# Patents

Contributing editor Richard T McCaulley Jr



2016

## GETTING THE DEAL THROUGH

© Law Business Research 2016

# GETTING THE DEAL THROUGH

# Patents 2016

# Contributing editor Richard T McCaulley Jr Ropes & Gray LLP

Publisher Gideon Roberton gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions Sophie Pallier subscriptions@gettingthedealthrough.com

Business development managers Alan Lee alan.lee@lbresearch.com

Adam Sargent adam.sargent@lbresearch.com

Dan White dan.white@lbresearch.com



Published by Law Business Research Ltd 87 Lancaster Road London, W11 1QQ, UK Tel: +44 20 3708 4199 Fax: +44 20 7229 6910

© Law Business Research Ltd 2016 No photocopying without a CLA licence. First published 2004 Thirteenth edition ISSN 1742-9862 The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of March 2016, be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by Encompass Print Solutions Tel: 0844 2480 112



#### CONTENTS

Global Overview	7	Korea	98
Richard T McCaulley Jr		Yoon Suk Shin, Eun-Young Park and Gon-Uk Huh	
Ropes & Gray LLP		Lee International IP & Law Group	
Pharmaceutical patents in India	8	Macedonia	106
Archana Shanker and Gitika Suri		Valentin Pepeljugoski	
Anand and Anand		Pepeljugoski Law Office	
Austria	10	Malaysia	112
Peter Israiloff		Benjamin J Thompson, Haneeta Kaur Gill and Hannah Arif	fin
Barger, Piso & Partner		Thompson Associates	
Brazil	17	Mexico	119
Philippe Bhering, Jiuliano Maurer, Flavia Merola and		Eugenio Pérez and José Luis Ramos-Zurita	
Rafael Toegel Bhering Advogados		Uhthoff, Gómez Vega & Uhthoff, SC	
Canada		Nigeria	125
Canada	24	Oyebade St Matthew-Daniel and Oluwakemi Oke	
David Reive Miller Thomson LLP		Strachan Partners	
China	•-	Pakistan	131
China	30	Ali Kabir Shah and Hanya Haroon	
<b>Jianyang (Eugene) Yu</b> Liu, Shen & Associates		Ali & Associates	
		Peru	138
Colombia	35	Maria del Carmen Arana Courrejolles	
Carlos R Olarte, Alexander Agudelo, Liliana Galindo and Catalina Jiménez		Estudio Colmenares & Asociados	
OlarteMoure		Philippines	148
Ecuador	42	Mila Federis and Caesar J Poblador	
María Rosa Fabara Vera	44	Federis and Associates Law Offices	
Fabara & Compañía Abogados		Poland	155
_		Dorota Rzążewska, Piotr Godlewski and Mirosława Ważyń	
France	<u>49</u>	JWP Patent & Trademark Attorneys	
Benjamin May and Marie Liens Aramis		Doutricol	-6-
		Portugal	161
Germany	55	António Andrade Vieira de Almeida & Associados	
Henrik Holzapfel			
Loschelder Rechtsanwälte		Russia	166
		Vladimir Biriulin and Nikolay Bogdanov	
Greece	61	Gorodissky & Partners	
Alkisti-Irene Malamis Malamis & Associates			
		Singapore	171
Honduras	67	Regina Quek One Legal LLC	
Ricardo A Mejía			
Bufete Mejía & Asociados		South Africa	180
India	73	Russell Bagnall Adams & Adams	
Archana Shanker and Gitika Suri		Adams & Adams	
Anand and Anand		Sweden	186
Italy	85	Kristian Fredrikson	
Stefania Bergia	85	Delphi	
Vanzetti e Associati		Switzerland	191
Taman		Rudolf A Rentsch, Andrea Carreira and Demian Stauber	-/-
Japan Yasufumi Shiroyama and Makoto Ono	92	Rentsch Partner AG	
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune		Taiwan	197
		Yulan Kuo, Frank Lu and Charles Chen	

Turkey 2	204	United States	224
Korcan Dericioğlu		Richard T McCaulley Jr	
Dericioğlu & Yaşar Law Office		Ropes & Gray LLP	
Ukraine 2	210	Venezuela	234
Vladyslav Podolyak		María Milagros Nebreda and Carlos Pacheco	
Vasil Kisil & Partners		Hoet Peláez Castillo & Duque	
United Kingdom 2	216	Vietnam	240
Richard T McCaulley Jr		Pham Vu Khanh Toan	
Ropes & Gray LLP		Pham & Associates	

# Portugal

#### António Andrade

Vieira de Almeida & Associados

#### Patent enforcement proceedings

1 Lawsuits and courts

What legal or administrative proceedings are available for enforcing patent rights against an infringer? Are there specialised courts in which a patent infringement lawsuit can or must be brought?

