

# EXTENDED CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	xiv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xvi
<i>Table of cases</i>	xviii
<i>Table of legislation</i>	xxxi
<i>Introduction to EU law and intellectual property rights: scope and approach</i>	xli
<b>1 COMPETITION AND IP LAW INTERFACE</b>	
I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES	1.01
A. Introduction	1.01
1. A complex relationship	1.01
2. IP laws	1.15
3. Competition laws	1.23
4. The early deference of EU competition law to IP law	1.34
B. Recent Trends	1.45
1. The modernization of competition law and the shift to a more economics-based approach	1.46
2. The modernization and harmonization of IP law	1.49
3. The evolving role of IP in commercial practice	1.54
a. New business models	1.55
b. Digital technologies	1.57
c. Competition law authorities have adapted	1.60
4. Competition law enforcement with sectoral variations?	1.61
C. The Key Protagonists	1.69
1. The European Commission	1.69
a. DG Competition	1.72
b. DG Connect	1.73
c. DG Grow	1.74
d. DG RTD ('Research and Innovation')	1.75
2. Council, courts and Parliament	1.76
D. IPRs in the Single Market	1.87
1. The single market imperative	1.87
2. Interplay between Articles 34–36 TFEU and 101–102 TFEU	1.88
3. Exhaustion of rights	1.96
4. Specific subject matter	1.100
5. Essential function	1.105
6. The importance of 'consent'	1.107
7. International exhaustion/harmonizing initiatives	1.111
<b>2 ARTICLE 101 TFEU AND IP LICENSING</b>	
I. ARTICLE 101 TFEU AND LICENSING OF IP – GENERAL PRINCIPLES	2.04
II. ARTICLE 101(1) TFEU – AN OVERVIEW	2.05
A. Agreements, Concerted Practices/Unilateral Conduct	2.06
B. Undertakings	2.15
1. Economic undertakings	2.15

2. Economic activity	2.16
3. Independent undertakings	2.17
4. Principal/agent	2.19
C. Object or Effect of Restricting Competition	2.31
1. Object restrictions	2.32
2. Effects restrictions	2.47
3. Ancillary restraints	2.53
4. Extent of necessary effect on competition – <i>de minimis</i>	2.59
5. Effect on trade – a question of jurisdiction	2.66
a. IPR as an entry barrier – the relevance of exhaustion	2.72
b. The height of the barrier posed by IPRs	2.81
III. ARTICLE 101(2) TFEU AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF INFRINGEMENT	2.88
IV. ARTICLE 101(3) TFEU	2.94
V. RESTRICTIVE CLAUSES IN LICENCE AGREEMENTS	2.102
A. Existence/Exercise/Specific Subject Matter	2.104
B. Exclusivity	2.129
1. Manufacturing exclusivity	2.142
2. Sales restrictions/exclusivity	2.145
3. Exclusivity in the courts	2.151
C. Tying and Bundling/Quality Control Obligations	2.174
D. Restrictions on Prices or Customers	2.195
E. Field of Use Restrictions	2.200
F. Non-compete Obligations	2.211
G. Disincentives for the Licensee to Develop/Exploit Own Technology/Grant Back Requirements	2.219
H. Royalty Payments on Unpatented/Partially Patented Products	2.245
I. Post-Expiry Royalties	2.257
1. Introduction	2.257
2. The early approach of the Commission	2.259
3. The Court of Justice Rules	2.263
4. The Commission's approach in the 2014 Technology Transfer Guidelines	2.274
5. The approach to post-expiry royalties in the US	2.278
J. No Challenge Clauses	2.282
K. Application of Article 101 TFEU to Different Types of IPR Licences	2.300
1. Patent licences/knowhow licences	2.301
2. Trademark licences	2.311
3. Copyright/design right licences	2.329

