



SEEK

Patent Litigation in Europe

Motivation

- Current disputes about reforming the European patent system (introduction of community patent, unified patent), the patent litigation system ("unified patent court"), "European Patent"
- Missing harmonisation of patent litigation within the EU ("single market")
- Fragmentation of national judicial enforcement systems lead to
 - Different outcomes of litigation in Europe
 - Incentives for strategic use and abuse of enforcement systems
 - Double litigation and strategic prolongation of suits
- No comparative data available to analyse the procedures and efficiency of national patent enforcement systems

Research Questions

- Incidence and outcomes of IPR litigation suits in different European legal systems
- Efficiency of European IPR litigation systems
- Comparative analysis of the impacts of institutional details of national enforcement systems on the outcomes of IPR cases

Research Team

- Katrin Cremers, ZEW
- Georg Licht, ZEW
- Mark Schankerman London School of Economics
- Chrisian Helmers
 University Carlos III of Madrid
- Cedric Schneider
 Copenhagen Business School
- Dietmar Harhoff, LMU Munich, INNO-tec
- Georg von Graevenitz
 LMU Munich, INNO-tec
- Nicolas van Zeebroeck
 Free University of Brussels
- Robert Pithkelty
 St. Peter's College, University of Oxford
- Tony Clayton
 IPO London

Data Requirements

- Coverage of all patent cases filed, settled cases too
- Necessary information on
 - Litigants
 - Duration
 - Procedural actions
 - First and higher instances
 - Outcome
 - Costs and potential damages
- Comparative information on non-comparable systems in Europe

Tasks Solved So Far

- Systematic overview and detailed description of the patent enforcement systems in Germany, France, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Belgium as a precondition for:
 - Adjustment of the German questionnaire to the other jurisdictional procedures to ensure comparability
 - Cooperation with lawyers from the University of Mannheim, Düsseldorf, Brussels, and London to take strategic interactions of procedural means into account
- Supplementary company data which can be combined with the litigation data are made available for all countries involved

Project Description

The German System

- 15 district courts have jurisdiction for patent cases
 - Three of them take more than 80% of the cases: Mannheim, Munich, and Düsseldorf
- Duality
 - Validity of patents: Jurisdiction at German Patent Court
 - Infringement: Jurisdiction at district courts

Data situation

- No data in electronic form available
- Since May 2010: ZEW collects all procedural information via questionnaire:
 - Mannheim: Collection finished:1368 filed cases in 2000–2008
 - Munich/Düsseldorf: Collection has started

The British System

- No unified legal system for the UK
- England and Wales: Patent County Courts (PCC) and the Patent Court (PHC)
- Nearly all cases are heard by the PHC
- Validity and infringement are dealt with by one court
- Appeals are made to the Court of Appeal

Data situation

- Lists of cases in electronic form available
- Detailed data to be collected via questionnaire
 - Problem: Procedural difference among the systems lead to comparability problems

The Dutch System

- Court in The Hague has exclusive jurisdiction on patent disputes
- Validity and infringement are dealt with by one court

Data situation

- Core data of court decisions are available in electronic form
- High coverage in 2000–2008
- Settled cases are not observable.
 - The court does *NOT* issue a decision when parties settle, so these cases will be missing
 - Settlement rate in NL very low: Between10% and 15%

The French System

- Tribunaux de Grande Instance (TGIs) have jurisdiction to judge infringement claims and claims to French patent disputes.
- Until June 2008 there were ten of those TGIs (Marseille, Bordeaux, Strasbourg, Lille, Limoges, Lyon, Nancy, Paris, Rennes, Toulouse).
- Court in Paris has exclusive jurisdiction on patent disputes (only since 2009)

Data situation

- Core data of court decisions are in electronic form available
- Low coverage in 2000–2008
- Settled cases are observable
 - The court does *ALWAYS* issue an indication that parties have settled