was a visiting scholar at the University of New Hampshire Franklin Pierce Law Center. Judge Lee served as the Chairman of Korea Patent Law Society. He authored *Korean Business Law* (IP chapter; published in the U.S. in 2010); *Copyright and Infringement* (2016) and articles, such as "A Review on the Environmental Right, Science & Technology and Patent System in Ecological Transition" (2021).

Ms. Unjung Park has mainly practiced intellectual property and product liability laws since joining Kim & Chang in 2022. She was previously a senior researcher at the International IP Law Research Center of the Patent Court, where she co-authored comparative research papers on indirect patent infringement and selection invention, and a Korean-English IP Law Dictionary. She published articles, such as "Evidencing Consumer Perception with Surveys" (2021) and "Revisiting Inventive Step Standard of Selection Inventions" (2022). Ms. Park received a JD from George Washington University Law School, an LLM from American University, and a BA in Economics from Yonsei University. She is a member of the New York Bar.

United Kingdom (Chapter 9)

Lord Justice Colin Birss was appointed as a judge of the Court of Appeal of England and Wales and as Deputy Head of Civil Justice in 2021. Lord Justice Birss was called to the Bar in 1990 and practiced in intellectual property law. In 2010 he became the judge of what is now the Intellectual Property Enterprise Court (IPEC) and in 2013 was appointed to the High Court.

Mr. Andrew Bowler is joint head of patent litigation at Bristows LLP in London. He has acted for clients in intellectual property disputes for 25 years at first instance, in the Court of Appeal and before the Supreme Court. Mr. Bowler's cases have covered a wide range of technologies, including complex mechanical and FMCG products, pharmaceuticals, mobile phones, automotives, electronics and medical devices. He also frequently coordinates cross-border patent litigation. Mr. Bowler is often asked to comment and lecture on intellectual property issues and is a regular speaker at international conferences on strategic considerations for European and international patent litigation.

Mr. Brian Cordery is a partner at Bristows. Since qualifying in 1996, Mr. Cordery has worked almost exclusively in the field of life sciences patent litigation, mainly for originators. Since 2001, Brian has authored an annual review of U.K. patent cases which is published in the CIPA Journal. Mr. Cordery lectures on patent litigation on the post-graduate diploma in intellectual property

law and practice run by Oxford University and he presently sits on the Exam Board for this diploma. Prior to joining Bristows, Mr. Cordery studied law at Oxford University.

Ms. Anna Edwards-Stuart has a degree in Natural Sciences from the University of Cambridge and a doctorate in molecular biology from the University of Oxford. She was called to the Bar of England and Wales in 2002 and has practiced in intellectual property law in chambers at 11 South Square, Gray's Inn, London since then. In 2019 she was appointed standing counsel to the U.K. Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks.

Ms. Alice Hart was called to the Bar of England and Wales by the Inner Temple in 2018 and has practiced at Three New Square Chambers since 2019. Her practice spans all areas of intellectual property law, with a focus on patents. She has a First class degree in Biochemistry from the University of Oxford, and legal qualifications from City University London.

Ms. Roisin Higgins KC is a U.K. advocate, member of the Scottish Faculty of Advocates and a door tenant of 8 New Square, barristers' chambers in London. She is a specialist in intellectual property and commercial law.

Ms. Morag Macdonald has been a partner in the Intellectual Property group of International law firm Bird & Bird since 1989. In that role she has conducted patent litigation in the UK and coordinated multi-jurisdictional patent litigation for over 30 years. She was co-head of the international IP group of Bird & Bird from 1995 to the end of 2022. She has a Master's degree in Mathematics, Physics and Law from Newnham College Cambridge.

Madam Justice Denise McBride is a member of the Judiciary of Northern Ireland and a High Court Judge, dealing with civil, commercial and chancery matters, amongst other things.

Mr. Michael Tappin KC was awarded a first class degree in chemistry and a doctorate in biochemistry from the University of Oxford. He was called to the Bar of England and Wales in 1991 and has practiced in intellectual property law in chambers at 8 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London since 1992. Between 2003 and 2008, he was standing counsel to the U.K. Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks. He took silk in 2009. In 2018, he was called to the Bar of Ireland and in 2021, was appointed as a Deputy Judge of the High Court of England and Wales.

