



OXFORD

Beyond the Code

*Protection of Non-Textual
Features of Software*

NOAM SHEMTOV

Beyond the Code

Protection of Non-Textual
Features of Software

Noam Shemtov

Senior Lecturer in Intellectual Property
and Technology Law,
Queen Mary, University of London

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Noam Shemtov 2017

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2017

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017947641

ISBN 978-0-19-871679-2

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Beyond the Code

For Ino and Daphne

Foreword

Software plays a crucial role in our economy and society. It is the backbone of how we communicate, create, travel, entertain, conduct business, and provide services and, increasingly in an era of 'big data', predicts and shapes our future behaviour. The pervasiveness of software makes it easy to forget that its transformational impact has occurred in just over half a century. The history of intellectual property protection of software is also relatively short, with copyright protection being widely recognized by the early to mid 1980s and patent protection for software related inventions from the 1970s. Like the technology itself, intellectual property issues relating to software have become more complex over time. Yet core areas of contention remain, relating to the scope of copyright protection, the use of contractual and technological mechanisms to protect against copyright infringement, the permissibility of reverse engineering, and the patentability of software. Much ink has been spilled, particularly in United States law journals, about these issues. But it is rare to see a systematic, thoughtful and current account of all of them in one place. This is where Dr Noam Shemtov's book, 'Beyond Code', steps in.

'Beyond Code' is concerned with the protection of non-literal features of software, not simply the code itself, because this is where the more interesting questions arise. The analysis delves into the domains of copyright, patents, trade secrets, trade marks, designs, and contract law, according to both United States and European (Union) law. These jurisdictions are wisely chosen, not least because the United States and Europe are powerhouses of software creation.

A central analytical thread running throughout the book is how to avoid over-protection of software, to ensure vibrant, competitive software industries. As such, the book offers valuable reform proposals, including; improvements to decompilation and reverse engineering exceptions in copyright law, the judicial utilization of a 'misuse' or 'abuse of right' doctrine, and interpretations of contractual enforceability, especially when licence terms conflict with substantive norms of copyright law. Dr Shemtov is to be commended for writing a sophisticated and highly accessible exegesis on intellectual property protection of software. It is an extremely valuable addition to the literature and will make highly beneficial reading for academics, practitioners, and students alike.

Professor Tanya Aplin

July 2017

Preface

My first expression of authorial interest in the legal protectability of software took place during the years of writing my PhD thesis. Ever since, I was fascinated by software's amorphous nature as a legally protectable subject matter. Software plays a crucial role in most parts of today's society. It is now an indispensable feature of the world of business, finance, industry and manufacture, education and research, medicine, government, entertainment, law and daily life in general. Furthermore, software stands at the heart of all disruptive technologies, as predicted at present. Hence, artificial intelligence, automation and robotics, Internet of things, biometric and digital identification and virtual reality, have software at their core.

As a legally protectable subject matter, software always proved to be challenging. None of our intellectual property regimes provide a good fit, and Mr. Bumble's memorable line from *Oliver Twist* on the law being an 'ass' does sometimes spring to mind when we witness jurists' continuous attempts to fit software within our existing intellectual property landscape in a manner that takes account of right owners' proprietary interest, while bearing in mind broader public welfare considerations.

In light of software's prominence in all walks of life in the 21st century and its unique characteristics as a legally protectable subject matter, it is somewhat surprising that it has not been subject to more analysis as a legally protectable asset, in particular in relation to the law in the European Union, where such works are relatively few and far between.

This book attempts to address this state of affairs by analyzing software's various facets as legally protectable subject matters, with particular emphasis on non-literal software aspects. It examines the protectability of the different aspects of software products or services under various intellectual property, quasi - intellectual property and contract laws, focusing in particular on the laws of the United States and European Union. This focus is due to the fact that, to date, both jurisdictions are not only extremely significant markets for software -based products and services, but also have the most mature software-related legal ecosystems.

