



MAX-PLANCK-GESELLSCHAFT



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,  
Competition, and Tax Law

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

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

Volume 7

Kristina Janušauskaitė

# Implementation of the EU Enforcement Directive in the Baltic Countries

Experience in View of the Development of Protection  
of Intellectual Property Rights



**Nomos**

**M IPLC**

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 978-3-8329-5784-1

1. Auflage 2010

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2010. 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.

*To my parents*



## Preface

This monograph was published on the basis of the dissertation which had been submitted to the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (Munich) in winter semester 2009/2010. The dissertation was devoted to comprehensive collection and examination of the legislation and practice of the Baltic countries regarding enforcement of intellectual property rights. As it can already be seen from the title of the monograph, the analysis of the implementation of the provisions of the EU Enforcement Directive in the Baltic countries was made considering relevant historical, social and economic aspects of the Baltic region. Therefore, such research can be interesting not only in terms of relevant legal issues, it also has practical dimension which can be useful for scholars as well as practitioners.

The author of the monograph first of all expresses her thanks to the supervisor of her dissertation Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Joseph Straus for his constructive guidance and his full support while doing the research on the topic and writing the dissertation. The author also thanks Prof. Dr. Michael Lehmann for his revision of the dissertation and positive evaluation as well as Prof. Dr. Vytautas Mizaras for his appreciable suggestions which enabled the dissertation to be more synchronised with the local actualities. Special thanks go to the MIPLC whose staff were extremely helpful during the author's doctoral studies in Munich, also to the MIPLC faculty members, especially to Chief Judge Rader R. Randall, Prof. Martin Adelman, Prof. Dr. Heinz Goddar, Prof. Dr. Thomas Dreier, all dear friends and colleagues from all over the world as well as the author's family whose help and full support was constantly felt.

Vilnius, August 2010

*Kristina Janušauskaitė*



# Contents

<b>§ 1 Abbreviations</b>	17
<b>§ 2 Introduction</b>	21
A. Subject-matter and objectives of the research	21
B. Structure of this study	25
<b>§ 3 Protection of IP rights in the Baltic countries: retrospective observations and the current infrastructure</b>	29
A. Specificity of the geopolitical situation of the Baltic countries: the general context	29
B. Historical overview of the protection of IP rights in the Baltic countries	31
I. Before World War II (1918 – 1940): the origins of modern national IP legislation	32
1. Industrial property legislation	32
2. Copyright legislation	35
II. The Soviet occupation (1940 – 1990/1991): the strained existence of IP rights	36
1. IP as a part of Soviet civil law	36
2. Aspects of enforcement of IP rights under the Soviet regulation	38
III. The period of substantial changes of IP rights protection (1990/1991 – 1994)	39
1. Adoption of the new national IP legislation	39
2. Adherence to the international treaties on IP protection	43
IV. Substantial reforms in the field of enforcement of IP rights regarding the implementation of <i>acquis communautaire</i>	46
V. Concluding remarks	48
C. Overview of the current national regulatory and institutional framework for the enforcement of IP rights	49
I. Adoption of national IP legislation: some procedural aspects	49
II. Competence and functions of the main national IP institutions	51
1. The Ministries of Culture: the Copyright Divisions and Boards	51
2. The collective administration societies	52

3. The trademark and patent offices	53
III. The role of the government institutions responsible for IP rights enforcement	54
1. The police authorities: a good start in IP rights infringement cases is crucial	54
2. Customs authorities: ensuring effective measures at the borders	56
IV. The national judicial systems in view of IP rights enforcement	57
1. Competence to hear IP rights infringement cases and jurisdiction	57
a) General structure of the court systems	57
b) Role of the national Supreme Courts	59
2. Establishment of specialized courts: a solution for the Baltic countries?	61
3. Common judiciary in the framework of community rights: Baltic perspective	63
V. IP practitioners and their role in IP enforcement-related processes: professionalism as the key factor	63
1. Legal representation	63
2. Patent and trademark attorneys	64
VI. Concluding remarks	65

#### **§ 4 Considerations of the relevant social and economic factors which are important to the implementation of the Enforcement Directive** 67

A. General considerations	67
I. Social changes in the Baltic countries in view of the accession into the European Union	67
II. IP piracy in the Baltics: prevailing tendencies and impact on the national IP rights enforcement legislation	69
B. Aspects of the Baltic IP research, innovation and industry	71
I. General remarks	71
II. IP teaching: a role of the national educational institutions and a level of the scientific research	72
III. Local research and innovation	74
1. Research and development areas	74
2. Foreign and local investments in local IP industries	75
IV. Factors promoting the local research and innovation	77
1. Promoting activities in the Baltic universities	77
2. IP strategy in the local business sector	79
3. Level of the national governments' regulation and their support in the field of research and development	79
V. Concluding remarks	80

