

Table of Contents

Frequently used Abbreviations	13
Acknowledgments	15
Preface	17
§1. Introduction	17
§2. The main research question	18
§3. Scientific contribution	20
§4. A concise overview of the chapters	22
§5. Limitations	23
§6. Terminology.....	25

Part I: The Theoretical Underpinning

Chapter 1: Setting the Scene: Preliminary

Injunctions, Patents and Uncertainty	29
§1.1. Introduction	29
§1.2. Justifications for patent protection.....	32
§1.3. Uncertainty in litigation	35
§1.3.1 (Technical) complexity in patent litigation.....	38
§1.3.2. Legal and economic uncertainties	40
§1.3.2.1. Legal uncertainties	41
§1.3.2.2. Economic uncertainties: assessing the economic harms that may occur to the plaintiff and to the defendant	43
§1.4. The property and liability rules framework and preliminary injunctions	46
§1.4.1. The framework itself	46

§1.4.2.	The role of preliminary injunctions in (the application of) the framework.....	48
§1.5.	Chapter conclusion	50

Chapter 2: Independent Economic and Doctrinal Reasons in Favour of the Availability of the Remedy of Preliminary Injunctions

53

§2.1.	Introduction	53
§2.2.	To preserve the status quo between the parties: more than an effect?	54
§2.3.	To prevent irreparable harm: the inadequacy of damages to make whole	58
§2.3.1.	Is 'to prevent irreparable harm' a distinct justification?	59
§2.3.2.	The main sources of irreparable harm	60
	A) An irreplaceable loss.....	60
	B) The difficulty to calculate damages	62
	C) The inability to pay and insolvent defendants	65
§2.4.	To prevent delay rendering rights meaningless (<i>periculum in mora</i>).....	65
§2.5.	To protect rights given: the need for enforcement.....	67
§2.6.	To preserve the ability for the court to do judgment later	70
§2.7.	Possible positive effects on innovation	70
§2.8.	Providing temporary clarity	72
§2.9.	Chapter conclusion	73

Chapter 3: Potential Risks with the Grant of Preliminary Injunctions in Patent Litigation

75

§3.1.	Introduction	75
§3.2.	Possible lock-in effect leading to biased decisionmaking.....	75
§3.3.	The subsequent trial on the merits is a legal fiction.....	76
§3.4.	Negative effects on competition and innovation	78

§3.4.1.	‘Working around’ the contested patent and the preliminary injunction: a waste of resources?.....	78
§3.4.2.	Hold-up problems.....	81
§3.4.3.	Settlements and (the threat of) preliminary injunctions....	82
§3.5.	An erroneous decision and the question of compensation.....	89
§3.5.1.	Potentially reparable harms – harms due to an undeserved wealth transfer.....	90
§3.5.2.	Deadweight losses and practically irreparable harm	93
§3.5.3.	An insufficient remedy to compensate and further effects.....	95
§3.6.	Chapter conclusion	95

Chapter 4: A Case Study of the role of Preliminary Injunctions in Practice: Generic Entry in the Pharmaceutical Market

§4.1.	Introduction	97
§4.2.	Preliminary injunctions and the (generic) pharmaceutical market.....	97
§4.3.	Characteristics of the pharmaceutical market regarding supply and demand.....	100
§4.4.	Generic entry and regulatory approval.....	102
§4.5.	Preventing generic entry versus First Mover Advantage	104
§4.6.	Main findings and data from the EU Pharmaceutical Sector Inquiry with respect to preliminary injunctions.....	107
§4.7.	Analysis of the findings of the Pharmaceutical Sector Inquiry.....	109

Chapter 5: How Courts Can Deal with Preliminary Injunctions from the Perspective of Law & Economics Theory.....

§5.1.	Introduction	111
§5.2.	Tight judicial control in decisionmaking under uncertainty	111
§5.2.1.	The Leubsdorf-Posner approach.....	111

§5.2.2.	A refinement of Leubsdorf's formula: Davis' Modified Framework.....	114
§5.3.	Alternatives to tight judicial control in decisionmaking under uncertainty.....	118
§5.3.1.	The PI liability rule	118
§5.3.2.	Romeu's dual standard	122
§5.3.3.	The relative consequences model of Norrgård.....	124
§5.4.	Chapter conclusion	125
§5.5.	A schematic overview of different Law & Economics theories	128