My intention in writing this book was to make it of interest to both legal scholars and practitioners. Therefore, it does not only survey the current legal state of affairs in relation to the different areas of coverage, it also attempts to predict how the law is likely to develop in this context. In addition, on occasions I chose to provide a critical viewpoint regarding the legal position at issue while suggesting potential fixes to address such shortcomings, irrespective of whether or not I believe that the said position is likely to change any time soon. To name just two examples in

this context, in relation to the combined effect of copyright, restrictive contractual provisions and TPMs, as well as in relation to the implications of the trade secrets regime under the newly enacted directive on software available under beta – test agreements, I provide an analysis of the present legal position and critique as to its inadequacy, but I also point out towards possible workarounds, should the courts be prepared to adopt an activist approach in this regard.

In terms of scoping, the book is intellectual property focused. However, I am of the view that no meaningful discussion could take place, especially with regard to the scope of protection of software under copyright law, without considering the implications of licensing provisions that seek to broaden the protection granted under the former. It is for this reason that the discussion in this book commences with an examination of such restrictive licensing provisions prevalent in the software industry, their origin, purpose and impact, as well as the juridical tools that are currently at the courts' disposal for mitigating the effect of such provisions. From this point onwards the discussion focuses purely on intellectual property law. Copyright law still being the main vehicle for protecting software's 'non-literal' elements is discussed in greater detail, with reference to exceptions and limitation applicable to such scenarios. The discussion then moves to protection available under patent law, trade marks and trade dress law, registered designs and design patents and, finally, trade secrets law.

I decided to include a separate chapter dealing with graphical user interfaces (GUIs). This feature of a software product or service's get-up is decisive to its success, while its legal protectability might be determined with reference to a wide tapestry of intellectual property rights. Questions of GUIs protectability are becoming even more important nowadays, where many software offerings are available as a service over the internet, without any possibility to access its code or architecture. While it is true that some may argue that a GUI includes 'literal' elements and thus, as a whole, might not be considered as non-literal *stricto sensu*, it is nevertheless discussed here in detail since its protectability is non-code related.

Finally, one could not conclude a personal note written at the first part of 2017 without referring to the looming departure of the United Kingdom from the European Union. By the time that the British public voted to leave the European Union, the vast majority of this book was already written. But even if it were not the case and I would have written the whole book at this very moment, there is little more that I would have done differently as the terms of such departure are far from clear. Hence, subject to a few explanatory comments, rather than enter the realm of political speculation, I opted to address the relevant issues on the basis of the political and legal state of affairs at the time of writing: The United Kingdom being a member state of the European Union.

List of Abbreviations

ABC	Hypothetical developer
AFC	Abstraction-filtration-comparison
AG	Attorney General
API	Application programming interfaces
BASCOM	<i>BASCOM Global Internet Services, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , No. 2015-1763, 2016 WL 3514158 (Fed. Cir. June 27, 2016)
BnetD	<i>Davidson & Associates DBA Blizzard Entertainment, Inc.; Vivendi Universal Inc. v. Jung et al.</i> 422 F.3d 630 (8th Cir. 2005)
BSA	<i>Bezpečnostní softwarová asociace – Svaz softwarové ochrany v. Ministerstvo kultury</i> , C-393/09
CAFC	Court of Appeal for the Federal Court
CCPA	Court of Custom and Patent Appeal
CDR	Council Regulation (EC) No.6/2002 of 21 December 2001, on Community design (consolidated version)
CFI	Court of first instance
CLS	<i>Alice Corp. Pty. V CLS Bank Int'l</i> 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)
CUTSA	California Uniform Trade Secrets Act
DDR	<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)
DMCA	Digital Millennium Copyright Act
DTSA	Defend Trade Secrets Act
ECJ	European Court of Justice
EPC	European Patent Convention
EPO	European Patent Office
EULA	End user license agreement
FOSS	Free and open source software
FSF	Free Software Foundation
GUI	Graphic user interface
HULU	Premium online streaming service
IEEE	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
IMS	<i>IMS Health GmbH & Co. OHG v. NDC Health GmbH & Co. KG.</i> , (C-418/01) [2004] E.C.R. I-503.
IPR	Intellectual property right