United States of America (Chapter 10)

Professor Peter S. Menell is the Koret Professor of Law at University of California Berkeley School of Law, co-founder and Director of the Berkeley Center for Law & Technology, and co-founder and Faculty Director of the Berkeley Judicial Institute. Professor Menell earned his SB from MIT, his PhD (economics) from Stanford University, and his JD from Harvard Law School. Professor Menell joined the law faculty at the University of California at Berkeley in 1990, where his research and teaching have focused on intellectual property law. Professor Menell has authored more than 100 articles and 15 books, including leading casebooks and intellectual property treatises.

Ms. Allison A. Schmitt is a Fellow at the University of California, Berkeley School of Law and the inaugural Director of the Berkeley Center for Law and Technology's Life Sciences Project. After graduating with a JD from Berkeley Law in 2015, Ms. Schmitt clerked for Judge Stanley R. Chesler at the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, and Judge Kathleen M. O'Malley at the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. She spent several years in private practice, focused on life science patent litigation, counseling and policy matters. Ms. Schmitt holds a PhD in chemistry from Duke University.

The Boards of Appeal of the European Patent Office (Chapter 11)

Mr. Frédéric Bostedt is a legally qualified member of the Boards of Appeal of the European Patent Office. Previously, he was the Head of the Legal Research Service of the Boards of Appeal. Before joining the Boards of Appeal, he worked as a lawyer for the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, France, and for the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia

in The Hague, Netherlands. He obtained law degrees in Germany (Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich), New Zealand (LLM, Wellington Victoria University) and France (Master 2 Droits de l'homme, Université de Strasbourg), and a doctorate degree in Germany (Dr. jur.).

Mr. Nikolaus Obrovski was appointed as a legally qualified member of the European Patent Office Boards of Appeal in 2020. He entered the Austrian judiciary in 2003, working at various courts, including the Intellectual Property Division of the Commercial Court of Vienna, and received a lifetime appointment as a federal Austrian judge in 2008. Mr. Obrovski also worked as an Intellectual Property Attaché at the Permanent Representation of Austria to the European Union, as a legal adviser on intellectual property at the European Commission in Brussels, and as a lawyer in the Legal Services of the European Patent Office Boards of Appeal. Mr. Obrovski earned Master's degrees in law and applied economics.

Spain (Chapter 12)

Judge Alberto Arribas entered the legal profession after passing competitive examinations in 1989. In 1990, he became a judge and has specialized in commercial matters since September 2004. He currently sits in Chamber No. 32 of the Provincial Court of Madrid, specializing in industrial property, IP and competition law. He became an expert in European Union law at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, working with the European Commission and the General Council of the Judiciary. Judge Arribas was made a permanent member of Chamber No. 2 (Commercial Law) of the General Codification Commission by Order of the Ministry of Justice on May 17, 2022. He served as counsel on the General Council of the Judiciary from 1999 to 2004. From October 2002 to July 2004, he was Director of the Continuing Education Service of the Judicial Academy. In terms of international experience, he has been a speaker at various interregional seminars on IP for judges and prosecutors in Latin America, organized by the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office (SPTO) and WIPO. He participated as an international expert in the twinning project entrusted by the European Commission to SPTO and the Danish Industrial Property Office in 2016, with the aim of ensuring that the IP enforcement system in Ukraine aligned with the *acquis communautaire*.

Judge Ángel Galgo Peco, who specializes in IP and competition law, presides over Chamber No. 32 of the Provincial Court of Madrid. Judge Galgo Peco began his legal career in 1989. Between 1997 and 1999, he worked as an expert for the United Nations Development Programme in El Salvador and Guatemala. In 2003, he was a national expert at the Council of Europe (Strasbourg) and, from 2004 to 2008, he worked at the European Union (The Hague and Brussels). From 2018 to 2024, he was a member of the Enlarged Board of Appeal of the European Patent Office (EPO). He was appointed to the WIPO Advisory Board of Judges from 2022 to 2025. Judge Galgo Peco regularly lectures at events organized by EPO, the European Union Intellectual Property Office, the Centre d'Études Internationales de la Propriété Intellectuelle and SPTO. He is involved as an expert in the IP Key project of the European Commission (China, Latin America and Southeast Asia) and in AL-INVEST Verde, as well as in WIPO judicial training programs.

