

# International Comparative Legal Guides

## Patents 2021

A practical cross-border insight into patent law

**11<sup>th</sup> Edition**

### Featuring contributions from:

Bird & Bird LLP

Cedar White Bradley IP LLC

Chuo Sogo Law Office, P.C.

CPST Intellectual Property

Daniel Law

DDPV Studio Legale

Duane Morris LLP

Eric Silwamba, Jalasi and Linyama  
Legal Practitioners

Gleiss Lutz

Gorodissky & Partners Ukraine

Gowling WLG

Haynes and Boone

Kadasa Intellectual Property  
(in association with Rouse & Co. International)

Law Office of KRAdamo

LexOrbis

Mintz

Nestor Nestor Diculescu Kingston Petersen

Ofo Ventura Intellectual Property & Litigation

OLIVARES

Patrinos & Kilimiris

PETOŠEVIĆ Russia

Pham & Associates

Reinhold Cohn Group

Reising Ethington P.C.

Rouse

Setterwalls

Shook Lin & Bok

SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan

TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law

**ICLG.com**



ISBN 978-1-83918-066-8  
ISSN 2044-3129

Published by

**glg** global legal group

59 Tanner Street

London SE1 3PL

United Kingdom

+44 207 367 0720

info@glgroup.co.uk

www.iclg.com

**Consulting Group Publisher**

Rory Smith

**Publisher**

James Strode

**Editor**

Jane Simmons

**Senior Editor**

Sam Friend

**Head of Production**

Suzie Levy

**Chief Media Officer**

Fraser Allan

**CEO**

Jason Byles

**Printed by**

Ashford Colour Press Ltd.

**Cover image**

www.istockphoto.com

Strategic Partners



# International Comparative Legal Guides

## Patents 2021

11<sup>th</sup> Edition

**Contributing Editor:**

**Katharine Stephens  
Bird & Bird LLP**

**©2020 Global Legal Group Limited.**

**All rights reserved. Unauthorised reproduction by any means, digital or analogue, in whole or in part, is strictly forbidden.**

### Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication.

This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

# Australia

Bird & Bird LLP



Jane Owen



Rebecca Currey

## 1 Patent Enforcement

**1.1 Before what tribunals can a patent be enforced against an infringer? Is there a choice between tribunals and what would influence a claimant's choice?**

The Federal Court of Australia (**Federal Court**) and the state and territory Supreme Courts have jurisdiction to hear patent infringement matters.

Patent infringement proceedings are typically brought in the Federal Court because this Court has numerous judges with extensive patent expertise who are appointed to the patent list and allocated to hear these matters.

**1.2 Can the parties be required to undertake mediation before commencing court proceedings? Is mediation or arbitration a commonly used alternative to court proceedings?**

Parties cannot be required to mediate before commencing proceedings. However, under the *Civil Dispute Resolution Act 2011* (Cth), the legal representatives for the party issuing the proceedings must sign and file a genuine steps statement that sets out the steps that have been taken to try and resolve the matter before issuing proceedings.

In the course of the proceeding, the Federal Court will consider options for alternative dispute resolution, including mediation, as early as reasonably practicable and may order the parties to mediate. Mediation is more common than arbitration, unless the dispute is governed by a contract mandating that arbitration be undertaken before or *in lieu* of Court litigation.

**1.3 Who is permitted to represent parties to a patent dispute in court?**

Barristers and solicitors represent parties in patent proceedings in the Federal Court.

In Australia, patent attorneys are a separate profession and have a right of audience in the Australian Patent Office but cannot appear in Court.

Litigants can self-represent, but a corporation must be represented by a legal practitioner unless leave of the Court is given.

**1.4 What has to be done to commence proceedings, what court fees have to be paid and how long does it generally take for proceedings to reach trial from commencement?**

To commence proceedings in the Federal Court, a party must file an originating application. The originating application will be accompanied by a statement of claim and a genuine steps statement in accordance with the *Federal Court Rules 2011* (Cth) (**FCRs**).

The fees to file an originating application are prescribed in schedule 1 of the *Federal Court and Federal Circuit Court Regulation 2012*. As of 1 July 2019, the fee for filing an originating application for a corporation is AUD 4,100.

