

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	V
Table of Abbreviations	XVI

Chapter I: Introduction..... 1

I. Premise..... 1

1. Exclusive Jurisdiction in Intellectual Property Rights Cases between Public and Private International Law	1
2. What is Included in Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules and what is not. Exclusive Jurisdiction and Subject Matter Jurisdiction	10
3. Peculiarities Related to the Analysis of the <i>Lucasfilm</i> and <i>Gallo</i> Cases, and a Brief Mention of Apple's and Samsung's still Unsettled Patent War around the Globe.....	16
4. Uniform European Union Patent and Unified Patent Litigation System: Where do we Stand?	19
5. Terminology: Private International Law (PIL); Brussels System; Court of Justice of the European Union (ECJ); Exclusive Jurisdiction; Intellectual Property; Traditional Knowledge (TK), Genetic Resources (GR) and Folklore (F); Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH); Registered and Unregistered Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs); State Granting an IPR; International Conventions on IP; Four Academic Sets of Principles; International Law Association Committee; the Hague Preliminary Draft; Validity Claims Principally and Incidentally Raised; Infringement Proceedings; Duplicated Proceedings; Misappropriation and Protection; Judgments; Rendering State and Requested Country; Courts.....	27
6. Internet and Geolocation Tools	40

II. Theses Purporting that Comity, The Act of State Doctrine and The Territoriality Principle Establish Implicit Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules

42

7. The US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit <i>Voda</i> Judgment and the UK Court of Appeal <i>Lucasfilm</i> Decision.....	42
8. The ECJ <i>GAT</i> Decision	45

<i>III. Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules are not Established either by Comity or by the Act of State Doctrine and the Territoriality Principle, but rather are Contrary to the Public International Law Rules on the Right of Access to Courts</i>	48
9. The Subject Matter and the Plan of this Research: Arguments Against Comity and the Act of State Doctrine, as well as Against the Territoriality Principle. The Human Right of Access to a Court	48
10. Arguments Against the Other Rationales in Support of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules: Foreign Immovable Property, Local Actions, the <i>Moçambique</i> Rule and Article 22(1) of the Brussels System; Double Actionability Rule; the Sound Administration of Justice and the Judicial Economy; the Best Placed Courts; the Difficulties of Applying Foreign Laws; Non-Recognition and Non-Enforcement of Judgments on Foreign IPRs; the Amendment of Registers; <i>Forum Non Conveniens</i>	49
11. Conclusions. Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules Shall be Abandoned in Benefit not only to IPRs Owners, but also to those with the Potential to Infringe IPRs: Referral.....	50
12. Delimitation of this Research: Overprotection of IPRs; Contracts; General Jurisdiction; Infringement Jurisdiction; Jurisdiction for Provisional Measures; Prorogation of Jurisdiction; Objective or Subjective Consolidation of Claims; <i>Lis Pendens</i> ; Arbitrability and Judicial Settlements; Allocation of Jurisdiction in Purely Domestic Cases	50

Chapter II: Comparison. Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules do not Express a Customary International Law Rule. The New Trend to Abandon them

55

<i>I. Aims, Delimitation and Terminology of the Comparison</i>	55
13. First Aim: Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules are not Expressions of Customary International Law Rule	55
14. Second Aim: Existing Trend in Favour of the Abandoning of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules	60
15. Delimitation, Plan and Terminology of the Comparison	61
<i>II. The Almost Universal Absence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules for Unregistered IPRs both with Respect to Infringement Issues and Validity Claims, whether Principally or Incidentally Raised</i>	62
16. The Almost Universal Absence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in International Instruments, as well as in EU and EFTA Norms, in National Statutory or Case-law Rules and in the Most Recent Academic Initiatives.....	62
17. The Very Limited Presence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in South Africa and in India	69

<i>III. The Almost Universal Absence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules for Registered IPRs Pure Infringement Claims, However Raised</i>	69
18. The Almost Universal Absence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in International Instruments, as well as in EU and EFTA Norms, in National Statutory or Case-law Rules and in the Most Recent Academic Initiatives Principles	69
19. The Very Limited Presence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in Certain Common Law Countries and in India	76
<i>IV. The Prevailing Absence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules for Registered IPRs Validity Issues Incidentally Raised</i>	77
20. The Prevailing Absence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in International Instruments and the Mitigation of the Scope of the Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules of the EU/EFTA Brussels System	77
21. The Prevailing Absence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in National Statutory or Case-law Rules and in the Most Recent Academic Initiatives Principles	87
22. The Presence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in the Brussels System, albeit with Mitigated Scope. The Limited Presence of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in Certain Common Law Countries and in India	89
<i>V. The Emerging Rejection of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules for Registered IPRs Validity Issues Principally Raised</i>	90
23. The Emerging Rejection of Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules	90
24. The Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules in EU/EFTA Norms as well as in the National Statutory or Case-law Rules	96
<i>VI. Conclusions</i>	97
25. The Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules Related to Unregistered IPRs Pure Infringement Claims and Validity Claims however Raised, as well as Registered IPRs Pure Infringement Claims and Validity Claims Incidentally Raised, are not an Expression of a Customary International Law Rule	97
26. The Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules related to Registered IPRs Validity Issues Principally Raised are not an Expression of Customary Law	98
 Chapter III: The Act of State Doctrine and Comity do not Mandate Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules	100
<i>I. Introduction</i>	100
27. Reasons for Addressing the Act of State Doctrine and Comity in this Same Chapter	100
28. Reasons for Primarily addressing Common Law Jurisprudence	101
29. The Act of State and Comity Doctrines as “Suggested” by Public International Law	102

<i>II. Theses According to which the Act of State Doctrine Implicitly Poses Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules</i>	102
30. Theses According to which the Act of State Doctrine Establishes Implicit Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules: the <i>Voda</i> and the ECJ <i>GAT</i> Decisions	102
31. Other Relevant Judgments	104
32. The Inapplicability of the Act of State to Unregistered IPRs	107
 <i>III. The Act of State Doctrine Does not Pose Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules</i>	108
33. The Act of State Doctrine Does not Prevent Courts from Adjudicating Foreign Acts of States	108
34. IPRs are not an Expression of the Sovereignty of Foreign Governments.....	114
35. Relevant Judgments	117
 <i>IV. Theses According to which Comity Implicitly Poses Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules</i>	120
36. Theses According to which Comity Establishes Implicit Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules: the <i>Voda</i> and the UK Court of Appeal's <i>Lucasfilm</i> Judgments	120
37. Other Relevant Judgments	123
38. The Applicability of Comity to Unregistered IPRs.....	126
 <i>V. Comity does not pose Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules</i>	128
39. Assuming Jurisdiction over Foreign IPRs Claims is Imposed by Public International Law, Referral	128
40. Assuming Jurisdiction over Foreign IPRs Claims does not Prejudice the Rights of Foreign Governments	129
41. Assuming Jurisdiction over Foreign IPRs Claims Corresponds to the Citizens' Interests.....	131
 <i>VI. The Act of State Doctrine and Comity are Contrary to Public International Law</i>	132
42. The Act of State and Comity are not Suggested by Public International Law.....	132
43. The Act of State and Comity are even Contrary to the Public International Law Rules on the Avoidance of a Denial of Justice and on the Right of Access to a Court	135
 Chapter IV: The Territoriality Principle does not Mandate Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules	137
 <i>I. Territoriality and Universality</i>	137
44. Territoriality and Universality in Public International Law	137
45. Territoriality and Universality in Relation to IPRs	138

<i>II. Territorial and Universal IPRs Protection Outside the IP Systems</i>	148
46. The Territoriality Principle as an Obstacle to the Universal Protection of IPRs. Thesis Proposing to Achieve that Universal Protection throughout International Legal Systems other than that which is Established for IP. The Relevance of these Theses for Present Purposes.....	148
47. Crimes of Piracy, Cyberattacks and Biopiracy	150
48. Human Rights to Intellectual Property	153
49. UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects	158
 <i>III. Territorial and Universal IPRs Protection Inside the IP Systems</i>	160
50. Theses According to which the Territoriality Principle Establishes Implicit Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules: the <i>Voda</i> , the UK Court of Appeal's <i>Lucasfilm</i> and the <i>Gallo</i> Judgments, Referral.....	160
51. The Territoriality Principle in the CUP, CUB, and TRIPs Agreement does not Pose Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules	161
52. Non-acceptability of the Opinion that the Territoriality Principle in the CUP, CUB, and TRIPs Agreement Poses Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules	161
53. Non-acceptability of the Opinion that the Territoriality Principle in the CUP, CUB, and TRIPs Agreement Impedes the Courts Seised from Adopting PIL Rules	170
54. Non-acceptability of the Opinion that the Territoriality Principle in the CUP, CUB, and TRIPs Agreement has only a Substantive Nature	172
55. Non-acceptability of the Opinion that the Territoriality Principle in the CUP, CUB, and TRIPs Agreement has a PIL Nature and Always Prescribes the Application of the <i>Lex Loci Protectionis</i>	173
56. The Territoriality Principle in other Relevant Norms Expressly Shaped as PIL Rules	176
57. Non-acceptability of the Opinion that the Territoriality Principle in Rules other than the CUP, CUB, and TRIPs Agreement does not Impose the Application of a Foreign Law	178
58. Non-acceptability of the Opinion that the Territoriality Principle in Rules other than the CUP, CUB, and TRIPs Agreement has only a Substantive Nature	179
 <i>IV. Thesis Here Purported: the Territoriality Principle as an Expression of the Proximity Principle</i>	180
59. Opinions Already Emphasizing the Connection between the Territoriality Principle and Proximity Reasons in IPRs Cases	180
60. Lagarde's Thesis on the Proximity Principle	182
61. Extension to IPRs of Lagarde's Thesis on the Proximity Principle	186
62. First Group of PIL Provisions Deviating from the Territoriality Principle: Rules that Adopt Jurisdiction Criteria which are not Based on the Territoriality Principle	188
63. Second Group of PIL Provisions Deviating from the Territoriality Principle: Rules that Adopt Connecting Factors which are not Based on the Territoriality Principle	199

64. Third Group of PIL Provisions Deviating from the Territoriality Principle: Rules Allowing Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Rendered by Courts of States other than the IPRs Granting Countries.....	204
---	-----

V. Conclusions	204
----------------------	-----

65. Overcoming the Exclusive Jurisdiction, the Exclusive Designation of the <i>Lex Loci Protectionis</i> and the Impossibility of Recognising and Enforcing Foreign Judgments Rendered by Courts other than the Ones having Exclusive Jurisdiction or According to a Law other than the <i>Lex Loci Protectionis</i>	204
--	-----

Chapter V: Other Arguments are Insufficient to Mandate Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules..... 206

66. Introduction.....	206
67. Foreign Immovable Property, Local Actions, the <i>Moçambique</i> rule and Article 22(1) of the Brussels System	207
68. Double Actionability Rule	212
69. Sound Administration of Justice and the Judicial Economy	215
70. Best Placed Courts	215
71. Difficulties and Costs of Applying Foreign Laws	216
72. Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments on Foreign IPRs: Voluntary Compliance and Vicious Circle	218
73. Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments on Foreign IPRs: Public Policy Exception and International Mandatory Rules of the Country that Granted the Right	221
74. Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments on Foreign IPRs: already Existing Rules and Tendency in Favor of Recognition and Enforcement, Issue Preclusion and <i>Res Judicata</i>	231
75. Amendment of Registers.....	235
76. <i>Forum Non Conveniens</i> and Special Circumstances Test.....	238

Chapter VI: Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules Imply a Denial of Justice and Violate the Fundamental Human Right of Access to Courts 245

I. Introduction.....	245
77. Premise	245
78. Denial of Justice.....	245
79. <i>Forum Necessitatis</i>	247
80. Hierarchy of the Sources of Law	256
81. <i>Forum Necessitatis</i> in the EU Brussels System.....	258
82. Exclusive Jurisdiction in the EU Brussels System	263

<i>II. The Fundamental Human Right of Access to Courts</i>	264
83. Origin and Nature.....	264
84. Characterisation	267
85. Civil Proceedings.....	268
86. Restrictions of the Right of Access to Courts	269
87. Restrictions Imposed by International Jurisdiction Rules.....	271
88. Alternative Means of Recourse in the Forum State rather than in Third States.....	276
89. Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules and the Right of Access to the Court	280
 <i>III. Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules are Contrary to the Public International Law Rules on the Denial of Justice and on the Fundamental Human Right of Access to Courts</i>	 281
90. Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules and Denial of Justice.....	281
91. Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules and the Fundamental Human Right of Access to Courts.....	286
92. Solutions of a PIL and Human Rights Nature.....	287
93. Analogy of the Conclusions Regarding the Relation between the Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules and the Fundamental Human Right of Access to Courts to the Conclusions Regarding the Relation between the same Exclusive Jurisdiction Rules and the Denial of Justice/ <i>Forum Necessitatis</i> Rules	290
 <i>IV. Declining of Jurisdiction and International Responsibility</i>	 290
94. Remedies for Denial of Justice	290
95. Remedies for Violation of the Fundamental Human Right of Access to Courts	292
 Chapter VII: General Conclusions	 295
96. Conclusions	295
97. EU IPRs and European Unified Patent Judiciary	298
98. Preventing Economic Inequalities in Litigation in Favour not only of the IPRs Owners but of those with the Potential to Infringe IPRs as well	299
99. Forum Shopping.....	300
 Bibliography	 303
Tables of Cases.....	330
Table of Treaties, Conventions and Other Instruments	336
Index.....	339