Part II: International and National Law

Chapter 6:	International and European Obligations and Preliminary Injunctions.....	133
§6.1.	Introduction	133
§6.2.	The international level: the TRIPS Agreement	133
§6.3.	The (supranational) European level	139
§6.3.1.	Introduction	139
§6.3.2.	The EU Enforcement Directive (2004/48/EC)	140
§6.3.3.	Further comments on the EU Enforcement Directive.....	145
§6.3.4.	Art. 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Art. 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU	148
§6.3.5.	The Brussels I Regulation.....	153
§6.4.	Chapter conclusion	157

Chapter 7:	An Overview of National Legal Frameworks and the Practices and Issues Courts Encounter.....	159
§7.1.	The Netherlands.....	159
§7.1.1.	Introduction	159

§7.1.2.	Legal basis.....	162
§7.1.3.	Urgency.....	163
§7.1.4.	Suitability.....	168
§7.1.5.	Balancing	169
§7.1.6.	Security and compensation	178
§7.1.7.	Intermediate conclusion.....	179
§7.2.	Germany	180
§7.2.1.	Introduction	180
§7.2.2.	The legal basis.....	181
§7.2.3.	Verfügungsanspruch	184
§7.2.4.	Verfügungsgrund	188
§7.2.5.	Interessenabwägung.....	192
	§7.2.5.1. The issue of patent validity	192
	§7.2.5.2. The balancing of interests as part of the Interessenabwägung.....	202
§7.2.6.	Sicherheitsleistung and damages	209
§7.2.7.	Intermediate conclusion.....	211
§7.3.	England	212
§7.3.1.	Introduction	212
§7.3.2.	The legal basis and guiding principles: Equity and American Cyanamid	212
	§7.3.2.1 Is there a serious question to be tried?	215
	§7.3.2.2. Are damages an adequate remedy?	222
	§7.3.2.3. If damages are not adequate, taking into account the position of both the plaintiff and the defendant, does the balance of convenience favour the injunction?	225
	§7.3.2.3.1. Balancing – ‘clearing the way’	227
	§7.3.2.3.2. Balancing – other factors	229
§7.3.3.	Previous decisions on patent validity	233
§7.3.4.	Cross-undertaking in damages	235
§7.3.5.	Intermediate conclusion.....	238

§7.4.	The United States.....	239
§7.4.1.	Introduction	239
§7.4.2.	The legal basis and test.....	240
§7.4.3.	Likelihood of success	242
§7.4.4.	Irreparable harm	244
§7.4.5.	Balance of convenience.....	259
§7.4.6.	Public interest.....	260
§7.4.7.	Bond and damages.....	264
§7.4.8.	Intermediate conclusion.....	265
§7.5.	Concluding discussion, thereby relating to earlier findings.....	266
§7.5.1.	Key commonalities	266
§7.5.2.	Key differences	267
§7.5.3.	How do national practices tie in with preceding chapters?.....	267
§7.5.4.	Improving the court's information position.....	269

Part III: A Look into the Future

Chapter 8: Preliminary Injunctions under the Unified Patent Court; What is known and to be Expected.....	275
§8.1.	Introduction..... 275
§8.2.	Background..... 276
§8.3.	Legislative basis for preliminary injunctions and the legal test..... 281
§8.4.	The UPC and an adequate security against an erroneous decision..... 286
§8.5.	The transitional period..... 288
§8.6.	Risk of differences between local courts and forum shopping..... 290
§8.7.	Patent trolls and the UPC..... 291

§8.8. Competition law and preliminary injunctions under the UPC	294
§8.9. Intermediate conclusion.....	295
§ 8.10. De Lege Ferenda – Recommended best Practices for the Unified Patent Court to Deal with Preliminary Injunctions	295
§8.10.1. Introduction	295
§8.10.2. Urgency (temporal and necessity)	296
§8.10.2.1. Urgency (temporal)	296
§8.10.2.2. Urgency (necessity).....	297
§8.10.2.3. Imminent infringement	297
§8.10.3. Validity	298
§8.10.3.1. A patent’s likelihood of validity – the role of presumptions.....	299
§8.10.3.2. An evident error on validity from within the court system	300
§8.10.3.3. The extent of the validity analysis itself.....	301
§8.10.4. Infringement and/or harm.....	301
§8.10.4.1. Likelihood of infringement analysis	302
§8.10.4.2. An explicit requirement to demonstrate irreparable harm?	302
§8.10.5. Balancing of hardships and the public interest.....	303
§8.10.6. Bond and damages.....	307
§8.10.7. Concluding proposal	308
Literature and Case Law	311
Cited legislation	311
List of cited cases	312
List of cited literature	317