The period of time that elapses between the filing of the originating application and the final trial depends on the complexity of the proceedings – for example, whether the applicant seeks to amend the patent(s), the number of patents asserted, whether experiments need to be carried out, and how long evidence preparation takes.

Generally, parties should allow anywhere between 12 and 18 months before the final trial on infringement.

**1.5 Can a party be compelled to disclose relevant documents or materials to its adversary either before or after commencing proceedings, and if so, how?**

The FCRs provide several mechanisms for disclosure of documents both before and after the commencement of proceedings.

### Before commencement

A party that believes it may have the right to obtain relief against a party, but does not have sufficient information to decide whether to start a proceeding, can seek an order for “preliminary discovery” of documents from the other party.

### After commencement

The FCRs also provide mechanisms to obtain “standard” and “non-standard” discovery of documents after the commencement of a proceeding.

Orders for discovery after commencement are not made as a matter of course and a party must only seek discovery (whether “standard” or “non-standard”) if it will facilitate the just resolution of the proceeding as quickly, inexpensively and efficiently as possible.

### Other mechanisms

A party to a proceeding can use Notices to Produce served on a party, requiring the party to produce any document or thing within the party's control at the trial.

**1.6 What are the steps each party must take pre-trial? Is any technical evidence produced, and if so, how?**

There are numerous steps a party must take in the lead-up to trial.

The Federal Court Practice Note, “Intellectual Property Practice Note (IP-1)”, provides some examples of special steps which may be ordered to be undertaken in patent matters. For example, the Court may order that the parties file an agreed technical primer to assist in explaining the technical background to the invention claimed in the patent in suit.

The first step in the proceeding is the pleading of each party’s case (a statement of claim, a defence and any cross-claim, defence to cross-claim and replies).

After the close of pleadings, evidence will be led by both parties.

Evidence relied on for both infringement and revocation will invariably include expert technical evidence.

In the immediate lead-up to the trial, a case management conference will occur before the judge. At the case management conference, the judge will set a timetable for the filing of submissions, objections to evidence, Court book preparation and other requirements the judge may have in preparing the matter for trial. This may include orders regarding a timetable for competing experts to confer prior to the trial and for expert evidence to be given concurrently at trial.

#### 1.7 How are arguments and evidence presented at the trial? Can a party change its pleaded arguments before and/or at trial?

At the trial, the parties’ arguments are made by both written and oral submissions.

As to the parties’ evidence, the affidavit evidence upon which a party intends to rely will be formally “read” by the party relying on the evidence and admitted into evidence. A person that has given evidence in affidavit form may be required for cross-examination by the other party.

In terms of seeking amendments to a pleaded case, the Court is generally receptive to applications for amendment (but may award costs or vacate orders because of the amendment). The FCRs provide that:

- a party must seek leave from the Court to amend its originating application both before and at trial;
- a party may amend a pleading once without leave of the Court at any time before pleadings close; and
- after pleadings close (as well as during the trial), any amendment is only by leave of the Court or with the consent of the opposing party.

#### 1.8 How long does the trial generally last and how long is it before a judgment is made available?

The length of a trial will depend on the complexity of the issues before the Court. On average, trials concerning one patent can run for anywhere between five and 15 days.

Judgment can be anticipated some six to 12 months after the end of the trial.

#### 1.9 Is there any alternative shorter, flexible or streamlined procedure available? If so, what are the criteria for eligibility and what is the impact on procedure and overall timing to trial?

Parties are able to seek an expedited or truncated hearing process and a tailored or concise pleading process in any proceeding. Whether a proceeding will be expedited will depend on whether the Court is of the view that there are circumstances which make the matter appropriate to be determined expeditiously.

A party should make known its request for an expedited procedure and hearing at the time of filing an originating application. A party should otherwise make its request for an informal or abbreviated pleadings process known as the first case management hearing.

The impact on overall timing will depend on the complexity of the proceeding. It is unlikely that a patent proceeding would be finalised in under three months if expedition is ordered.

#### 1.10 Are judgments made available to the public? If not as a matter of course, can third parties request copies of the judgment?

