

List of Works Cited

Table of Periodical Materials:

Periodical Materials in English

- Benjamin N. Roin, *Unpatentable Drugs and the Standards of Patentability*, 87 Tex. L. Rev. 503 (2009).
- Brian Cordery et al., *Patent cases in 2008-Review of Patent Cases in English Courts in 2008*, 38 C.I.P.A. J. 110 (2009).
- Dale E. Johnson, *Predicting Human Safety: Screening and Computational Approaches*, 5 Drug Discov. Today, 445 (2000).
- David A. Balto & Andrew W. Wolman, *Intellectual Property and Antitrust: General Principles* 43 IDEA 395 (2003).
- David A. Fryburg, *Do technical and commercial biases contribute to the pharmaceutical industry's productivity problems? An analysis of how reordering priorities can improve productivity*. Drug Discov. Today. doi:10.1016/j.drudis.2010.06.010 (2010)
- Edward H. Valance, *Understanding the Markush Claim in Chemical Patents*, 1 J. Chem. Doc. 87 (1961).
- F Scott Kieff, *The Case for Registering Patents and the Law and Economics of Present Patent-Obtaining Rules*, 45 B. C. L. Rev., 55 (2003).
- Gary W. Caldwell, *Compound Optimization in Early- and Late-phase Drug Discovery: Acceptable Pharmacokinetic Properties Utilizing Combined Physicochemical, in vitro and in vivo Screens*, 3 Curr. Opin. Drug Discov. Dev. 30 (2000).
- Gerhard Barth, et al., *The Olanzapine Patent Dispute: German Court Grants a Preliminary Injunction on a Patent Invalidated by the First-Instance Federal Patent Court*, 27 Biotech. L. Rep. 532 (2008).
- Hans-Rainer Jaenischen, *The Grant of a Compulsory License for Recombinant γ -IFN in Germany*, 11 Biotech. L. Rep. 369 (1992)
- H.-J Federsel, *Process R&D under the magnifying glass: Organization, business model, challenges, and scientific context*. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Doi:20.1016/j.bmc.2010.06.029
- Israel Agranat et al., *Intellectual property and chirality of drugs*. 4 Drug Discov. Today 313 (1999).
- Israel Agranat et al., *The Strategy of Enantiomer Patents of Drugs* 15 Drug Discov. Today 163 (1999).
- Janice M. Mueller et al., *Enabling Patent Law's Inherent Anticipation Doctrine*, 45 HOUS. L. REV. 1101 (2008)
- Jerome H. Reichman, *Harmonization without Consensus: Critical Reflections on Drafting a Substantive Patent Law Treaty* 57 Duke L. J. 85 (2007).
- Jerome H. Reichman, *Intellectual Property in the Twenty-first Century: Will the Developing Countries Lead or Follow?* 46 Hous L. Rev. 1115 (2009).
- John F. Duffy, *Rethinking the Prospect Theory of Patents*, 71 U. Chi. L. Rev. 439 (2004).