Judge Enrique García García entered the legal profession after passing competitive examinations in 1989. He has worked in different parts of Spain (Extremadura, the Basque Country and Madrid). He was among the first cohort of Spanish judges to specialize in commercial matters (passing a competitive examination in 2004) and later took up a position in one of the first commercial courts in Spain. Since 2006, he has sat on the full bench of commercial courts, starting with Chamber No. 28 (Commercial Law) of the Provincial Court of Madrid (initially as presiding judge and then as a judge), and thereafter in Chamber No. 32 of the Court, which specializes in IP, industrial property, and competition and advertising law, when it began operations in April 2023. He has given lectures at international training events on IP and industrial property and written several publications on the subject.

Judge Luis Rodríguez Vega began his legal career in 1989 and sat on various civil courts until 2004. That year he was appointed as a specialist in commercial matters and moved to a commercial court in Barcelona, Spain. In 2015, he was promoted to his current position of judge sitting in Chamber No. 15 of the Provincial Court of Barcelona, which also specializes in commercial and, in particular, patent matters. He was a professor at the Spanish Judicial Academy and associate professor at Pompeu Fabra University in Barcelona. He regularly participates in continuing education events for judges, as well as in national and international IP forums.

About the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the global forum for intellectual property (IP) services, policy, information and cooperation. It is a self-funding agency of the United Nations with 193 Member States.

WIPO's mission is to lead the development of a balanced and effective international IP system that enables innovation and creativity for the benefit of all. WIPO's mandate, governing bodies and procedures are set out in the WIPO Convention, which established WIPO in 1967.

WIPO helps governments, businesses and society realize the benefits of IP. WIPO provides:

- a policy forum to shape balanced international IP rules for a changing world;
- global services to protect IP across borders and to resolve disputes;
- technical infrastructure to connect IP systems and share knowledge;
- cooperation and capacity- building programs to enable all countries to use IP for economic, social and cultural development; and
- a world reference source of IP information.

About the WIPO Judicial Institute and the WIPO IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector

The WIPO Judicial Institute works to strengthen judiciaries as part of the IP and innovation ecosystems in Member States. It fosters transnational dialogue on IP for the judicial community; conducts targeted studies to promote in-depth understanding of topics of relevance to the global IP judiciary; provides education and resources for IP judges, and through WIPO Lex, contributes to the wider availability of legal knowledge on IP-related treaties, laws, and judicial decisions.

The WIPO Judicial Institute is part of WIPO's IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector, which supports Member States in developing their IP and innovation ecosystems to drive economic growth.

The IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector's work also includes:

- support for researchers, innovators, and enterprises, including small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs);
- IP commercialization for business growth;
- emergence of IP as an asset class;
- development of advisory expertise on national IP strategies;
- economic analysis on the role IP plays in promoting innovation and creativity; and
- strengthening alternative dispute resolution and the services provided by the Arbitration and Mediation Center.

Acknowledgments

An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges was developed under the general direction of Daren Tang (WIPO Director General) and Marco Alemán (WIPO Assistant Director General, IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector). Judge Jeremy Fogel, Executive Director of the Berkeley Judicial Institute, Professor Peter Menell at Berkeley Law, and Eun-Joo Min, Director of the WIPO Judicial Institute conceived and steered the project.

The *Guide* was made possible by the time and invaluable support of the distinguished judges, practitioners and academics, listed in the opening pages of each chapter.

The *Guide* benefited greatly from reviews and comments by WIPO experts, including Nina Belbl, Thomas Dillon, Andras Jokuti, Tomoko Miyamoto, Todd Reves, Xavier Vermandele and Hao Zhou. Colleagues in the WIPO Judicial Institute, in particular Patricia Felden, Calvin Kim and Beibei Yang, provided precious support.

For the production of the print and digital formats of the *Guide*, deep gratitude is due to Dan Savu and his colleagues in the Solutions Design and Delivery Section (WIPO); Vanessa Harwood, Charlotte Beauchamp and their colleagues in the Publications and Design Section (WIPO); Spencer Cabildo and his colleagues in the Web Communications Section (WIPO); and Caroline Griffin (WIPO).

Foreword by WIPO

Patents tell the story of innovation today and the technologies of tomorrow. As well as serving as powerful catalysts for technology dissemination, business growth and economic development, their dynamic nature means that patent laws and jurisprudence must keep pace with ever-changing circumstances.

Given this, patent disputes often take on a larger significance, requiring courts to be the final arbiters of issues with far-reaching legal, social and economic implications. Countries are therefore exploring new ways of enhancing the judicial administration of patent disputes, particularly through the introduction or amendment of specialized rules and practices.