Judgments are made publicly available online in Australia, typically within 24 hours of being handed down by the judge.

#### 1.11 Are courts obliged to follow precedents from previous similar cases as a matter of binding or persuasive authority? Are decisions of any other jurisdictions of persuasive authority?

The doctrine of precedent is central to the Australian judicial system. Australian Courts are bound to follow the *ratio decidendi* (reasons for the decision) of superior Australian Courts, and will not depart from decisions of the same Court without good reason.

Older decisions from the United Kingdom may be persuasive (Australian patent law has departed from UK patent law), but they are not binding. See *Seiko Epson v Calidad* [2017] FCAFC 1403 for an example of this consideration. Decisions of European and US Courts are of interest, but are less persuasive. However, since adopting the concept of “support” instead of fair basis in Australia, European cases may have some increased persuasion on that issue.

#### 1.12 Are there specialist judges or hearing officers, and if so, do they have a technical background?

There are presently 19 judges in the Federal Court’s Intellectual Property National Practice Area – Patents & Associated Statutes, who can be assigned to patent cases.

There is no requirement for these judges to have a technical background, though some of them do.

#### 1.13 What interest must a party have to bring (i) infringement, (ii) revocation, and (iii) declaratory proceedings?

- **Infringement**  
Only the patentee and the exclusive licensee can bring infringement proceedings.  
The exclusive licensee is defined in the *Patents Act 1990* (Cth) (**Patents Act**) as the licensee that has the right to exploit the patented invention throughout the patent area to the exclusion of the patentee and all other persons.
- **Revocation**  
Any person has standing to bring an application to either the Federal Court or state and territory Courts for an order revoking the patent.  
A defendant in any infringement proceedings may also cross-claim for revocation.
- **Declaratory proceedings**  
A person can apply to the Federal Court for a declaration that an act does not or would not infringe a patent,

whether or not the patentee has made an assertion that the doing of the act would infringe a claim.

The person cannot apply to the Federal Court for a declaration unless the patentee has refused or failed to make a written admission of non-infringement.

The person must have given the patentee full written particulars of the act and asked the patentee in writing for a written admission that the doing of the act does not or would not infringe the patent. The person must also undertake to pay the patentee's reasonable costs of obtaining advice as to whether the act has or would infringe the claim. The patentee must be joined as a respondent in the proceeding.

**1.14 If declarations are available, can they (i) address non-infringement, and/or (ii) claim coverage over a technical standard or hypothetical activity?**

Non-infringement declarations can be sought in relation to technical standards and hypothetical activity.

**1.15 Can a party be liable for infringement as a secondary (as opposed to primary) infringer? Can a party infringe by supplying part of, but not all of, the infringing product or process?**

In Australia, a party can be liable for "indirect" or "contributory" infringement of a patent.

The Patents Act (section 117) provides that if the use of the product by a person would infringe a patent, then the supply of that product by one person to another is an infringement of the patent by the supplier, unless the supplier is the patentee or licensee.

**1.16 Can a party be liable for infringement of a process patent by importing the product when the process is carried on outside the jurisdiction?**

A person can be liable for infringement of a process patent by importing a product into Australia made by the process outside the jurisdiction.

In *Apotex Pty Ltd v Warner-Lambert Company LLC* (No 2) [2016] FCA 1238, the Federal Court found that the importation and sale in Australia of a product that was made overseas using a method or process which was the subject of an Australian patent, infringed claims of the Australian patent because the acts of importation and sale occurred within Australia.

**1.17 Does the scope of protection of a patent claim extend to non-literal equivalents (a) in the context of challenges to validity, and (b) in relation to infringement?**

Australia does not have a doctrine of non-literal equivalents. It can be argued that integers are inessential and need not be present for an infringement finding but this is rarely successful.

**1.18 Can a defence of patent invalidity be raised, and if so, how? Are there restrictions on such a defence e.g. where there is a pending opposition? Are the issues of validity and infringement heard in the same proceedings or are they bifurcated?**

A respondent can assert in an infringement proceeding, in response to an allegation of patent infringement, that it has not

infringed the patent because the patent is invalid and should be revoked. This claim does not arise in relation to a patent application (i.e. a patent application under opposition).

