European Intellectual Property Review

2019 Volume 41 Issue 3 ISSN: 0142–0461

Table of Contents

Opinion

CHRISTOPHE GEIGER AND ELENA
IZYUMENKO

Freedom of Expression as an External Limitation to Copyright Law in the EU: The Advocate General of the CJEU Shows the Way 131

This article analyses the recent opinion delivered by A.G. Szpunar of the CJEU in the Afghanistan Papers case. It highlights, in particular, four crucial points that stand out in the opinion. First, the adoption of a fundamental rights perspective when evaluating copyright regulation in general. Secondly, the need to ensure that copyright's internal mechanisms designed to take into account the fundamental right to free expression (i.e. the idea/expression dichotomy, the criteria for protection such as the originality requirement and the exceptions and limitations) are interpreted in a manner that gives full effect to freedom of expression. The presence of such mechanisms should, thirdly, by no means be understood as immunising copyright from any further freedom of expression scrutiny: according to the Advocate General, if on the contrary fundamental rights are not sufficiently taken into account by the existing copyright system, there are circumstances when the exclusive rights "must yield to an overriding interest relating to the implementation of a fundamental right or freedom"—an explicit admittance (for the first time at EU level) of the admissibility of an external limitation to copyright by freedom of expression. This approach is not called into question by the Advocate General in his two other opinions that shortly followed Afghanistan Papers-Pelham and Spiegel Online. If at first sight he seems to take a more restrictive approach towards the opening of the closed list of limitations in EU copyright law by the use of fundamental rights, he still considers that such an external limitation is possible "in exceptional cases", specifying that this is in particular the case when the "essence of a fundamental right" is at stake. This article concludes by addressing the final focal point of the Afghanistan Papers opinion—the unacceptability of misusing copyright for the purposes not corresponding to its rationales and its social function. Such reference to the concept of copyright misuse is particular noteworthy since this notion has never been applied before by the EU courts in such an explicit way.

Articles

ALPANA ROY AND ALTHAF MARSOOF

The Brave New World of ICANN's "New gTLDs": An Analysis of Trade Mark Disputes During and Post Delegation 138

The aim of this article is to provide a comprehensive and critical analysis of trade mark disputes concerning new generic top-level domains or "new gTLDs" that have arisen both during and after the process of their delegation. In its first part, the article considers pre-delegation disputes, which mainly determine whether or not a particular "string" becomes delegated resulting in its inclusion in the root zone of the hierarchical namespace of the Internet's Domain Name System. Essentially, these disputes concern the "right" side of the dot. The second part of the article considers post-delegation disputes, particularly between trade mark owners and third parties who have registered domain names with a new gTLD. These are disputes concerning the "left" side of the dot. A consideration of disputes concerning new gTLDs reveal a problematic interplay between ICANN's dispute resolution mechanisms that apply during and after the delegation process. The outcome is that those who own non-fanciful trade marks are at a significant disadvantage in a world of new gTLDs.

CRAWFORD JAMIESON

In Defence of a UK Doctrine of Equivalents 147

This article considers whether the UK Supreme Court was right in *Actavis v Eli Lilly* to introduce a doctrine of equivalents when determining the infringement of patents in the UK. *Actavis v Eli Lilly* is undoubtedly among the most significant patent cases in recent years. It has accordingly attracted considerable academic commentary, which has identified several unsatisfactory elements of the UK's formulation of the doctrine of equivalents. In this article, I argue that these ought not to detract from the force of the argument in favour of a UK doctrine of equivalents. An analysis of the UK's approach to contractual interpretation indicates that determining whether a patent is infringed and construing a patent's claims are logically distinct matters. When the underlining statutory framework is examined, a doctrine of equivalents flows logically from a thorough-going distinction between infringement and construction. I therefore argue that the Supreme Court was correct to adopt a doctrine of equivalents, regardless of the reservations some have with its current formulation.

DR KRZYSZTOF GARSTKA AND PROF. PRZEMYSŁAW POLAŃSKI

Notice and Search-down Injunctions in Online Copyright Enforcement: Should they be Embraced or Forgotten? 155

Notice and "search-down" injunctions are court orders obliging an operator of a file-hosting platform to search third-party websites for links leading to infringing content present on the platform's service. This EU-oriented article analyses those orders' effectiveness and their impact on human rights, such as freedom of expression and freedom to conduct a business, concluding that when adequately designed, notice and search-down injunctions can be a useful, balanced copyright enforcement tool. The article also considers the limitations of judicial remedies in the studied context, and ponders the possibility of integrating the notice and search-down procedure within art.14 of the E-Commerce Directive.