ISP	Internet service provider
IT	Information technology
LJ	Lord Justice
MDY	<i>MDY Industries v. Blizzard Entertainment</i> 629 F.3d 928 (9th Cir. 2010) (14 December 2010) 2013
MPEP	The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure
OHIM	The Office of Harmonization in the Internal Market
OPEL	Case C-48/05 <i>Adam Opel AG v. Autec AG</i> [2007] E.C.R. I-1017
OSI	Open Source Initiative
PRC	<i>PRC Realty Sys., Inc. v. Nat'l. Ass'n. of Realtors</i> , Nos 91-1125, 91-1143, 1992 U.S. App. LEXIS 18017, at 38 (4th Cir. 4 Aug. 1992)
ProCD	<i>ProCD, Inc. v. Zeidenberg</i> 86 F.3d 1447 (7th Cir. 1996)
PTAB	Patent Trial and Appeal Board
PTO	Patent and Trademark Office
QC	Queen's Counsel
SAAS	Software-as-a-service
SSO	Structure, sequence and organization
SST	<i>Secure Services Technology v. Time and Space Processing</i> 722 F.Supp.1354 (E.D. Va. 1989)
TDS	Trade Secrets Directive
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
TM	Trademark
TPM	Technological protection measures
TRIPS	The Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
TSD	Trade Secrets Directive
UCITA	Uniform Computer Information Transactions Act
USPTO	United States Patent and Trademark Office
UTSA	Uniform Trade Secrets Act
VGS	Virtual game solution
VOIP	Voice over Internet Protocol
WPL	<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. World Programming Ltd</i> [2010] EWHC 1829 (Ch)

Table of Contents

FOREWORD	xiii
PREFACE	xv
TABLE OF CASES	xvii
TABLE OF LEGISLATION	xxiii
TABLE OF TREATIES, ETC	xxvii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxix
1. LICENCE-CREATED MONOPOLIES: CONTROLLING USE THROUGH RESTRICTIVE LICENSING TERMS	1
1.1 Setting the Scene	2
1.2 Restricting Licensees Through the Use of Technology-Based Solutions	4
1.2.1 The position in the European Union	5
1.2.2 The US position	5
1.2.2.1 <i>Judicial perspectives</i>	6
1.3 Reverse Engineering, Reproducing Functional Elements, and Contractual Provisions	10
1.3.1 Contractual prohibitions on reverse engineering and reproduction	11
1.3.2 Licence types	13
1.3.3 Summation	14
1.4 The Case for Freedom of Contract	14
1.5 Contracts of Adhesion	17
1.6 Regulating 'Freedom of Contracts'	19
1.6.1 Limitations based on public policy	19
1.6.2 Regulating the enforceability of contracts of adhesion	21
1.6.3 Misusing a legal right	22
1.7 The Combined Effect of Contracts of Adhesion and Technological Protection Measures	23
1.8 The Special Case of Software	26
1.8.1 The collapse of the copyright-patent dichotomy	26
1.8.2 Software's expressive core	27

1.8.3	Software as a vault	28
1.8.4	Barriers to entry	29
1.8.5	Summation	31
2.	LEGAL MECHANISMS FOR MITIGATING THE EFFECT OF RESTRICTIVE LICENSING PROVISIONS	32
2.1	Introduction	32
2.2	Contract Law-Based Mechanisms	34
2.2.1	Licence or sale?	34
2.2.1.1	<i>United States</i>	35
2.2.1.2	<i>European Union</i>	38
2.2.2	Contract formation and content	38
2.2.2.1	<i>Contract formation</i>	39
2.2.3	Contract content	46
2.2.3.1	<i>UCITA</i>	47
2.2.3.2	<i>Directive on unfair terms in consumer contracts</i>	47
2.2.3.3	<i>Directive for the protection of computer programs</i>	47
2.3	Pre-Emption-Based Mechanisms	51
2.3.1	Statutory pre-emption	51
2.3.2	Constitution pre-emption	54
2.4	Competition Law-Based Mechanisms	56
2.4.1	EU competition law and prohibitions on reproduction of functional software features	57
2.4.1.1	<i>Article 101</i>	57
2.4.1.2	<i>Article 102</i>	59
2.4.2	US antitrust law	65
2.4.2.1	<i>Section 1 of the Sherman Act—anticompetitive agreements</i>	65
2.4.2.2	<i>Section 2 of the Sherman Act: abuse of dominant position</i>	66
3.	ON REVERSE ENGINEERING AND DECOMPILATION	70
3.1	Reverse Engineering and Decompilation of Software: A Practical Overview	71
3.1.1	On reverse engineering	71
3.1.2	On software and black box reverse engineering	71
3.1.3	On software, reverse engineering, and decompilation	72