In this regard, in any proceeding for infringement, the alleged infringer can counter-claim for revocation of the patent, including on the basis that the patent is not a patentable invention.

Issues of validity and infringement are usually heard in the same proceeding. However, a Court may consider issues of infringement before issues relating to validity in appropriate circumstances, or the Court may consider it appropriate to hear issues of validity and infringement concurrently.

**1.19 Is it a defence to infringement by equivalence that the equivalent would have lacked novelty or inventive step over the prior art at the priority date of the patent (the "Formstein defence")?**

No; there is no such defence under Australian patent law as there is no doctrine of equivalence.

**1.20 Other than lack of novelty and inventive step, what are the grounds for invalidity of a patent?**

In the Federal Court, other than lack of novelty and inventive step, the validity of a patent may be challenged on the grounds that:

- the invention has been secretly used in the patent area;
- the patentee is not entitled to the patent;
- it is not a manner of manufacture;
- it is not useful;
- the patent was obtained by fraud, false suggestion or misrepresentation; and
- the specification does not comply with section 40(2) and (3) of the Patents Act, being internal support, "best method" and clarity requirements.

**1.21 Are infringement proceedings stayed pending resolution of validity in another court or the Patent Office?**

Court proceedings are the superior proceedings and so no procedure can take place in the Australian Patent Office if there are pending Court proceedings.

If two separate proceedings concerning the patent are ongoing, a party may seek to have the matters listed together but there is no rule that a revocation claim be determined before a parallel infringement proceeding.

**1.22 What other grounds of defence can be raised in addition to non-infringement or invalidity?**

Australian patent law includes these specific exemptions to infringement:

- immediately before the priority date of the claim, the person was already exploiting, or had taken definitive steps (contractually or otherwise) to exploit the product, method or process in Australia;
- use of a patented invention occurred on board or in a foreign vessel, and the vessel came into Australian territory only temporarily or accidentally;
- use of a patented invention occurred in the construction or working of a foreign aircraft or land vehicle if the aircraft or land vehicle came into Australian territory only temporarily or accidentally;

- exploitation was connected with obtaining regulatory approval in Australia; and
- an act was done for experimental purposes relating to the subject matter of the invention.

**1.23** (a) Are preliminary injunctions available on (i) an *ex parte* basis, or (ii) an *inter partes* basis? In each case, what is the basis on which they are granted and is there a requirement for a bond? Is it possible to file protective letters with the court to protect against *ex parte* injunctions? (b) Are final injunctions available? (c) Is a public interest defence available to prevent the grant of injunctions where the infringed patent is for a life-saving drug or medical device?

### Preliminary injunctions

Preliminary injunctions are available on an *ex parte* and *inter partes* basis.

In deciding whether to grant a preliminary injunction against an alleged infringer, the Court will make two enquiries:

- does the patentee have a *prima facie* case (there is a probability that the patentee will succeed at final hearing); and
- does the balance of convenience favour the granting of the injunction (this involves an assessment of the harm to the applicant and prejudice to the respondent in ordering the injunction, and whether damages are likely to be an adequate remedy if the applicant is successful at final hearing).

There is no requirement for a bond. Rather, the patentee will have to give the “usual undertaking as to damages”; that is, it undertakes to the Court to submit to any order the Court may consider to be just for the payment of compensation to any person affected by the operation of the injunction.

If the person in whose favour the preliminary injunction is granted is resident overseas and has no assets in Australia, or is otherwise unlikely to be able to satisfy a call on the undertaking as to damages, the Court may require that person to provide security for the undertaking as to damages.

### Final injunctions

Relief that a Court may grant for infringement of a patent includes an injunction, subject to such terms that the Court thinks fit.

### Public interest defence

Australian Courts have not dealt with this issue. The final form of the injunction is a matter within the Courts’ discretion, and it is likely that public interest can be a factor for consideration. There is *obiter dicta* in recent Federal Court cases that if infringement had been found in respect of a method of treatment patent that an injunction against all supply of that product which would encompass non-infringing uses would not be an appropriate remedy (e.g., *Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd v Generic Health Pty Ltd* (No 4) [2015] FCA 634).