JANE NIELSEN AND DIANNE NICOL

The Myriad Litigation and Genetic Diagnostic Testing in Australia 163

This article details a study conducted to ascertain whether the *Myriad* litigation has had a discernible effect on the availability and pricing of genetic diagnostic testing in Australia. It concludes that the impacts of the litigation have been minimal. The great area of uncertainty for Australian testing resides with method patents, where scope for restrictive case law remains.

Comments

EMMA FLETT AND JOHN PATTEN

SEPs Education: Court of Appeal Confirms its FRANDly Approach to Global SEP Licences 171

On 23 October 2018, the English Court of Appeal, upholding the judgment of the High Court, has affirmed the English courts as an attractive forum for standard-essential patent (SEP) holders by confirming that the SEP holders may, under certain circumstances, use the English courts to obtain global licences on fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms against would-be infringers.

EUGÉNIE COCHE

Heks'nkaas or the "Fifty Shades of Taste" Explained by the CJEU through EU Copyright Law 173

If the CJEU were to grant a prize to the 2018 most "original" copyright dispute, *Levola Hengola v Smilde Foods* (C-310/17) (the *Heks'nkaas* case) would undoubtedly stand among the nominees. The main reason why this case hit the spotlight is most probably because it touched upon the fundamentals of EU copyright law, namely its protectable subject-matter. Intriguingly, the complexities of copyright were unveiled by the following question: "Does Union law preclude the taste of food—as the author's own intellectual creation—from being protected by copyright?" Notwithstanding the court's dissenting answer, which clarified the scope of EU copyright law, it is of paramount importance to also discuss and unravel the ruling's preceding procedure, including the Opinion by the Advocate General, as it shed light on the many existing controversies within copyright law.

JOHN HULL

A Reappraisal of Negotiating Damages: The Supreme Court Judgment in Morris-Garner v One Step (Support) Ltd 180

In Morris-Garner v One Step (Support) Ltd, the Supreme Court allowed an appeal from the courts below on the basis that they had erred in their approach to the assessment of damages. In the course of his judgment, Lord Reed took the opportunity to restate some fundamental principles of the English law of damages in what is likely to be seen as a landmark judgment in this area.

NEDIM MALOVIC, LLM

CJEU Discusses Principles of Legal Certainty and Sound Administration in EU Trade Mark Oppositions 186

This article considers the 2018 decision of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) in European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) v Puma SE. In this case, the CJEU held that the General Court was correct in finding that the EUIPO should have considered earlier decisions that the opponent—Puma—had put forward in its opposition. Nothing would indeed preclude earlier EUIPO decisions, determining the existence of reputation in other inter partes proceedings, from being relied on, as evidence in support of the reputation of an earlier trade mark. This analysis discusses the case, first, by setting out the facts and what conclusions the EUIPO bodies and the General Court had reached, and then by turning to the CJEU decision. The final part reflects on the implications thereof.

JONATHAN TURNBULL AND ALEX FREELOVE

UK Supreme Court Raises Sufficiency Standard for Swiss-Form Claims and Limits the Ability to Assert Them Against "Skinny Label" Products 189

The Supreme Court in *Warner-Lambert v Actavis and Mylan* appears to have adopted a higher standard of assessment for plausibility in the context of sufficiency, thereby potentially increasing the amount of information required to be disclosed in a patent's description for Swiss-form claims. This may influence the time when innovator companies file their patent applications before their clinical trials, since more specific information may now be required to ensure that a patent remains valid. Although obiter, the Supreme Court has proposed an objective test for direct infringement based on "outward presentation", under which "skinny labels" carving out the patented indication may be effective in avoiding infringement.

BIANCA HANUZ

Liability Implications of Extending the Communication to the Public Right to Third-Party Re-Posting of Images Already Freely Available Online with Right Holder Permission 190

The decision in *Renckhoff* (C-161/17) finds that art.3(1) Directive 2001/29 covers third-party re-posting of an image already made available online with consent, freely and for free. An additional authorisation from the right holder is required for re-posting. The decision is equitable to right holders, but it raises additional hurdles for those engaging in the online use of works. Furthermore, Renckhoff will also interact with the application of hyperlinking rules. This contribution unpacks the Advocate General's and CJEU's opposing views and analyses the effects of the decision on stakeholder liability.

Book Review

197