3.1.4	The various stages of reverse engineering	73
3.1.5	Motivation and methods for reverse engineering	75
3.1.6	Reasons for and benefits of decompilation	78
3.1.7	Interoperability	79
3.1.7.1	<i>Free and Open Source Software (FOSS)</i>	80
3.2	Decompilation and Copyright Law	83
3.2.1	Idea-expression dichotomy and decompilation	84
3.2.2	The decompilation exception under the EU computer programs copyright regime	85
3.2.3	Decompilation under the US copyright regime	85
3.2.3.1	<i>Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of America, Inc.</i>	86
3.2.3.2	<i>Sega Enterprises v. Accolade</i>	87
3.2.3.3	<i>Sony Computer Entertainment v. Connectix</i>	90
3.3	An Entitlement to Exclude Access to Ideas	93
3.4	Entitlements in the Case of Decompilation of Computer Programs	94
3.4.1	An anomaly?	95
3.5	A Critical Overview of Article 6 as a Means to Enable Decompilation to Achieve Interoperability	96
3.6	A Note on Reverse Engineering in a Cloud Environment	101
4.	THE IDEA-EXPRESSION DICHOTOMY AND ITS ROLE IN SOFTWARE-RELATED DISPUTES	102
4.1	Introduction	102
4.2	The Idea-Expression Dichotomy: Critique and Justifications	104
4.2.1	A brief note regarding critiques of the idea-expression dichotomy principle	104
4.2.2	Economic and efficiency-based justifications of the idea-expression dichotomy	105
4.2.3	The idea-expression dichotomy and natural laws systems	106
4.3	Idea-Expression Dichotomy: Emergence and Development	108
4.3.1	The emergence of the idea-expression dichotomy on both sides of the Atlantic	109
4.3.2	The development of the idea-expression dichotomy in the United Kingdom	112
4.3.3	The application of the idea-expression dichotomy in recent UK software-related disputes	120
4.3.4	The application of the idea-expression dichotomy in EU software-related disputes	121

4.3.5	The development of the idea-expression dichotomy in the United States	124
4.3.6	The application of the idea-expression dichotomy in US software-related disputes	127
5.	THE COMBINED EFFECT OF COPYRIGHT AND RESTRICTIVE LICENSING PROVISIONS	136
5.1	Exercising A Right in a Manner That Runs Contrary to its Objectives and Social Function	138
5.2	The US Copyright-Misuse Doctrine	140
5.3	The 'Function' of Intellectual Property Rights as a Means to Regulate the Manner of their Exercise	149
5.3.1	The essential function of a patent	150
5.3.2	The essential function of a copyright	151
5.3.3	The functions of a trade-mark as a curb on the manner of its exercise: the CJEU setting internal limitation on the circumstances in which a trade mark could be enforced	152
5.3.4	Applying the 'protectable functions' rationale to software-related scenarios	156
5.4	A Brief Note on the Prohibition of Abuse of Law in the European Union	158
6.	PATENTING SOFTWARE	160
6.1	Computer-Implemented Inventions in the United States	161
6.1.1	Background	161
6.1.2	Policy trends and judicial interpretation	162
6.1.2.1	<i>Policy trends</i>	162
6.1.2.2	<i>The development of case-law</i>	163
6.2	Computer-Implemented Inventions at the European Patent Office	178
6.2.1	Background	178
6.2.2	Trends and case-law development	179
6.2.2.1	<i>The contribution approach</i>	179
6.2.2.2	<i>The 'any-hardware' approach</i>	180
6.3	Convergence of the Present Approaches in the United States and European Patent Office	184
7.	PROTECTING USER INTERFACES	188
7.1	Copyright Protection Over 'Look-and-Feel' Elements	190
7.1.1	GUI protection under US copyright law	190
7.1.2	Look-and-feel protection under EU law	193