**1.24** Are damages or an account of profits assessed with the issues of infringement/validity or separately? On what basis are damages or an account of profits assessed? Are punitive damages available?

In patent matters in Australia, it is typical for an order to be made that the issue of liability for infringement/validity be heard prior to and separately from determination of any damages/account of profits.

Damages are compensatory in nature and so the assessment is made on the basis of the actual loss suffered by the patentee. The analysis will require the Court to determine what proportion of the infringer’s sales would have been sales of the patentee or the exclusive licensee, and then determine the profit that would have been made by reason of the sales.

Additional (punitive) damages can also be awarded, but this provision has only been applied once in Australia and resulted in an award of a modest sum.

An award of additional damages may be appropriate, having regard to:

- the flagrancy of the infringement;
- the need to deter similar infringements;
- the conduct of the infringing party, including after it was informed that it had allegedly infringed;
- any benefit accrued to the infringer because of the infringement; and
- any other relevant matters.

Profits are assessed by calculation of the profit earned by the infringer by reason of the conduct. This is a forensic accounting exercise.

**1.25** How are orders of the court enforced (whether they be for an injunction, an award of damages or for any other relief)?

Enforcement of a judgment or orders in the Federal Court is ordinarily an *ex parte* procedure that commences with the filing of a Request for Enforcement and supporting documentation. A registrar will consider the Request for Enforcement, and if satisfied, issue the enforcement process, which is then handled by the Sheriff’s office.

The methods of enforcement include:

- warrants for the seizure and sale of property;
- order for possession or delivery of goods; and
- an enforcement hearing.

An application may also be made for contempt. This is a broad power of the Court, and includes the power to fine and imprison.

**1.26** What other form of relief can be obtained for patent infringement? Would the tribunal consider granting cross-border relief?

Other relief which a Court may grant for infringement of a patent includes declarations of infringement. Cross-border relief will not be ordered.

**1.27** How common is settlement of infringement proceedings prior to trial?

Settlement prior to trial is common – it is estimated to occur in 50% of cases.

**1.28** After what period is a claim for patent infringement time-barred?

Infringement proceedings cannot be brought unless started within:

- three years from the day on which the relevant patent is granted; or
- six years from the day on which the infringing act was done, whichever period ends later.

**1.29 Is there a right of appeal from a first instance judgment, and if so, is it a right to contest all aspects of the judgment?**

A party can appeal judgment of a single judge of the Federal Court to the Full Federal Court of Australia. Appeal is as of right in respect of any aspects of the judgment but will only succeed if the Full Federal Court finds that the judge at first instance made an error of law.

**1.30 What are the typical costs of proceedings to a first instance judgment on (i) infringement, and (ii) validity? How much of such costs are recoverable from the losing party?**

The range of expected costs in running/defending an infringement case or running/defending a combined infringement and revocation case ranges between AUD 600,000 and AUD 2.5 million.

The successful party would anticipate recovering between 60% and 75% of its costs from the unsuccessful party.

**1.31 For jurisdictions within the European Union: What steps are being taken in your jurisdiction towards ratifying the Agreement on a Unified Patent Court, implementing the Unitary Patent Regulation (EU Regulation No. 1257/2012) and preparing for the unitary patent package? Will your country host a local division of the UPC, or participate in a regional division? For jurisdictions outside of the European Union: Are there any mutual recognition of judgments arrangements relating to patents, whether formal or informal, that apply in your jurisdiction?**

No. There is no formal or informal recognition of foreign judgments specifically relating to patents in Australia. Australia is party to enforcement of foreign judgment treaties, and judgment debts of foreign Courts can be recovered in Australian Courts in prescribed circumstances.

## 2 Patent Amendment

**2.1 Can a patent be amended *ex parte* after grant, and if so, how?**

A patentee may seek the leave of the Commissioner of Patents to amend a patent after grant (section 104 of the Patents Act) or during infringement proceedings with leave of the Court – see question 2.2.

**2.2 Can a patent be amended in *inter partes* revocation/invalidity proceedings?**

Yes, a patentee may make an application to a Court during any relevant proceedings for an order that the patent be amended (section 105 of the Patents Act).