Patent rights must be enforced before the Intellectual Property Court, which is a court specialised in IP rights with the exclusive competence to decide on the enforcement actions – and validity actions – regarding any IP right and also unfair competition.

There is an exception for the actions related to pharmaceutical patents and generic medicines, which are subject to mandatory arbitration, according to Law 62/2011, of 12 December. Upon the publication of a marketing authorisation application for a generic product the patent holder has a 30-day period to start an arbitration action (institutionalised or ad hoc).

Patent infringement is a criminal offence and a criminal complaint before a criminal court is also available, although this route is rarely used.

#### 2 Trial format and timing

#### What is the format of a patent infringement trial?

The typical form of a patent trial is the live and oral questioning of the witnesses or expert witnesses appointed by the parties, in order to evidence the facts alleged in the statement of claim and statement of defence.

The witnesses respond to questions from the parties' lawyers – examination in chief and cross-examination – and also from the judge. The evidence includes documentary evidence and testimonial evidence and could also include affidavits, legal opinions and expert opinions.

Disputes are decided by a single judge – in the first instance – and a typical patent infringement trial could last between 18 months and two years. A preliminary injunction could take between three and eight months.

In the mandatory arbitrations for the enforcement of pharmaceutical patents, the main action could last up to one year and a preliminary injunction between two and five months.

#### 3 Proof requirements

## What are the burdens of proof for establishing infringement, invalidity and unenforceability of a patent?

For establishing infringement the burden of proof lies with the claimant (patent holder). There is a reversal of the burden of proof regarding process patents of a new product, as established by law: 'if a patent is for a manufacturing process of a new product, the same product manufactured by a third party shall be considered to have been manufactured by the patented process unless proven otherwise.'

For invalidity and unenforceability of a patent the burden of proof lies with the party that alleges the facts which underlie the invalidity and unenforceability.

#### 4 Standing to sue

Who may sue for patent infringement? Under what conditions can an accused infringer bring a lawsuit to obtain a judicial ruling or declaration on the accusation?

The patent holder or a licensee/sub-licensee (if this is contemplated in the respective licence or sub-licence contract) has standing to sue.

Before an action is brought by the patent holder against the infringer, the accused infringer can file a declaratory action for non-infringement of the patent, as an anticipatory defence measure.

After a patent infringement action is submitted against the infringer its defence should be filed in such action and may include a counterclaim, notably for the invalidation of the patent.

## 5 Inducement, and contributory and multiple party infringement

To what extent can someone be liable for inducing or contributing to patent infringement? Can multiple parties be jointly liable for infringement if each practises only some of the elements of a patent claim, but together they practise all the elements?

Although there is no legal provision for contributory infringement, there are legal provisions related to contribution of third parties to patent infringement, apart from the infringer. In particular, within the measures to preserve evidence, the materials and instruments – in the possession of a third party – used in producing and distributing the infringing products can be seized.

Multiple parties may be jointly liable for infringement if each practises only some of the elements (or steps) of a patent claim, but together they practise all the elements (or steps).

#### 6 Joinder of multiple defendants

Can multiple parties be joined as defendants in the same lawsuit? If so, what are the requirements? Must all of the defendants be accused of infringing all of the same patents?

The rules on the coalition of defendants in the Civil Procedural Code state that multiple parties can be joined as defendants in the same lawsuit basically if there is the same and only cause of action against them.

#### 7 Infringement by foreign activities

To what extent can activities that take place outside the jurisdiction support a charge of patent infringement?

A cross-border injunction will be an available measure to deal with these activities.

#### 8 Infringement by equivalents

#### To what extent can 'equivalents' of the claimed subject matter be shown to infringe?

The doctrine of equivalents is regularly invoked in patent litigation cases and is also regularly considered and applied by the courts and arbitral tribunals.