<b>§ 5 Aspects of enforcement of IP rights in the Baltic countries in view of the implementation of the EU Enforcement Directive</b>	<b>83</b>
A. EU Enforcement Directive: idea, objectives and scope of application	83
I. Brief review on the adoption of the Directive	83
1. Commission's Proposal for a Draft Enforcement Directive: between support and critique	83
a) Supportive positions	83
b) Criticised aspects	84
c) Adopted EU Enforcement Directive: tension remained?	86
2. Relation between the Enforcement Directive, other international standards on IP enforcement and EU directives	87
a) Part III of TRIPS Agreement: was the Enforcement Directive necessary?	87
(1) Community's competence to legislate on enforcement of IP rights	87
(2) Necessity to adopt a directive on enforcement of IP rights	88
b) Enforcement Directive as the first extensive horizontal instrument on enforcement of the substantive IP rights	90
(1) Prior EU-wide provisions on enforcement of IP rights	90
(2) Character of the provisions of the Enforcement Directive	92
II. Review of the catalogue of enforcement measures, procedures and remedies under the Enforcement Directive: "grandfather" provisions and novelties	93
1. Substantive provisions under the Directive	93
a) Right of information (Article 8)	94
b) Corrective measures (Article 10)	95
c) Injunction (Article 11)	96
d) Alternative measures (Article 12)	98
e) Damages (Article 13)	98
f) Publication of judicial decisions (Article 15)	101
2. Procedural provisions under the Directive	102
a) Evidence (Article 6)	102
b) Measures for preserving evidence (Article 7)	103
c) Provisional and precautionary measures (Article 9)	105
d) Legal costs (Article 14)	106
III. Concluding remarks	107

B.	Implementing legislation of the Baltic countries	108
I.	Legislative (formal) implementation	108
1.	Prior-to-implementation provisions on IP enforcement, duration of the implementation and the implementing provisions	108
a)	Prior-to-implementation national IP enforcement provisions: key aspects	108
(1)	Copyright legislation	108
(2)	Industrial property legislation	111
b)	Duration of the implementation of the Directive	112
c)	Adoption of the implementing amendments on IP enforcement	114
(1)	General remarks	114
(2)	Copyright legislation	115
(3)	Industrial property legislation	116
II.	Concluding remarks	118
C.	General provisions of the Enforcement Directive in view of the implementing Baltic legislation and other Baltic national laws	119
I.	Interpretation of the “subject-matter” under Article 1 of the Directive	119
1.	The Commission’s position	119
2.	The protected “subject-matter” under the Baltic national legislation	120
a)	The definition of “IP rights” under the Baltic legislative acts	120
(1)	IP right holders and their economic rights	120
(2)	Moral rights	121
b)	“Grey areas” under the national legislation	122
(1)	Non-property rights, firm names, commercial (industrial) secrets	122
(2)	Civil enforcement remedies in cases of infringements of “grey area” rights	123
II.	The scope of the application of the Enforcement Directive	126
1.	Covered and excluded legal areas under Article 2 of the Directive	126
a)	Areas to which the Directive has no prejudice	126
b)	Applicability of the Directive to any infringement of IP rights	128
2.	The term “ <i>commercial scale</i> ” (“ <i>commercial purposes</i> ”) under the Directive	129
a)	Embodiment of the term in the Draft Enforcement Directive	129
b)	Relevance of the definition of “commercial scale” in IP enforcement practice	130
c)	Judicial interpretation of the term “commercial purposes”: the Lithuanian court practice	131

(1)	Before the implementation of the Directive	131
(2)	Implementing amendments: finally solving the issue of the “ <i>commercial purposes</i> ”?	133
III.	The principle of “Fair and Equitable Measures, Procedures and Remedies” under Article 3 of the Directive	134
1.	Essence of the principle	134
2.	Embodiment of the principal in the Baltic legislation and practice	135
IV.	Presumption of authorship and ownership	137
1.	Debatable aspects of the “presumption” provision set out in Article 5 of the Directive	137
2.	Authorship presumption and reversal of burden of proof under the Baltic legislation and practice	138
a)	Authorship presumption	138
b)	Reversal of burden of proof under the national patent legislation	140
V.	Legal standing in civil proceedings ( <i>locus standi</i> )	142
1.	List of persons having a right to assert enforcement measures and remedies under Article 4 of the Directive	142
2.	<i>Locus standi</i> under the Baltic legislation	143
a)	IP right holders	143
b)	Licensees	144
(1)	Before the implementation of the Directive	144
(2)	The implementing provisions regarding <i>locus standi</i>	
c)	Rights-management collective societies and professional defence bodies	146
d)	Foreign natural and legal persons	148
VI.	Concluding remarks	148
D.	Preserving evidence in IP infringement cases and right of information under the national legislation and court practice in view of the implementation of the Enforcement Directive	150
I.	Evidence and measures to preserve evidence in IP rights infringement cases in view of Articles 6 and 7 of the Enforcement Directive	150
1.	General remarks	150
2.	National measures for preserving evidence: before and after the implementation of the Enforcement Directive	151
a)	Prior-to-implementation regulation of measures preserving evidence	151
b)	Implementing amendments on measures preserving evidence	152