**2.3 Are there any constraints upon the amendments that may be made?**

An amendment must meet the requirements in section 102 of the Patents Act – an amendment is not allowable if the amended specification claims or discloses matter extending beyond the complete specification as filed.

If the application to amend is made to the Court during proceedings, then the Court must also be satisfied that there is no matter that should dissuade the Court from exercising its discretion to allow the amendment (e.g. delay by the patentee in seeking amendment after knowing that it should so amend; covetous claiming).

## 3 Licensing

**3.1 Are there any laws which limit the terms upon which parties may agree a patent licence?**

Pursuant to section 144 of the Patent Act, a term of a patent licence may be void in certain circumstances, including where the effect of a term is to:

- prohibit or restrict the use of a product or process (whether patented or not) supplied or owned by a person other than the lessor or licensor; or
- require the acquisition of a product not protected by the patent, lessor or licensor.

**3.2 Can a patent be the subject of a compulsory licence, and if so, how are the terms settled and how common is this type of licence?**

After a period of three years from when the grant has elapsed, a person may apply to the Federal Court for an order requiring the patentee to grant the applicant a licence to work the patented invention (section 133 of the Patents Act). If the fee is not agreed, the Court sets the fee.

Very few compulsory licences have been ordered.

## 4 Patent Term Extension

**4.1 Can the term of a patent be extended, and if so, (i) on what grounds, and (ii) for how long?**

The term of a patent relating to pharmaceutical substances can be extended if regulatory approval was not obtained until at least five years after the date of the patent.

The extension period is the difference of the time period from the filing date of the patent to the first regulatory approval date – this should take less than five years.

## 5 Patent Prosecution and Opposition

**5.1 Are all types of subject matter patentable, and if not, what types are excluded?**

Not all subject matter is patentable.

Human beings and processes for their biological generation are not patentable (section 18(3) of the Patents Act).

Pure business processes are not patentable subject matter, even if they are computer-implemented: *Commissioner of Patents v RPL Central Pty Ltd* [2015] FCAFC 177; and *Encompass Corporation Pty Ltd v InfoTrack Pty Ltd* [2019] FCAFC 161.

**5.2 Is there a duty to the Patent Office to disclose prejudicial prior disclosures or documents? If so, what are the consequences of failure to comply with the duty?**

There is no such duty.

### 5.3 May the grant of a patent by the Patent Office be opposed by a third party, and if so, when can this be done?

A third party may oppose the grant of a patent within three months after the patent application has been advertised as accepted by the Patent Office.

### 5.4 Is there a right of appeal from a decision of the Patent Office, and if so, to whom?

There is a right of appeal under the Patents Act from a decision of the Patent Office to the Federal Court from:

- a refusal to grant a patent (section 100A);
- an opposition decision (section 60);
- a decision to revoke after re-examination (section 101); and
- refusal or grant of, or direction to make, an amendment (sections 104 and 109).

### 5.5 How are disputes over entitlement to priority and ownership of the invention resolved?

Disputes over ownership can be resolved in the Patent Office (section 32 of the Patents Act), or by the grant of the patent after an opposition in the Patent Office (section 33 of the Patents Act) or by application to the Court.

### 5.6 Is there a "grace period" in your jurisdiction, and if so, how long is it?

Yes – there is a grace period of 12 months.

### 5.7 What is the term of a patent?

A standard patent has a maximum term of 20 years (or up to 25 years for pharmaceutical substances). An innovation patent has a term of up to eight years (innovation patents are in the process of being phased out).

### 5.8 Is double patenting allowed?

No, it is not (section 64(2) of the Patents Act).

## 6 Border Control Measures

### 6.1 Is there any mechanism for seizing or preventing the importation of infringing products, and if so, how quickly are such measures resolved?

There is no such mechanism.

## 7 Antitrust Law and Inequitable Conduct

### 7.1 Can antitrust law be deployed to prevent relief for patent infringement being granted?

The *Competition & Consumer Act 2010* (Cth) (CCA) can be deployed against a patentee. This was argued in *Apple v Samsung*, but whilst the case proceeded to concluded trial, the case settled before judgment.