### 3 TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER BLOCK EXEMPTION

I. OVERVIEW OF THE TTBER	3.04
II. PROVISIONS OF THE TTBER – SUMMARY	3.12
A. Article 1 – The Definitions	3.14
B. Article 2 – The Exemption	3.22
C. Article 3 – The Market Share Thresholds	3.27
D. Article 4 – The Hardcore Restrictions	3.39
E. Article 5 – The Excluded Restrictions	3.45
F. Articles 6–11 – Additional Provisions	3.47
1. Article 6 – Withdrawal of the benefit of the block exemption	3.48
2. Article 7 – Non-application of the block exemption to networks of agreements	3.51
3. Article 8 – Application of market share thresholds	3.52
4. Articles 9–11 – Relationship with other block exemptions, transitional period and duration	3.56
III. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE TTBER	3.58
A. Distinction Between Competitors and Non-competitors	3.58
1. Blocking positions	3.64
2. Key takeaways on blocking positions	3.94

B.	Use of Market Share Thresholds	3.95
IV.	THE APPLICATION OF THE CORE OPERATIVE PROVISIONS OF THE TTBER	3.102
A.	Hardcore Restrictions – Agreements Between Competitors	3.102
1.	Price fixing	3.103
2.	Output restriction	3.112
3.	Allocation of markets/customers	3.115
a.	Sole licences	3.118
b.	Restrictions protecting the parties from each other	3.119
c.	Restrictions protecting licensees from each other (and the licensor from the licensees)	3.124
B.	Hardcore Restrictions – Agreements Between Non-competitors	3.135
1.	Price fixing (Article 4(2)(a))	3.136
2.	Passive sales restrictions on the licensee (Article 4(2)(b))	3.140
a.	Sales into reserved territories/customer groups (Article 4(2)(b)(i))	3.144
b.	Captive use limitation (Article 4(2)(b)(ii))	3.152
c.	Single customer supply obligations (Article 4(2)(b)(iii))	3.153
d.	Sales at the wholesale level only (Article 4(2)(b)(iv))	3.154
e.	Sales to authorized distributors only (Article 4(2)(b)(v))/sales to end-users must be permitted (Article 4(2)(c))	3.155
C.	A Change in the Competitive Relationship of the Parties (Article 4(3))	3.159
D.	Excluded Restrictions (Article 5)	3.163
1.	Grant back obligations (Article 5(1)(a))	3.166
2.	No challenge provisions (Article 5(2)(b))	3.182
3.	Limiting developments outside the licence (Article 5(2))	3.192
4	COMPETITION LAW ASSESSMENT OF TECHNOLOGY LICENCES OUTSIDE THE TTBER	
I.	OVER THE MARKET SHARE THRESHOLD	4.07
II.	MULTILATERAL LICENCES AND POOLING AGREEMENTS	4.10
A.	The Creation and Operation of a Technology Pool	4.15
B.	Agreements Between the Pool and Licensees	4.21
III.	SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS	4.31
5	OTHER AGREEMENTS INVOLVING IP LICENCES	
I.	VERTICAL AGREEMENTS AND ANALOGOUS ARRANGEMENTS	5.02
II.	APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 101 TFEU TO OTHER AGREEMENTS RELATING TO IPRS	5.22
III.	HORIZONTAL AGREEMENTS AND IP – GENERAL PRINCIPLES	5.24
IV.	R&D AGREEMENTS/SPECIALIZATION AGREEMENTS	5.29
A.	The Definitions – Article 1	5.42
B.	The Exemption – Article 2	5.43
C.	Access to the Results of the Collaboration and to IPR – Articles 3 and 4	5.44
1.	Access to results: ‘foreground’ IPR and knowhow	5.47
2.	Access to pre-existing knowhow	5.53
3.	Limits to permissible joint exploitation	5.56
4.	Obligations to supply	5.59
D.	Market Share and Duration – Articles 6 and 7	5.60
E.	The Hardcore Restrictions – Article 8	5.65
1.	Restrictions on R&D	5.67
2.	Restrictions on output or sales	5.68
3.	Restrictions on pricing or royalties	5.70
4.	Restrictions on active and passive sales/sales to resellers	5.71
F.	The Excluded Restrictions – Article 9	5.73
V.	SPECIALIZATION AGREEMENTS OR PRODUCTION AGREEMENTS	5.79
VI.	STANDARDIZATION AGREEMENTS	5.84