- John F. Duffy, *Rules and Standards on the Forefront of Patentability*, 51 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 609 (2009).
- John S. Lazo, *Combinatorial Chemistry and Contemporary Pharmacology*, 293 J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther. 705 (2000).
- Jonathan J. Darrow, *The Patentability of Enantiomers: Implications for the Pharmaceutical Industry*, 2 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 1 (2007).
- Jonathan M. Spenner, *Obvious-to Try Obviousness of Chemical Enantiomers in View of Pre- and Post-KSR Analysis*, 90 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 477, (2008).
- Joseph Straus, *Patent Application: Obstacle for Innovation and Abuse of Dominant Position under Article 102 TFEU?* J. Eur. & Compet. Prac., (forthcoming 2010) doi:10.1093/jeclap/lpq011.
- Kimberly M. Thomas, *Protecting Academic and Non-Profit Research: Creating a Compulsory Licensing Provision in the Absence of an Experimental Use Exception*, 23 Santa Clara Computer & High Tech. L. J. 347 (2007).
- Lance Leonard Barry, *Teaching a Way is not Teaching Away*, 79 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 867 (1997).
- Lewis Anten, *What's new with novelty – Section 102 of S. 643*, 54 J. Pat. Off. Soc'y 75 (1972).
- Lucille J. Brown, *The Markush Challenge*, 31 J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci. 2 (1991).
- Mark A. Lemley, *The Economics of Improvement in Intellectual Property Law* 75 Tex. L. Rev. 989 (1996-1997).
- Michael Enzo Furrow, *Pharmaceutical Patent Life-Cycle Management After KSR v. Teleflex*, 63 Food & Drug L.J. 275 (2008).
- Miles J. Sweet, *The Patentability of Chiral Drugs Post-KSR: The More Things Change, the More They Stay the Same*, 24 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 129 (2009).
- Peter Landers, *Cost of Developing a New Drug Increases to About \$1.7 Billion*, Wall St. J., Dec. 8, at B4 (2003).
- Peter Mansell, *Who is afraid of the patent cliff?* 1 SCRIP Executive Briefing 1 (2008).
- Philip Ma et al., *Value of novelty?*, 1 Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. 571 (2002).
- Rebecca S. Eisenberg, *Pharma's Nonobvious Problem*, 12 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 375 (2008).
- Richard T. Jackson, *A Lockean Approach to the Compulsory Patent Licensing Controversy*, 9 J. Tech. L. & Pol'y 116 (2004).
- Robert Fitt, *Selection Patents and Markush Claims in Europe*, 20 Biotech. L. Rep. 17 (2010).
- Robert Merges, *Intellectual Property Rights and Bargaining Breakdown: The Case of Blocking Patents* 62 Tenn. L. Rev. 75 (1994-1995).
- Robert P. Merges, et al., *On the Complex Economics of Patent Scope*, 90 Colum. L. Rev. 839 (1990).
- Rochelle Cooper Dreyfuss, *Nonobviousness: A Comment on Three Learned Papers*, 12 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 431 (2008).
- Sean B. Seymore, *Rethinking Novelty in Patent Law*, 60 Duke L. J. (forthcoming 2011)
- Seven M. Paul et al., *How to improve R&D productivity: the pharmaceutical industry's grand challenge*. 9 Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. 203 (2010).
- Theon van Dijk, *Patent Height and Competition in Product Improvements*, 44 J. Indus. Econom. 151 (1996).
- Thomas Hays, *An application of the European Rules on Trademark Exhaustion to Extra-market Goods* 91 Trademark Rep. 675 (2001).
- Thomas N. Tiedt, *The Drug Safety System Conundrum*, 62 Food & Drug L.J. 547 (2007).
- Vincent L. Capuano, *Obviousness of Chemical Compounds: The "Lead Compound" Concept*, Intell. Prop. Today 33 (2007).

Volker Vossius, *Selection Inventions in Chemistry According to German Patent Law – A problem of Novelty*, 59 J. Pat. Off. Soc’y 180 (1977).

Winfried Tilmann, *Validity of Selective Product Claims – Venice Conferences III and V, Lundbeck and Olanzapine*, IIC 149 (2010).

Periodical Materials in German

Astrid Buhrow et al., *Grenzen Ausschliesslicher Rechte Geistigen Eigentums durch Kartellrecht (Q187) [Limitations on Exclusive Intellectual Property Rights by Competition Law (Q187)]*, Gewerblicher Rechtsschutz und Urheberrecht Internationaler Teil. [GRUR Int.], 407 (2005) (Ger.).

Heiko Sendrowski, *“Olanzapine” – eine Offenbarung? (Olanzapine – a disclosure?)* GRUR 797 (2009).

Peter Meier-Beck, *Die Rechtsprechung des Bundesgerichtshofs zum Patent und Gebrauchsmusterrecht im Jahr 2008 (The jurisprudence of Federal Court of Justice for patent and utility model law in 2008)*, GRUR 893 (2009) (Ger.).

Wolfgang Bublak et. al., *Offenbarungsgehalt der Vorveröffentlichung einer chemischen Strukturformel (Disclosure in the Prior Publication of a Chemical Structural Formula)*, GRUR 382 (2009).

Wolrad Prinz zu Waldeck und Pyrmont, *BGH: Enantiomer eines bekannten Razemats kann patentiert werden – „Escitalopram“ (BGH: enantiomer of a known racemate can be patented – “Escitalopram”)*, (Gewerblicher Rechtsschutz und Urheberrecht, Praxis im Immaterial- und Wettbewerbsrecht) [GRUR-Prax], 13 (2010).

Periodical Material in Korean

Chaho Chung, et al., *Seontaekbalmyoungin Geoulsang Eesungilchae Balmyoungui Shingyuseoung Pandan [Novelty Determination of Enantiomer Invention as a Selection Invention]*, 49 Seoul Nat’l U. L. 355 (2008) (S. Kor.).

Table of Books:

Alan L. Durham, *Patent Law Essentials: A Concise Guide* 61 (2nd ed. 2004).

Donald S. Chisum, *Chisum on Patents* (2010).

Chris P. Miller ET AL., *The Chemist’s Companion Guide to Patent Law* 15 (2010).

