



MAX-PLANCK-GESELLSCHAFT

**UNA**  
Universität  
Augsburg  
University

**TUM**  
TECHNISCHE  
UNIVERSITÄT  
MÜNCHEN

THE GEORGE  
WASHINGTON  
UNIVERSITY  
LAW SCHOOL  
WASHINGTON DC

**MIPLC Studies**

Edited by

Prof. Dr. Christoph Ann, LL.M. (Duke Univ.)  
Technische Universität München

Prof. Robert Brauneis  
The George Washington University Law School

Prof. Dr. Josef Drexl, LL.M. (Berkeley)  
Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and  
Competition Law

Prof. Dr. Thomas M.J. Möllers  
University of Augsburg

Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Joseph Straus,  
Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and  
Competition Law

Volume 9

Tuire Anniina Väisänen

# Enforcement of FRAND Commitments under Article 102 TFEU

The Nature of FRAND Defence in Patent Litigation



**Nomos**

**MIPLC**

Munich  
**Intellectual  
Property**  
Law Center

Augsburg  
München  
Washington DC

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

a.t.: Munich, Univ., Diss., 2010

ISBN 978-3-8329-5837-4

1. Auflage 2011

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2011. Printed in Germany. Alle Rechte, auch die des Nachdrucks von Auszügen, der fotomechanischen Wiedergabe und der Übersetzung, vorbehalten. Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machine or similar means, and storage in data banks. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to »Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort«, Munich.

# Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Abstract   | 7         |
| Introduction   | 11        |
| <b>1. Objectives and Benefits of Standardization</b>                                 | <b>15</b> |
| 1.1 ETSI GSM Standards   | 16        |
| 1.2 The Role of SSOs and Rational Behind the<br>FRAND Commitments                    | 19        |
| 1.3 Criticized Pitfalls of the Current FRAND Regime                                  | 21        |
| 1.3.1 The Patent Hold-Up Problem   | 21        |
| 1.3.2 Royalty Stacking   | 23        |
| <b>2. Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights</b>                           | <b>27</b> |
| 2.1 The Objectives of Article 102 TFEU   | 30        |
| <b>3. The Applicability of Article 102 TFEU to Enforce FRAND<br/>    Commitments</b> | <b>33</b> |
| 3.1 Market Definition in Technology Markets  | 34        |
| 3.2 Dominance in Technology Markets  | 35        |
| 3.3 Abusive Conducts in a Standard-setting Context                                   | 37        |
| 3.3.1 Excessive Pricing Under Article 102 (a) TFEU                                   | 38        |
| 3.3.2 Price Discrimination under Article 102 (c) TFEU                                | 41        |
| 3.4 Other Exclusionary Practices   | 44        |
| 3.4.1 The Misuse of Intellectual Property Rights                                     | 44        |
| 3.5 Conclusion on the Applicability of Article 102 TFEU<br>on FRAND Commitments      | 45        |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>4. Case Studies Related to the Enforcement of FRAND Commitments under Article 102 TFEU</b>   | <b>47</b> |
| 4.1 The <i>Qualcomm</i> Case  | 48        |
| 4.1.1 What is the Object of the European Commission’s Decision to Initiate Proceedings in the <i>Qualcomm</i> case?                       | 48        |
| 4.2 Possible Doctrinal Solutions based on the Meaning of FRAND Terms  | 50        |
| 4.2.1 The Meaning of FRAND Commitments under Article 102 (a) and (c) TFEU - Possible Doctrinal Solutions Based on Established EC Case Law | 52        |
| 4.2.2 Deceptive Conduct in the Standard-Setting Process - Is the AstraZeneca “ <i>Doctrine</i> ” Applicable to FRAND Commitments?         | 55        |
| 4.3 Need for a Precedent from the European Commission   | 60        |
| <br>  |           |
| <b>5. FRAND Defence in Patent Litigation under German Law</b>   | <b>65</b> |
| 5.1 FRAND Defence and Limited Right to Injunctions  | 66        |
| 5.2 The IPCoM v Nokia Case  | 69        |
| <br>  |           |
| Conclusion  | 73        |
| <br>  |           |
| References  | 75        |