### 7.2 What limitations are put on patent licensing due to antitrust law?

The licensing and assignment of intellectual property is now the subject of the same competition laws as other commercial transactions due to the repeal of section 51(3) of the CCA (which had provided an exemption from certain provisions Part IV of the CCA).

Licensing, assignment and other contractual arrangements, whether existing before the repeal or coming into effect after the repeal (in September 2019), are affected.

The following are examples of the type of conduct prohibited under the CCA that may arise in relation to patent licensing:

- (a) cartel conduct;
- (b) the making or giving effect to agreements, arrangements or understandings that have the purpose, effect or likely effect of substantially lessening competition in a market; and
- (c) engaging in the practice of exclusive dealing.

### 7.3 In cases involving standard essential patents, are technical trials on patent validity and infringement heard separately from proceedings relating to the assessment of fair reasonable and non-discriminatory (FRAND) licences? Do courts grant FRAND injunctions, i.e. final injunctions against patent infringement unless and until defendants enter into a FRAND licence?

There is the potential for a separate question, but such matters are typically heard at the same time.

There has been no decision in relation to SEPs and the applicability of FRAND terms in Australia.

*Motorola v Hytera* is a current case which may provide some insight on FRAND terms and injunctions in Australia. The trial of this matter is presently part heard, and Hytera recently sought leave to file a Fifth Further Amended Defence (which was refused).

## 8 Current Developments

### 8.1 What have been the significant developments in relation to patents in the last year?

- The Full Federal Court of Australia has confirmed that computer implementation of an otherwise unpatentable business method does make the method patentable subject matter: *Encompass Corporation Pty Ltd v InfoTrack Pty Ltd* [2019] FCAFC 161. This has been followed by the Full Court in *Commissioner of Patents Rokt Pte Ltd* [2020] FCAFC 86.
- The Full Federal Court of Australia has clarified the implied licence to purchasers of patented goods – modifications to patented goods that go beyond repair, such as remaking the patented product, will infringe the relevant patent. This conduct falls outside the implied licence: *Calidad Pty Ltd v Seiko Epson Corporation* [2019] FCAFC 115. Special leave to appeal this to the High Court of Australia has been granted.
- The Full Federal Court of Australia has clarified the circumstances in which additional damages may be awarded for patent infringement, including that deliberate and continued copying will not be sufficient if the allegation of infringement could objectively be considered reasonably defensible: *Oxworks Trading Pty Ltd v Gram Engineering Pty Ltd* [2019] FCAFC 240.



- Changes to the Crown use provisions of the Patents Act by the *Intellectual Property Laws Amendment (Productivity Commission Response Part 2 and Other Measures) Act 2020*, including:
  - a) clarification of the circumstances in which exploitation by the Crown is not an infringement of a patent, including an emergency, or that the relevant Minister has tried for a reasonable period, but without success, to obtain from the patentee, authorisation to exploit the invention on reasonable terms, and the relevant Minister has approved the exploitation in writing; and
  - b) clarification that terms concerning remuneration payable to the patentee should be as agreed with the patentee, or, in the absence of agreement, determined by a prescribed court.
- Changes to the compulsory licensing provisions of the Patents Act by the *Intellectual Property Laws Amendment (Productivity Commission Response Part 2 and Other Measures) Act 2020* to clarify the circumstances in which a compulsory licence may be ordered by a court, including that *demand in Australia for the invention is not being met on reasonable terms, authorisation to exploit the invention is essential to meet that demand and it is in the public interest to grant the licence.*

### 8.2 Are there any significant developments expected in the next year?

Within the next year, the phasing out of the innovation system will begin. From 26 August 2021 no new innovation patent applications can be filed, other than divisional applications based on applications filed on or before 25 August 2021.

### 8.3 Are there any general practice or enforcement trends that have become apparent in your jurisdiction over the last year or so?

There is a continuing swing against granting interlocutory relief in pharmaceutical patent proceedings after the decision in *Sigma Pharmaceuticals (Australia) Pty Ltd (ACN 004 118 594) v Wyeth [2009] FCA 595*. Following the decision in Sigma, see the decisions in *Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH v Alphapharm Pty Ltd (No 3) [2018] FCA 2060*, with the appeal to the Full Federal Court dismissed, and *Mylan Health Pty Ltd v Sun Pharma ANZ Pty Ltd (No 2) [2019] FCA 505*.