7.2 Trade-Mark, Trade-Dress, and Unfair-Competition	
Protection for GUIs	195
7.2.1 United States: trade-mark and trade-dress protection to GUIs	196
7.2.1.1 <i>Rules on eligibility and scope of protection</i>	196
7.2.1.2 <i>Applying the rules</i>	202
7.2.2 European Union: trade-mark protection for GUIs	203
7.2.2.1 <i>Distinctiveness</i>	203
7.2.2.2 <i>Functionality</i>	204
7.2.2.3 <i>Infringement</i>	206
7.2.3 A brief note on unfair-competition laws in the European Union	206
7.3 Design Patents and Registered Designs	207
7.3.1 Design patents in the United States	208
7.3.1.1 <i>Eligibility</i>	208
7.3.1.2 <i>Infringement</i>	210
7.3.2 Registered designs in the European Union	211
7.3.2.1 <i>Eligibility</i>	211
7.3.2.2 <i>Infringement</i>	213
7.4 A Brief Note on Patent Protection for GUIs	214
7.4.1 Utility-patent protection in the United States for GUIs	214
7.4.2 Protecting GUIs at the EPO	216
8. TRADE SECRETS AND THE SOFTWARE INDUSTRY	219
8.1 Introduction	219
8.2 Trade Secrets: The Legal Basis of the Right	221
8.3 Trade Secrets Protection in the European Union	224
8.3.1 Protection in Member States prior to the Trade Secrets Directive	224
8.3.2 The Trade Secrets Directive	225
8.3.2.1 <i>Background</i>	225
8.3.2.2 <i>The Trade Secrets Directive's framework</i>	226
8.4 Trade Secrets Protection in the United States	233
8.4.1 Background	233
8.4.2 Legislative framework	234
8.4.2.1 <i>The Uniform Trade Secrets Act</i>	235
8.4.2.2 <i>A brief note on the Defend the Trade Secrets Act 2016</i>	243
INDEX	245

Table of Cases

United Kingdom

Aerotel Ltd v. Telco Holdings Ltd & Ors Rev 1 [2006] EWCA Civ. 1371, 28	183, 217
Beta Computers (Europe) Ltd. v. Adobe Systems (Europe) Ltd (1996) FSR 367	42
Burnett v. Chetwood 2 Mer. 441, 35 Eng. Rep. 1008 (Ch. 1720)	108
Designers Guild Ltd v. Russell Williams (Textiles) Ltd [2001] 1 WLR 2416; [2001] FSR 11; [2001] ECDR 10 (HL)	115-17, 134
Donaldson v. Beckett 1 Eng. Rep. 837 (H.L. 1774)	109
Europemballage Corp, Continental Can Co Inc. v. Commission [1973] CMLR 199	61
Exxon Corp. v. Exxon Insurance Consultants International Ltd [1981] 3 All E.R. 241	120-1
Harman v. Osborne [1967] 2 All ER 324, [1967] 1 WLR 723, at 728	112, 118
Hollinrake v. Truswell [1894] 3 Ch. D 420	109-10, 112-13, 118, 160
Ibcos Computers v. Barclays Mercantile Highland Finance [1994] FSR 275	114-15, 119-20
Kenrick v. Lawrence (1890) 25 QBD 99	112
LB (Plastics) Limited v. Swish Products Limited [1979] RPC 551	112, 114, 118
L'Estrange v. F Groucob Ltd [1934] 2 K.B. 394	45
Ladbroke (Football) Ltd v. William Hill (Football) Ltd [1964] 1 WLR 273	117
McCrum v. Eisner [1917] 87 LJ Ch. 99, 102	112
Millar v. Taylor 98 Eng. Rep. 201 (KB 1769)	109
Navitaire Inc. v. Easyjet Airline Company and Bulletproof Technologies Inc. [2004] EWHC 1725 (Ch)	120-1, 128-9
Nova Productions Limited v. Mazooma Games Limited & Others [2007] EWCA Civ. 219	103, 121
Poznanski v. London Film Production, Ltd. (1937), MacG. Cop. Cas. (1936-45) 107	112
Reckitt & Colman Products Ltd v. Borden, Inc. and Others [1990] 1 All ER 873	206
Rees v. Melville, (1914) MacG. Cop. Cas. (1911-16) 168	112
Samsung Electronics (UK) Ltd v. Apple, Inc. [2012] EWCA Civ. 1339	214
SAS Institute, Inc. v. World Programming Ltd [2010] EWHC 1829 (Ch)	48, 115, 122, 137, 230
Symbian Ltd v. Comptroller General of Patents [2008] EWCA Civ. 1066	183
Temple Island Collections Ltd v. New English Teas [2012] EWPC 1	118
Thompson v. LM & S Ry [1930] 1 KB 4.1	43
Thornton v. Shoe Lane Parking [1971] 2 WLR 585	42
University of London Press v. University Tutorial Press [1916] 2 Ch. 601, 610	117