A. Introduction	5.84
B. The Approach of the Commission under Article 101(1) TFEU – Introduction	5.89
C. Standardization Agreements – ‘By Object’ Restrictions	5.100
D. Standardization Agreements – ‘By Effect’ Restrictions	5.102
E. FRAND	5.107
F. Good Faith Disclosure	5.125
G. Article 101 TFEU, IP and Standardization – Conclusion	5.133
VII. SUBCONTRACTING	5.136

## 6 IP, DOMINANCE AND ABUSE

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	6.01
A. Dominance	6.10
B. Abuse	6.21
C. Purpose of Article 102 TFEU	6.29
D. Article 102 TFEU: Bright Line/by Object or ‘Effects’?	6.43
E. Article 102 TFEU – Constantly Evolving: Start With First Principles	6.56
F. Does Article 102 TFEU Have Exceptions?	6.77
G. How Does IP Fit Into This Regime?	6.82
H. Refusals to Deal – Overview	6.88
I. The Development of the Case Law	6.96
1. <i>IMS Health</i>	6.131
a. The Commission interim measures decision and IMS’s appeal to the GC	6.134
b. The CJEU’s preliminary ruling on the national court reference	6.139
2. <i>Microsoft</i>	6.142
a. Indispensability	6.151
b. Elimination of competition	6.154
c. New product	6.158
d. Justification	6.164
e. Other interesting points	6.169
f. Refusals beyond Microsoft?	6.171
J. Other Types of Abuse	6.180
1. Tying	6.182
2. Unfair licences	6.194
3. Excessive royalties	6.207
4. Exclusivity	6.222
5. Abuse of the IP system	6.230
a. <i>AstraZeneca</i> – misuse of patent and regulatory systems	6.239
b. <i>Boehringer Ingelheim</i> – unmeritorious patents	6.257
c. <i>Teva</i> – divisional patents	6.259
d. Other IP related abuses – patent ambush	6.260
e. Collecting societies	6.266
II. SUMMARY ON ARTICLE 102	6.286
A. Dominance	6.289
B. Abuse	6.292

## 7 MERGERS AND IP

I. OVERVIEW	7.01
A. Introduction	7.01
II. JURISDICTION	7.11
A. EU Merger Regulation	7.11
B. Concentrations	7.14
C. Turnover Thresholds	7.27
D. Substantive Appraisal	7.39
1. Introduction	7.39
2. Innovation concerns	7.42

3. Existing research and development programmes	7.47
4. General innovation concerns	7.56
5. Non-horizontal concerns	7.62
6. Procedural issues	7.83
7. Conclusion on innovation	7.86
E. Big Data Concerns	7.89
III. ANCILLARY RESTRICTIONS	7.96
A. Acquisitions and Joint Ventures	7.99
B. Principles Applicable to Common Restrictions in Acquisitions	7.100
1. Licence agreements	7.100
2. Non-competition clauses and IPR	7.105
C. Principles Applicable to Common Restrictions in Joint Ventures	7.112
1. Licence agreements	7.112
2. Non-competition covenants	7.114
IV. REMEDIES	7.119
A. Types of Remedies	7.122
1. Licence agreements	7.122
2. Re-branding	7.135
3. Interoperability	7.139
4. Access to data	7.145
V. CONCLUSION	7.151
8 IPR/COMPETITION LAW ISSUES IN THE PHARMACEUTICAL SECTOR	
I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	8.01
II. ARTICLE 101 AND IPR IN THE PHARMACEUTICAL SECTOR	8.38
A. R&D/Product Development	8.41
B. Licensing Following the Research Phase	8.48
1. Post-expiry royalties	8.52
a. The early decisions	8.53
b. <i>Ottung v Klee</i> – the first Court case	8.57
c. <i>Ottung v Klee</i> confirmed	8.64
d. The implications of the case law	8.68
e. What if a simple right to terminate is not commercially feasible?	8.77
f. Summary	8.86
2. Grant back obligations	8.93
C. Co-marketing, Co-promotion and Authorized Generics	8.98
D. Parallel Trade	8.110
E. Agreements at the Time of Generic Entry	8.117
F. Agreements to Coordinate Higher Prices	8.121
III. LITIGATION AND SETTLEMENTS	8.131
A. <i>Lundbeck</i>	8.136
1. Potential competition	8.145
2. By object	8.156
B. <i>Paroxetine</i>	8.165
1. Potential competition	8.168
a. Relevance of the market context	8.168
b. Factual considerations	8.169
2. Patent issues	8.171
3. By object	8.175
a. Market features	8.176
b. Patent/settlement specific issues	8.178
c. Agreement/factual specific issues	8.182
d. Potential counter-arguments/scope of the patent	8.186
e. Relevance and assessment of procompetitive effects in 'by-object' analysis	8.189
4. By effects – effect of uncertainty – counterfactual	8.191
C. <i>Servier</i>	8.194