3.	Lithuanian practice on civil (ex parte) searches	154
a)	General aspects	154
b)	Requirements for civil (ex parte) searches requests	156
(1)	Substantiated requests by interested parties	156
(2)	Presentation of “ <i>reasonably available evidence</i> ” by the requesting party	158
(3)	Most frequent evidence in <i>civil search</i> cases in Lithuania	160
(4)	Application of measures preserving evidence on <i>ex parte</i> basis	161
(5)	Sufficiency of evidence and application of “ <i>samples</i> ” provision	162
c)	Enforcing court rulings on civil searches	164
d)	Requirement to submit a civil claim	165
e)	Protection of interests of the opposing party (alleged infringers)	166
II.	Right of information under the national legislation in view of Article 8 of the Directive	168
1.	Scope and content of requested information	168
2.	Providers of requested information	170
III.	Concluding remarks	172
E.	Provisional measures and injunctions under the implementing national legislation and court practice	174
I.	Provisional measures under the national legislation in view of Article 9 of the Enforcement Directive	174
1.	Application of provisional measures as procedural civil remedies	174
a)	Objectives and nature	174
b)	Requirements for application of interlocutory injunctions	176
2.	Permanent injunctions under the national legislation in view of Article 11 of the Directive	178
a)	Injunctions against the continuation of IP infringements	178
b)	Possibilities of preventive claims	179
3.	Injunctions against intermediaries	180
4.	Assurance of compliance with permanent injunctions	182
II.	Concluding remarks	183
F.	Damages, legal costs and other enforcement measures	184
I.	Adjudication of damages in IP rights infringement cases in view of Article 13 of the Directive	184

1.	Actual damages and alternative methods to calculate damages: dilemma in the national IP infringement cases	184
a)	General remarks regarding compensation of damages	185
b)	Actual damages (losses)	187
(1)	Civil legal liability conditions	187
(2)	Reimbursement of direct material damages	189
(3)	Loss of profit	191
(4)	An infringer's gained profit; unjustified enrichment	193
(5)	Pre-established damages	194
c)	Alternative methods to compute damages: is fair and adequate estimation possible?	194
(1)	General grounds for alternative methods to compensate damages	194
(2)	Compensation instead of actual damages (losses)	196
(3)	License analogy method	199
d)	Moral prejudice (non-pecuniary damages)	200
II.	Legal costs as an important procedural factor in view of Article 14 of the Directive	203
1.	National procedural rules on legal costs	203
2.	Practical aspects regarding covering of legal costs	204
III.	Application of corrective and alternative measures	205
1.	Corrective measures in view of Article 10 of the Directive	205
2.	Alternative measures in view of Article 12 of the Directive	208
IV.	Publication of judicial decisions in view of Article 15 of the Directive	210
V.	Concluding remarks	211
G.	Other national IP enforcement measures which do not fall under the scope of the Directive	213
I.	Other sanctions for IP infringements in view of Article 16 of the Directive	213
1.	Administrative and criminal liability and sanctions under the Baltic legislation	213
a)	General overview of the national provisions	213
b)	Relevant aspects of administrative and criminal liability	216
c)	Adjudication of civil damages in administrative and criminal cases	220
II.	Border measures under the EC Regulation 1383/2003	222
1.	General remarks	222
2.	Border measures and civil remedies as implemented under the Enforcement Directive	224
III.	Concluding remarks	225

<b>§ 6 Conclusions and observations</b>	227
A. Implementation of the Enforcement Directive in the Baltic countries: outcomes	227
B. Further strengthening IP rights enforcement: incentives to innovate and create in the Baltics?	229
Bibliography	231
<b>§ 7 Annex I: International, EU and National Legislation</b>	241
A. International Treaties	241
B. European Union Legislation and Preparatory Acts	241
C. National Legislation	242
I. Lithuania	242
II. Latvia	243
III. Estonia	244
<b>§ 8 Annex II: Cases</b>	245
<b>§ 9 Summary (in German)</b>	249
<b>§ 10 Index</b>	257