Despite this, few publications address the procedural aspects of patent case management from a judge's perspective. *An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges* aims to fill this gap. This is a comprehensive, accessible and practical guide, organized around the different stages of patent litigation in ten patent-heavy jurisdictions, but with applicability around the world

We are grateful to our esteemed group of authors comprising renowned judges, practitioners and academics for their outstanding contributions. We would also like to thank the 360 judges from almost 90 countries and six regional courts who participated in the 2021 WIPO Intellectual Property Judges Forum, under the special theme of judicial patent case management and which greatly informed the evolution of this *Guide*.

In particular, Judge Jeremy Fogel, Executive Director of the Berkeley Judicial Institute and Professor Peter Menell at Berkeley Law, have been formidable partners in conceiving and steering this document to publication. Their expertise and insight into judicial education and research have ensured that this is a meaningful and functional resource for judges worldwide.

WIPO's vision is for a balanced and effective approach to intellectual property that works for everyone, everywhere. This requires that the judicial structures around IP respond effectively to the needs of each Member State while, at the same time, working harmoniously across territorial boundaries to engage with the demands of an interconnected and increasingly digital world. We hope that the *Guide* will promote greater knowledge, as well as the cross-pollination of judicial approaches and best practices as we work towards this important global goal.

Daren Tang

Director General

World Intellectual Property Organization

Foreword by Berkeley Judicial Institute

Since 2018, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) has convened leading jurists representing more than eighty countries to discuss trends and developments in the law resulting from the increasingly global reach of innovation. WIPO's annual IP Judges Forum has provided invaluable opportunities both for the exchange of views and for the development of collaborative relationships across countries and legal systems.

An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges, which owes its existence directly to dialogues that began at the WIPO IP Judges Forum, is the culmination of a remarkable effort on the part of prominent judges, noted practitioners, and leading legal academics representing ten dynamic and unique legal systems. Each national team has worked diligently to make the infrastructure and inner workings of its system for adjudication of patent cases transparent and understandable to those who otherwise might not be familiar with them. My University of California at Berkeley School of Law colleague, Professor Peter Menell, played a key role in framing the project. He and Berkeley Center for Law & Technology Fellow Allison Schmitt produced the U.S. chapter and supported the overall effort. Eun-Joo Min and her colleagues at WIPO have done a masterful job of editing the final product and organizing it in a way that makes it easily accessible to users.

Technological innovation is vital to economic and social progress, public health, and environmental protection. Patent protection plays a central role in promoting innovation, and as the impacts of innovation have increasingly transcended international boundaries, the need for a working familiarity with different national and sub-national patent systems has increased. Although their work often is the subject of international treaties and cooperation agreements, national patent systems, judicial institutions, and enforcement regimes vary significantly across jurisdictions. The overarching goals of this project are to enhance understanding of international patent protection, share best practices for improving patent case management, and promote international comity.

Among other things, the *Guide* explores, catalogs, and compares how major industrial nations structure their patent enforcement regimes: whether and to what extent judicial officers who adjudicate patent cases are required or expected to have relevant subject matter or technical expertise; whether determinations of patent validity and infringement are the subject of bifurcated or unified proceedings; the process and legal effect of judicial claim construction; and each system's approach to pre-hearing investigation, including the role of the parties in presenting and arguing the significance of references to prior art. Each country has its own way of addressing these questions, and each has a wealth of experience and perspective as to which this *Guide* is intended to provide substantive and procedural details.

Each constituency within the scope of WIPO's broader mandate will find value in these pages. Judges who preside over cases involving parallel proceedings in different countries will have access to more specific and practical information about how matters are handled in other jurisdictions and may bear upon their own adjudicative process. Lawyers and litigants considering the strategic interplay among cases in multiple countries involving the same technology will gain additional insight into the frameworks of the legal systems involved. And scholars who study patent litigation and its impact on technology and innovation generally will find experience-based detail not readily apparent in the language of statutes and treatises.

The *Guide* is also intended as a source of good ideas as nations and the global community struggle to address many of the greatest challenges, from climate change to pandemics. Even as each country has chosen to promote innovation in a manner that reflects its own history, culture and values, the success of WIPO's annual IP Judges Forum has shown that judges truly value learning from each other. The wisdom and insights shared by the national teams that have contributed to this publication are likely to affect their international colleagues in subtle yet important ways.

Jeremy Fogel

Executive Director, Berkeley Judicial Institute
Former Judge and Director of the Federal Judicial Center
in the United States of America