D. <i>Cephalon/Teva</i>	8.206
E. Pay For Delay – Summary	8.210
IV. ARTICLE 102 TFEU AND IPR IN THE PHARMACEUTICAL SECTOR	8.214
A. Some Concepts	8.214
B. Dominance	8.215
1. Relevance of the Anatomic Therapeutic Classification	8.216
2. Market definition in generics/ <i>Paroxetine</i> – the relevance of patents	8.237
3. Dominance and IPRs in pharma	8.244
C. Abuse	8.253
1. The abuse of patent/regulatory procedures	8.253
a. <i>AstraZeneca</i>	8.254
b. <i>Pfizer Italy</i> – divisional patents	8.280
c. <i>Reckitt Benckiser</i> – UK – exclusionary strategy	8.285
d. <i>Boehringer Ingelheim</i> – Commission – misuse of patent system	8.288
e. <i>Teva/Copaxone</i> – Commission – misuse of divisional patents	8.291
f. Denigration – Commission – <i>Teva/Copaxone</i> ; <i>Vifor/Pharmacosmos</i>	8.297
g. Spain – CNMC – <i>Merck Sharp</i> and <i>Dohme</i> misuse of legal procedures/ withholding information	8.300
h. Use of blocking patents – Switzerland/EU – <i>Novartis/Eli Lilly</i>	8.302
2. Pay for delay and other exclusionary strategies	8.304
a. <i>Les Laboratoires Servier</i> ( <i>Servier</i> )	8.305
b. <i>Paroxetine</i> /generics	8.309

## 9 COMPETITION LAW, STANDARDS AND FRAND

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	9.01
II. STANDARDS, SEPS AND FRAND – HISTORICAL AND TECHNICAL CONTEXT	9.05
III. CASE LAW AND LEGISLATIVE/REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS	9.31
A. Patent Ambush – <i>Rambus</i>	9.35
B. Non-FRAND Terms – <i>Qualcomm/Royalties</i>	9.46
C. <i>IPCom</i> – The Transfer of FRAND	9.54
D. PAEs, Privateering and Portfolio Splitting	9.56
E. Injunctions – A Straw in the Wind – <i>Google/MMI</i>	9.71
F. Seeking Injunctions, Imposing Unfair Terms – EU Investigations into Motorola Mobility Inc (MMI) and Samsung	9.73
1. Commission investigations: <i>Apple/Samsung</i> ; <i>Microsoft and Apple/Motorola</i>	9.78
a. Dominance	9.85
b. Abuse	9.91
2. National courts and CJEU – reference in <i>Huawei v ZTE</i>	9.112
3. Access to court/the exercise of IPR	9.123
4. The ability to raise a competition defence in injunction proceedings	9.132
5. Discrimination and the right to a licence	9.144
IV. NON-COMPETITION LAW INITIATIVES	9.159

Index	473
-------	-----