François Dessemontet, *The Legal Protection of Know-how in the United States of America* 194 (H.W. Clarke trans., 2d ed. 1976).

F. Scott Kieff et al., *Principle of Patent Law* 525 (4th ed. 2008).

Irina Haracoglou, *Competition Law and Patents: a follow-on innovation perspective in the biopharmaceutical industry* (2008).

Jerome Rosenstock, *The Law of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Invention, Patent and Nonpatent Protection* (2d ed. Supp. 2008).

Johnson. A. William, *Invitation to Organic Chemistry* (1999).

Patents and Technological Progress in a Globalized World 4-5 (Wolrad Prinz zu Waldeck und Pymont et al. eds., 2009)

Mark J. Davison et al., Australian Intellectual Property Law, 434 (2008).

Martin J. Adelman, et al., Cases and Materials on Patent Law (3d ed, 2009).

Marton I. Kamien & Nancy L. Schwartz, Market Structure and Innovation (1982).

Table of Cases:

Austria

Oberster Gerichtshof [OGH] [Supreme Court] Apr. 22, 1986, docket No. 4 Ob 319/86, IIC 80 (1989) (Austria).

EPO Board of Appeal

T 181/82, Official Journal of the EPO 401, 1984.

T 296/87, Official Journal of the EPO 195, 1990.

T 12/81, Official Journal of the EPO 296, 1982.

T 181/82, Official Journal of the EPO 401 1984.

T 7/86, Official Journal of the EPO 381, 1988.

T 296/87, Official Journal of the EPO 195, 1990.

T 651/91, available at <http://legal.european-patent-office.org/dg3/biblio/t910651du1.htm>

Germany

German Federal Court of Justice

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] May 30, 1978, GRUR 696, 1978 (Ger.)

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] Jan. 26, 1988, IIC 736, 1989 (Ger.).

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] Jul. 12, 1990, GRUR 436, 1991 (Ger.)

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] Jan. 17, 1995, GRUR 330, 1995 (Ger.).

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] Dec. 5, 1995, GRUR 190, 1996 (Ger.).

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] Dec.16, 2008, IIC 596, 2009 (Ger.).

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] Dec.16, 2008, BeckRS 05422, 2009 (Ger.).

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] May 6, 2009, GRUR 694, 2009 (Ger.).

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] Sept. 10, 2009, GRUR 123, 2010 (Ger.).

German Federal Patent Court

Bundespatentgericht (BPatG) [Federal Patent Court] Jun. 7, 1991, GRUR Int. 98, 1994 (Ger.).
Bundespatentgericht (BPatG) [Federal Patent Court] Apr. 24, 2007, BeckRS 14624, 2007 (Ger.).
Bundespatentgericht (BPatG) [Federal Patent Court] Jun. 4, 2007, NJOZ 4786, 2007 (Ger.).

Japan

Tōkyō Kōtō Saibansho [Tokyo High Ct.] Jul. 30, 1983, Sho 53 (Gyo Ke) No. 20 (Japan).
Tōkyō Kōtō Saibansho [Tokyo High Ct.] Mar. 30 1978, Sho 51 (Gyo Ke) No. 19 (Japan).
Tōkyō Kōtō Saibansho [Tokyo High Ct.] Oct. 31, 1963, Sho 34 (Gyo Na) No. 13 (Japan).
Tōkyō Kōtō Saibansho [Tokyo High Ct.] Sept. 8, 1985, Sho 60 (Gyo Ke) No. 51 (Japan).

United kingdom

Biogen Inc v. Medeva Plc, R.P.C. 1 (1997) (U.K.).
Dr Reddy's Laboratories Ltd v Eli Lilly & Company Ltd, R.P.C. 19 (2008) (U.K.).
Dr Reddy's Laboratories Ltd v Eli Lilly & Company Ltd EWCA Civ 1362 (2009), available at <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2009/1362.html>
Generics v Lundbeck, R.P.C. 13 (2009) (U.K.).
Generics v Lundbeck, R.P.C. 19 (2008) (U.K.).
I.G. Farbenindustrie's AG's Patent, R.P.C. 289 (1930).
Synthon BV v Smithkline Beecham Plc, R.P.C. 10 (2006)(U.K.).
Windsurfing International Inc. v Tabur Marine (GB) Ltd. R.P.C. 59 (1985) (Gt. Brit.).

United States

U.S. Supreme Court

Westinghouse v. Boyden Power Brake Co., 170 U.S. 537 (1898).
Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 684 (1966).
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 U.S. 1727 (2007).

Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit

Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ., 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs., Inc., 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001).
Chester v. Miller, 906 F.2d 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1990).
Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed.Cir.1991).

Elan Pharms., Inc. v. Mayo Found., 346 F.3d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 2003).
Eli Lilly and Company v Zenith Goldline Pharmaceuticals. Inc., 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).
Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd., 52 F.3d 1043 (Fed. Cir. 1995).
In re Deuel, 51 F.3d 1552 (Fed. Cir, 1995).
In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994).
In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347 (Fed.Cir.1992).
In re O'Farrell, 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988).
In re Schoenwald, 964 F.2d 1122 (Fed. Cir. 1992).
In re Sony, 54 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995).
Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984)
McNeil-PPC, Inc. V. L. Perrigo Co., 337 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2003).
Metabolite Laboratories, Inc. v. Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 370 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004).
Novo. Nordisk Pharms., Inc. v. Bio-Tech. Gen. Corp., 424 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2005).
Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc., 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).
Schering corp. v. Geneva Pharms., Inc., 339 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003).
Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc., 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991).
Smithkline Beecham Corporation v. Apotex Corp., 403 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2005).
Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991).
Yamanouchi Pharm. Co., Ltd. v. Danbury Pharmacal, Inc., 231 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals

In re Adamson, 275 F.2d 952 (C.C.P.A. 1960).
In re Brown, 329 F.2d 1006 (C.C.P.A. 1964).
In re LeGrice, 301 F.2d 929 (C.C.P.A. 1962).
In re Lukach, 442 F.2d 967 (C.C.P.A. 1971).
In re Petering, 301 F.2d 681 (C.C.P.A. 1962).
In re Schaumann, 572 F.2d 312 (C.C.P.A.1987).
In re Williams, 171 F.2d 319 (C.C.P.A. 1948).

District Court

Eli Lilly and Company v Zenith Goldline Pharmaceuticals. Inc., 364 F.Supp 2d 820 (S.D. Ind. 2005).
Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc., 348 F. Supp. 2d 713 (N.D.W.Va. 2004).

South Korea

Supreme Court Decision [S. Ct.], 2004Hu2307, Mar. 24, 2006 (S. Kor.).

Supreme Court Decision [S. Ct.], 2008Hu3469, Mar. 25, 2010 (S. Kor.).

Supreme Court Decision [S. Ct.], 2008Hu736, 2008Hu743, Oct. 15, 2009 (S. Kor.).

Table of Statutes and Other Materials:

European Patent Convention (13th ed. amended 2007).

Patents Act of 1977 (2004) (U.K.).

Patentgesetz [German Patent Act] (1980, amended 1988) (Ger.); translated in World Intellectual Property Organization, Patent Law, http://www.wipo.int/clea/docs_new/pdf/en/de/de081en.pdf.

Swiss Patent Act (amended 1995) (Switz.)

Teukheoboeb [Korean Patent Act] (amended 2010) (S. Korea).

Tokkyohō [Japanese Patent Act] (Japan).

The U.S. Patent Act, 35 U.S.C.

Examination Guidelines for Patent and Utility Model in Japan (June 2010).

Manual of Patent Practice – UK Patents Act 1977 (July 2010).

U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, § 2164.01 (8th ed. 8th rev. 2010).

Others:

Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, Legal Instruments – Results of the Uruguay Round vol. 31, 33 I.L.M. 81 (1994).

Dietmar Harhoff, Economic Cost-Benefit Analysis of a Unified and Integrated European Patent Litigation System, 2009 available at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/indprop/docs/patent_studies/litigation_system_en.pdf.

European Commission's pharmaceutical sector inquiry report, available at http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/pharmaceuticals/inquiry/communication_en.pdf.

IMS Health, Top 15 Global Products 2009, available at http://www.imshealth.com/deployedfiles/imshealth/Global/Content/StaticFile/Top_Line_Data/Global_Top_15_Products.pdf.

IPR Helpdesk, Some Basic Issues Surrounding Improvements Made to Patented Invention and to Dependent Patents, available at <http://www.ipr-helpdesk.org/>.

Jerome H. Reichman et al., Non-Voluntary Licensing of Patented Inventions: Historical Perspective, Legal Framework under TRIPS, and an Overview of the Practice in Canada and the USA1-2, (June 2003), available at http://www.ictsd.org/pubs/ictsd_series/iprs/CS_reichman_hasenzahl.pdf

Wesley M. Cohen et al., Protecting Their Intellectual Assets: Appropriability Conditions and Why Manufacturing Firms Patent (or Not) 23-24, Nat'l Bureau of Econ. Res., Working Paper No. 7752 (2000).