**Jane Owen** is a partner and head of the Intellectual Property practice of Bird & Bird in Sydney. She has more than 30 years' experience in all aspects of intellectual property, including portfolio establishment, IP strategising, commercialisation and enforcement. Her main sector focus is within life sciences, healthcare and education. Specialising in contentious IP, Jane focuses on patent litigation, particularly in the life sciences sector. Her experience ranges across complex patent infringement/revocation, trade marks and passing off, design infringement, disputes on ownership of IP, and appeals from decisions of the Commissioner of Patents and the Registrar of Trade Marks. Jane's litigation experience also allows her to advise clients in IP-driven commercial transactions, enabling them to minimise the risk of later disputes.

**Bird & Bird LLP**  
Level 22 MLC Centre, 19 Martin Place  
Sydney, NSW 2000  
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9226 9805  
Email: [jane.owen@twobirds.com](mailto:jane.owen@twobirds.com)  
URL: [www.twobirds.com](http://www.twobirds.com)



**Rebecca Currey** is a senior associate in our Intellectual Property practice, based in Sydney. She has experience across all areas of intellectual property, particularly trade mark enforcement, patent litigation, and copyright matters. Rebecca's main focus is on patent litigation matters where she has acted for clients in relation to a large variety of technologies including pharmaceuticals, mining, telecommunications, and banking and payment systems. She also acts for clients in contentious trade mark matters in the Federal Court of Australia including acting for a client in relation to a claim of trade mark infringement by the use of registered trade marks as part of a Google Adwords strategy and misleading and deceptive conduct allegations.

**Bird & Bird LLP**  
Level 22 MLC Centre, 19 Martin Place  
Sydney, NSW 2000  
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9226 9865  
Email: [rebecca.currey@twobirds.com](mailto:rebecca.currey@twobirds.com)  
URL: [www.twobirds.com](http://www.twobirds.com)

Over the last century we have been lucky enough to have played a part in protecting some of the world's most ground-breaking inventions and forward thinking brands, and we are pretty confident that we are one of the most ambitious, energetic, dedicated groups of intellectual property professionals you are likely to meet.

We thrive on helping clients with creative and cost-effective ways to improve or protect their intellectual property position internationally, and we think you will struggle to find many other international law firms that have our track record when it comes to the quality and experience of our team.

We continue to top the rankings in the legal market and this first-class reputation allows us to attract world-leading IP advisors and litigators; by working with us, you will be able to draw upon their formidable experience in this field.

Not only do we have the range and depth of expertise, but with more than 300 specialist lawyers across 30 offices, we have numbers in force.

[www.twobirds.com](http://www.twobirds.com)

# Bird & Bird

# ICLG.com

## Current titles in the ICLG series

Alternative Investment Funds  
Anti-Money Laundering  
Aviation Finance & Leasing  
Aviation Law  
Business Crime  
Cartels & Leniency  
Class & Group Actions  
Competition Litigation  
Construction & Engineering Law  
Consumer Protection  
Copyright  
Corporate Governance  
Corporate Immigration  
Corporate Investigations  
Corporate Tax  
Cybersecurity  
Data Protection  
Derivatives  
Designs  
Digital Business

Digital Health  
Drug & Medical Device Litigation  
Employment & Labour Law  
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments  
Environment & Climate Change Law  
Environmental, Social & Governance Law  
Family Law  
Fintech  
Foreign Direct Investment Regimes  
Franchise  
Gambling  
Insurance & Reinsurance  
International Arbitration  
Investor-State Arbitration  
Lending & Secured Finance  
Litigation & Dispute Resolution  
Merger Control  
Mergers & Acquisitions  
Mining Law  
Oil & Gas Regulation

Outsourcing  
Patents  
Pharmaceutical Advertising  
Private Client  
Private Equity  
Product Liability  
Project Finance  
Public Investment Funds  
Public Procurement  
Real Estate  
Renewable Energy  
Restructuring & Insolvency  
Sanctions  
Securitisation  
Shipping Law  
Telecoms, Media & Internet  
Trade Marks  
Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms