

JOHN W. SCHLICHER

**LICENSING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, LEGAL, BUSINESS, AND MARKET
DYNAMICS WITH SUPPLEMENT**

COMBINED TABLE OF CONTENTS

November 17, 2004

PREFACE

CHAPTER 1 AN INTRODUCTION TO LICENSING OF PATENTS AND KNOW-HOW

1.1 TECHNOLOGY, LICENSING AND LAW

1.2 THE COMMERCIAL VALUE, COST AND RISK OF TECHNOLOGY

**1.3 THE NATURE OF RIGHTS TO TECHNOLOGY UNDER PATENT, TRADE
SECRET AND CONTRACT LAW**

(a) Contracts

(b) Trade Secrets

(c) Patents

(d) Copyrights

**1.4 LICENSING AS A METHOD OF EXPLOITING THE COMMERCIAL VALUE
OF PATENT, TRADE SECRET, AND CONTRACT RIGHTS**

**(a) The Value of Rights Depends on Demand for Tangible Products and
Processes Embodying the Rights**

**(b) The Value of Rights Depends of Future Costs of Producing and Selling (or
Using) Tangible Embodiments, Not Sunk Costs**

**(c) The Business Decision to Exploit Rights by Vertical Integration or by
Licensing**

**(1) Where Vertical Integration and Licensing Are Equally Efficient and
Profitable**

**(2) Where Vertical Integration and Licensing Are Not Equally Efficient
and Profitable**

1.5 AN OVERVIEW OF LICENSING STRATEGY

- (a) Provisions to Maximize and Capture Demand**
- (b) Provisions to Decrease Transaction Costs**
- (c) Provisions to Decrease Uncertainty and Risk**
- (d) Provisions to Reduce the Licensee's Ability to Substitute Other Rights**

1.6 LICENSING STRATEGY, TERMS AND PROFITS

- (a) Controlling the Supply and Price of Licenses under the Rights**
- (b) Using Different Terms for Licensees with Different Demands**
- (c) Terms to Induce Licensee Investments**
- (d) Licensing to Increase Asset Specific Investment by Product Customers**
- (e) Terms to Induce Licensee Investments and Limit Licensee Output Restriction**
- (f) The Impact of Monopsony (that is Negotiating with a Single Potential Licensee)**
- (g) Adjusting the Terms to Provide the Proper Scale of Production by Licensees**
- (h) Terms to Induce Licensees to Use Inputs in the Right (Low Cost) Proportions**
- (i) Increasing Demand for the Rights by Increasing the Supply of Complementary Products**
- (j) Increasing Demand for the Rights by Increasing the Supply of Complementary Technology**
- (k) Practices that Reduce the Transaction Costs**
- (l) Terms to Reduce the Costs of Uncertainty and Litigation about Rights**
- (m) Controlling Rivalry from Substitute Rights Produced and Owned by Others**

1.7 AN OVERVIEW OF HOW THE LAW LIMITS LICENSING PRACTICES

CHAPTER 2 THE LAW OF LICENSING PATENT AND KNOW-HOW RIGHTS

2.1 THE LEGAL LIMITS ON LICENSING

2.2 AN INTRODUCTION TO PATENT AND TRADE SECRET LAW

(a) Patent Law

(b) Trade Secret Law

2.3 THE LEGAL THEORIES OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS TO TECHNOLOGY

(a) Property Right

(b) Monopoly Rights

(c) Regulated Natural Monopoly Rights

(d) A "Public" Contract

2.4 FUNDAMENTAL LEGAL CONCEPTS OF LICENSING

2.5 INTRODUCTION TO THE LIMITS ON LICENSING UNDER ANTITRUST, MISUSE AND PUBLIC POLICY DOCTRINES

(a) Antitrust Standards

(b) Misuse Standards

(1) The Misuse Defense

(2) The Misuse Defense Beyond Practices Categorically Condemned by the Supreme Court

(3) The Patent Act and the Judicial Standards

(c) The Public Policy Standard

2.6 A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE LEGAL LIMITS ON LICENSING

2-78

(a) Legislation

(b) Judicial Decisions

(c) Tying

- (d) Exclusive Dealing**
- (e) Package Licensing**
- (f) Royalties**
- (g) Resale Restrictions on Field of Use**

2.7 THE ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING LEGAL LIMITS ON LICENSING PATENT AND RELATED RIGHTS

- (a) Markets and Competition**
- (b) An Illustration of the Effects of Anticompetitive Agreements and Conduct**
- (c) Markets, Competition and Technical Information**
- (d) Markets, Competition and Intellectual Property Law**
- (e) An Illustration of the Effects of Intellectual Property Law**
- (f) Intellectual Property as Monopoly in Legal Doctrine**

2.8 2.11 THE BASIC OPTIONS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OWNERS

- (a) Capture the Commercial Value of the Rights other than by Limiting Rivalry with Substitute Rights**
- (b) Increase the Profitability of Supplying Rights or Products by Limiting Rivalry with the Cooperation of Suppliers of Substitute Rights or Substitute Products**
- (c) Increase the Profitability of Supplying Rights or Products by Limiting Rivalry without the Cooperation of Suppliers of Substitutes**

2.9 2.12 THE LAW AND THE BASIC OPTIONS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OWNERS

- (a) Licenses that Primarily Limit Rivalry among Suppliers of Substitute Products**
- (b) Licenses that Primarily Limit Rivalry among Suppliers of Substitute Rights**
- (c) Licenses that Limit Rivalry in Markets beyond the Scope of the Rights by "Foreclosing" Other Suppliers of "Unprotected" Products**
- (d) Evaluating the Potential Effects of Licensing in Markets for Products beyond the Reach of the Rights**

- (e) **The Time Horizon for Judging Anticompetitive Effects**

CHAPTER 3 THE LEGAL LIMITS ON THE DECISION TO LICENSE AND PAYMENTS FOR LICENSES

3.1 ACQUIRING RIGHTS

- (a) **Refusing To Use or License**
- (b) **The Amount of Royalty Payments**
- (c) **The Relation of Royalty Payments to the Scope of the Patent**
 - (1) **The Zenith Rule on Royalty Payments**
 - (2) **The Competitive Effects**
 - (3) **Procompetitive Reasons for Basing Royalties on Patented and Unpatented**
 - (4) **An Alternative Interpretation of the Zenith Rule**

3.2 3.5 THE RELATION OF ROYALTY PAYMENTS TO THE PATENT TERM

- (a) **The Brulotte Rule on Royalty Payments**
- (b) **The Competitive Effects**
- (c) **Procompetitive Reasons for Basing Royalties on a Term Extending Beyond the Rights**
- (d) **Other Implications of Brulotte**

3.3 3.6 THE RELATION OF ROYALTY PAYMENTS TO THE VALUE OF RIGHTS IN DIFFERENT USES OR TO DIFFERENT USERS – DISCRIMINATORY ROYALTIES

- (a) **The Shrimp Peeler Rule on Royalty Payments**
- (b) **The USM Rule on Royalty Payments**
- (c) **The Competitive Effects**
- (d) **Procompetitive Reasons for Discriminatory Royalties**
- (e) **Baxter's "Parable" Illustrating of the Market Effects of Discriminatory Royalties**

- 3.4 THE RELATION OF ROYALTY PAYMENTS TO THE VALUE OF RIGHTS TO DIFFERENT USERS - ROYALTIES PROPORTIONAL TO USE OF A PATENTED MACHINE**
- 3.5 THE RELATION OF ROYALTY PAYMENTS TO THE VALUE OF RIGHTS TO DIFFERENT USERS - ROYALTIES PAYABLE BY LICENSED SELLERS AND LICENSED BUYERS OF A SINGLE PRODUCT**
- 3.6 SHARING ROYALTIES WITH LICENSEES**
- 3.7 LICENSING IN EXCHANGE FOR RIGHTS - GRANTBACKS**
 - (a) The Transparent Wrap Rule**
 - (b) The Applications of Transparent Wrap**
 - (c) The Competitive Effects**

CHAPTER 4 THE LEGAL LIMITS ON THE NATURE OF PRODUCTS AND RIGHTS SUPPLIED TOGETHER – TYING AND PACKAGE LICENSING

- 4.1 SUPPLYING TANGIBLE PRODUCTS WITH A LICENSE – TYING ARRANGEMENTS**
- 4.2 THE LAW APPLIED TO TYING ARRANGEMENTS**
- 4.3 THE THEORY OF TYING - ACQUIRING A "LIMITED MONOPOLY" BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE RIGHTS**
- 4.4 THE COMPETITIVE EFFECTS OF TYING ARRANGEMENTS**
 - (a) Supply All Complements - Full Vertical Integration**
 - (b) Supply the Protected Product - Partial Vertical Integration**
 - (c) Supply the Protected Product with an Express Royalty Bearing License - Partial Integration with Economic Discrimination**
 - (d) Supply the Protected Product at Price Proportional to Intensity of Use - Partial Integration with Economic Discrimination**
 - (e) Supply the Protected Product and a Complementary Product to Meter Intensity of Use - Partial Integration with Economic Discrimination**
 - (f) Supply the Protected Product and a Complementary Product that would be Supplied by a Single Seller - Reducing the Harm from Monopoly Supply of a Complement**

- (g) Supply the Protected Product and a Complementary Product at Prices that Encourage Use in Low-Cost Proportions**
- (h) Supply the Protected Product and a Complementary Product to Assure Compatibility and Quality**
- (i) Supply a Complementary Product to Reduce the Transaction Costs of Express Licensing**
- (j) Supply the Protected Product and a Complementary Product to Acquire Market Power in Supply of the Complement**

4.5 4.5 THE LEADING DECISIONS AND STATUTES ON EXTENDING THE RIGHTS

- (a) Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener**
- (b) Henry v. A.B. Dick**
- (c) Motion Picture Patents**
- (d) Carbice**
- (e) Leitch**
- (f) Morton Salt and B.B. Chemical**
- (g) The Mercoid Cases**
- (h) Special Equipment**
- (i) The 1952 Amendment to the Patent Act**
- (j) Dawson**
- (k) The 1988 Amendment to the Patent Act**

4.6 LICENSING MORE THAN ONE PATENT OR COPYRIGHT IN A SINGLE AGREEMENT - PACKAGE LICENSING

- (a) The Law**
- (b) The Theory of the Law on Package Licensing**
- (c) Royalties and Package Licensing**
- (d) The Competitive Effects**

CHAPTER 5 LEGAL LIMITS ON THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF LICENSED RIGHTS - EXCLUSIVITY, FIELD OF USE, PRICE, QUANTITY, TERRITORY, CUSTOMER AND CROSS-LICENSING

5.1 ASSIGNING THE RIGHTS TO OTHERS

5.2 GRANTING AN EXCLUSIVE LICENSE

5.3 EXCLUSIVE DEALING - RESTRICTIONS AGAINST A LICENSEE DEALING IN SUBSTITUTE PRODUCTS

5.4 FIELD OF USE RESTRICTIONS

- (a) The General Talking Pictures Rule on Limited Fields of Use**
- (b) The Competitive Effects**
- (c) The General Talking Pictures Rule on Field of Use Limits on Purchasers from a Licensee**
- (d) The Application of the Rule on Field of Use Limits on Purchasers from a Licensee**
- (e) The Application of the Rule on Field of Use Limits to Products made by a Patented Process 5-21**

5.5 PRICE RESTRICTIONS

- (a) The Competitive Effects**
- (b) The General Electric Rule**
- (c) Price Limits under Cross-Licensed Patents - Line Material**
- (d) Price Limits**
- (e) Resale Price Limits - Univis Lens and Ethyl Gasoline**
- (f) Price Limits in Licenses used for Cartel Administration**

5.6 QUANTITY RESTRICTIONS

- (a) The Law**
- (b) The Competitive Effects**

5.7 5.7 TERRITORIAL LIMITATIONS

(a) Know-how Licenses

- (1) Fowle v. Park8**
- (2) The Rule of Reason Applies**
- (3) Du Pont**
- (4) Foundry Services, Blohm & Voss**
- (5) A & E Plastik**
- (6) Shin Nippon**
- (7) The Grant of a Limited License Does Not Constitute an Agreement Not To Compete by the Licensor or the Licensee**

(b) Patent Licenses

(c) Territorial Restrictions Are Unlawful if the Primary Purpose of a License or Series of Licensor Is to Eliminate Competition Among Companies that Would Exist in the Absence of the License or Licenses

- (1) National Lead**
- (2) Timken**
- (3) General Electric (1948)**
- (4) General Electric (1949)**
- (5) ICI**
- (6) Honeywell**

5.8 HOW THE LAW DETERMINES THE PRIMARY PURPOSE AND EFFECTS OF A LICENSE – THE PROBLEM OF SHAM LICENSES

- (a) The Likely Effects in the Market Setting**
- (b) Restrictions Broader than the Licensed Rights**
- (c) Restrictions Lasting Longer than the Licensed Rights**
- (d) The Existence and Significance or Commercial Value of the Licensed Rights**
- (e) The Nature of the License or Licenses**

- (f) Agreement Not to Challenge the Licensed Rights**
- (g) Other Restrictions on Competitive Activities**
- (h) The History of the Agreement**
- (i) The Actual Effects**

5.9 EXCLUSIVE, TERRITORIALLY LIMITED CROSS LICENSES OF PATENTS AND KNOW-HOW

5.10 CUSTOMER LIMITATIONS

5.11 CROSS-LICENSING AND LIMITATIONS ON THE GRANT OF LICENSES

CHAPTER 6 LICENSES DEEMED TO ARISE FROM SALE OF A PRODUCT - IMPLIED LICENSES AND EXHAUSTION OF RIGHTS

6.1 LICENSES ARISING FROM THE SALE OF A PRODUCT

6.2 A LICENSE MAY BE EXPRESS OR IMPLIED

6.3 THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT IMPLY A LICENSE

6.4 THE LEGAL THEORY OF EXHAUSTION

6.5 THE ORIGINS OF THE EXHAUSTION DOCTRINE - BLOOMER

6.6 EXHAUSTION APPLIES ONLY TO AUTHORIZED, UNCONDITIONAL SALES - MITCHELL

6.7 SOME EARLY APPLICATIONS OF EXHAUSTION – ADAMS, HOBBIE, KEELER

6.8 THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANTITRUST AND MISUSE LIMITS TO EXHAUSTION - HENRY, BAUER, MOTION PICTURE PATENTS

6.9 THE MODERN EXHAUSTION DOCTRINE

- (a) Univis Lens**
- (b) General Talking Pictures**
- (c) Mallinckrodt**

CHAPTER 7 THE LIMITS ON LICENSING UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF FEDERAL PREEMPTION

7.1 FEDERAL PREEMPTION AND THE STATE LAW OF LICENSING

7.2 PATENT INVALIDITY AS A DEFENSE TO ROYALTY OBLIGATIONS

7.3 A LICENSEE MAY SHOW PATENT INVALIDITY IF PART OF AN ANTITRUST DEFENSE TO ROYALTY OBLIGATIONS

7.4 A LICENSEE MAY DEFEND AN ACTION FOR ROYALTIES BY PROVING ON PATENT INVALIDITY - LEAR

- (1) The Doctrinal Basis for Lear**
- (2) The Decision on Licensee Estoppel**
- (3) The "Decision" on the Enforceability of Payment Terms of Patent Licenses**
- (4) The Effects of Licensee Estoppel and a Licensee's Agreement to Pay Regardless of Validity**
- (5) When do Royalty Obligations End under Lear**
- (6) The Enforceability of a Licensee's Express Agreement not to Challenge Validity**
- (7) Antitrust and Misuse Implications of Agreements not to Assert Invalidity**
- (8) The Enforceability of Termination Provisions**

- 7.5 THE ENFORCEABILITY OF TRADE SECRET AND KNOW-HOW LICENSES - KEWANEE**
- 7.6 THE ENFORCEABILITY OF ROYALTY OBLIGATIONS IN PATENT AND KNOW-HOW LICENSES - ARONSON**
- 7.7 THE ENFORCEABILITY OF ROYALTY OBLIGATIONS IN LICENSES MADE IN THE CONTEXT OF LITIGATION - CONSENT JUDGMENTS AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS**
- 7.8 THE ENFORCEMENT OF PATENTS AGAINST PARTIES TO ASSIGNMENTS AND EXCLUSIVE LICENSES**

CHAPTER 8 THE DIFFERENT PURPOSES AND METHODS OF LICENSING REGULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, THE EUROPEAN UNION, AND JAPAN

- 8.1 INTRODUCTION**
- 8.2 UNITED STATES LAW AND FOREIGN LICENSING**
 - (A) United States Antitrust Law Applies To Licenses Affecting U.S. Domestic Or Foreign Commerce**
 - (B) United States Misuse Law**
- 8.3 WHO ENFORCES THE LAWS**
- 8.4 WHEN GOVERNMENT REVIEW AND ENFORCEMENT OCCURS**
- 8.5 GOVERNMENT GUIDELINES AND RULES**
- 8.6 THE PURPOSES OF LICENSE REGULATION**
 - (A) The EU Goal Of Creating A Unitary Market, And Preventing Interference With Parallel Imports**
 - (b) The EU And Japanese Goal Of Preventing Licensors From Preserving A Technology Advantage Over Licensees**
 - (C) The Eu And Japanese Goal Of Fairness To Licensees (And Preventing Licensors From Earning Too Much Money)**

8.7 THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES, THE EU, AND JAPAN, AND THE PRINCIPLES OF A SENSIBLE POLICY

8.8 THE FUTURE OF LICENSING REGULATION AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

CHAPTER 9 UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT ON LICENSING

9.1 GOVERNMENT ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT PRIOR TO THE 1970'S

9.2 GOVERNMENT ENFORCEMENT POLICY DURING THE 1970'S

9.3 THE SHIFT IN ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT POLICY ON LICENSING IN THE 1980'S

(A) The Basis For The New Policy

(B) The Form Of Antitrust Analysis Under The New Policy

(C) Applying This Antitrust Analysis To The Nine No-No Provisions

(1) Tying Arrangements Involving A License

(2) Assignment Back Of Licensee Future Patents

(3) (Resale Restrictions Of Any Kind

(4) A Licensee's Agreement To Deal Exclusively In The Patented Products

(5) Joint Control By Owner And Licensee Of Further Licensing

(6) Package Licensing

(7) Royalties Not "Reasonably Related" To Sales Of Patented Products

(8) Restrictions On Sale Of Unpatented Products Made Using A Patented Process

(9) Limits On The Price Of A Licensee's Sales

(10) The Limitations Of Simple Formulas For Analyzing More Complex Transactions

(11) The Continuing Vitality Of This Enforcement Approach Throughout The 1980's

9.4 THE 1988 ENFORCEMENT GUIDELINES

- (A) Intellectual Property Owners Should Enjoy Whatever Value The Rights Have, Even If The Result Is A Monopoly**
- (B) Antitrust Law Favors Restrictions In Licenses That Assist The Owner Earning Maximum Returns From Use Of The Rights**
- (C) A Rule Of Reason Applies To All License Provisions, And Looks For Provisions That Create Or Facilitate The Exercise Of Market Power In Some Market Beyond That Provided By The Intellectual Property Being Licensed**
- (D) The Four Step Analysis Of Competitive Effects**
 - (1) Step 1 - Identifying Agreements Among Competitors To Limit Rivalry In Creating Technology Or Exploiting IP Rights**
 - (2) Step 2 - Identify Agreements Among Competitors To Limit Rivalry In Supplying Products**
 - (3) Step 3 - Identifying The Effects Of Agreements Between Companies That Have A Vertical Relationship With Respect To Performance Of The Agreement.**
 - (4) Step 4 - Weighing Anticompetitive Risks Against Procompetitive Efficiencies**

9.5 THE 1995 LICENSING GUIDELINES

- (A) The General Principles**
- (B) Goods Markets, Technology Markets, And Innovation Markets**
- (C) Horizontal And Vertical Relationships**
- (D) Applying Per Se Rules**
- (E) Applying A Rule Of Reason**
- (F) The Safety Zone Based On Market Share**
- (G) Application To Particular License Provisions**
 - (1) Licenses Between Existing Competitors**
 - (2) Resale Price Restrictions**
 - (3) Tying Arrangements**

- (4) Package Licensing**
- (5) Exclusive Dealing**
- (6) Cross-Licensing And Pooling Arrangements**
- (7) Grantbacks**
- (8) Acquisition Of Intellectual Property Rights**

9.6 A SUMMARY OF THE 1970'S APPROACH, THE 1988 GUIDELINES, AND THE 1996 GUIDELINES

CHAPTER 10 (EU) CHAPTER 10 LICENSING REGULATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

10.1 THE TREATY OF ROME

10.2 BRIEF HISTORY OF EU LICENSING BLOCK EXEMPTIONS

10.3 THE 1996 EU TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER BLOCK EXEMPTION

- (a) The Scope Of The Exemption**
- (b) The Structure And Operation Of The Exemption**
 - (1) The Four Lists**
 - (2) The Commission's Right To Withdraw The Exemption**
- (c) Practices Potentially Restrictive Of Competition, But Satisfying The Article 85(3) Criteria For Exemption - The Article 1 Or White List Practices**
 - (1) Article 1 Practices**
 - (2) The Geographic And Time Limits On Article 1 Practices**
- (d) Practices Generally Not Restrictive Of Competition - The Article 2 (Whiter-Than-White) Practices**
 - (1) The Article 2 Practices**
- (e) Practices That May Or May Not Be Restrictive Of Competition, And That May Receive Exemption After Notification - The Article 4 Or Gray List Practices**
- (f) Practices Presumed To Be Restrictive Of Competition, And Not Satisfying The Criteria For Exemption - The Article 3 Or Black List Practices**

- (g) Some Comments On The 1996 Exemption**
 - (1) Exclusive Territories**
 - (2) Tying Arrangements**
 - (3) Field Of Use Limitations**
 - (4) Grantbacks**
 - (5) Challenging Validity**
 - (6) Limitation On Sale Of Competing Products**
 - (7) Royalty Limitations**

CHAPTER 11 LICENSING REGULATION IN JAPAN

11.1 THE JAPAN FAIR TRADE COMMISSION

11.2 THE 1968 GUIDELINES

11.3 THE 1989 JFTC GUIDELINES

- (a) The Scope Of The 1989 Guidelines**
- (b) The Structure And Operation Of The 1989 Guidelines**
- (c) Patent License Restrictions Considered, In Principle, Not To Be An Unfair Trade Practice - Article 1**
- (d) Patent License Restrictions That May Be An Unfair Trade Practice - Article 2**
- (e) Patent License Restrictions Highly Likely To Be An Unfair Trade Practice - Article 3**
- (f) Know-How License Restrictions Considered, In Principle, Not To Be An Unfair Trade Practice - Article 1**
- (g) Know-How License Restrictions That May Be An Unfair Trade Practice - Article 2**
- (h) Know-How License Restrictions Highly Likely To Be An Unfair Trade Practice - Article 3**

CHAPTER 12 THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN ANTITRUST LIMITS ON LICENSING PRACTICES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION, JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

12.1 THE DIFFERENT PURPOSES AND METHODS OF LEGAL REGULATION OF LICENSING IN THE UNITED STATES, THE EUROPEAN UNION, AND JAPAN

- A. Introduction**
- B. Who Enforces The Laws**
- C. When Government Review And Enforcement Occurs**
- D. Government Guidelines And Rules**
- E. The Purposes Of License Regulation**
 - 1. The EU Goal Of Creating A Unitary Market, And Preventing Interference With Parallel Imports**
 - 2. The EU And Japanese Goal Of Preventing Licensors From Preserving A Technology Advantage Over Licensees**
 - 3. The EU And Japanese Goal Of Fairness To Licensees (And Preventing Licensors From Earning Too Much Money)**

12.2 THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES, THE EU, AND JAPAN

12.3 THE FUTURE OF LICENSING REGULATION AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

12.4 THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN ANTITRUST LIMITS ON LICENSING PRACTICES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION, JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

- (a) An Overview Of Legal Limits On Licensing Strategy**
- (b) Refusing To License, Enforcing Rights And Controlling The Supply Of Licenses**
- (c) Royalty Issues**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**

- (3) Japan**
- (d) Grantbacks**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (e) Tying Arrangements**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (f) Package Licensing**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (g) Granting An Exclusive License**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (h) Exclusive Dealing: Restrictions Against The Licensor Or Licensee Dealing In Competitive Products**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (i) Limits On Use Of Trademarks**
- (j) Quality Restrictions**
- (k) Field Of Use Restrictions**

- (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (l) Price Restrictions**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (m) Quantity Restrictions**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (n) Customer Restrictions**
 - (1) European Union**
 - (2) Japan**
- (o) Territory Restrictions**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**
- (p) Preserving the Value of Rights and Challenges to the Validity of Rights**
 - (1) United States**
 - (2) European Union**
 - (3) Japan**