European Union

European Commission

Microsoft (Case COMP/ C- 3/ 37.792) Commission Decision C(2004) 900	97
---	----

General Court

Bang & Olufsen A/S v. OHIM Case T-508/08	205
--	-----

Court of Justice

Adam Opel AG v. Autec AG [2007] ECR I-1017 Case C-48/05	154
Arsenal Football Club v. Reed [2002] ECR I-10273 Case C-206/01	153, 155
Bezpečnostní softwarová asociace – Svaz softwarové ochrany v. Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic, Case C-393/09	5, 10, 49, 121, 137, 156, 189, 193
Centrafarm v. Sterling Drug [1974] ECR 1147, Case C-15/74	150
Coditel v. Cine Vog Films [1980] E.C.R 881, Case C-62/79	151
Consten and Grundig v. Commission [1966] ECR 299, Cases C-56 and 58/64	60
Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft mbH v. Metro-SB-Grossmärkte GmbH & Co. KG [1971] ECR, Case C-78/70	151
Football Dataco Ltd and others v. Yahoo! UK Limited, Case C-604/10	113
Google France SARL and Google Inc. v. Louis Vuitton Malletier SA, Google France and Google Inc. v. Viaticum SA and another, and Google France and Google Inc. v. CNRRH and others, Joined Cases C-236/08, C-237/08, and C-238/08	156
Hoffmann-La Roche & Co AG and Hoffmann-la Roche AG v. Centrafarm Vertriebsgesellschaft Pharmazeutischer Erzeugnisse mbH 1978 ECR 1139, 3 CMLR 217 [1978] Case C-2/77	153
Hofner and Elser v. Macrotron GmbH [1991] ECR I-1979	58
IMS Health GmbH & Co. OHG v. NDC Health GmbH & Co. KG. (C-418/01) [2004] ECR I-503	62, 64
Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening [2009] ECR I-6569; [2009] ECDR 16 Case C-508	113, 115, 156
Kefalas and Others v. Greek State and OAE [1998] ECR I-2843, Case C-367-96	158
Koninklijke Philips Electronics NV v. Remington Consumer Products Ltd [2002] ECR I-5475, Case C-299/99	212
L'Oréal SA v. Bellure NV [2009] ECR I-5185 Case C-487/07	155
La Roche & Co AG and Hoffmann-la Roche AG v. Centrafarm Vertriebsgesellschaft Pharmazeutischer Erzeugnisse mbH (Case 102/77) 274	64
Lego Juris A/S v. OHIM, Mega Brands Inc., Case 48/09	204
Microsoft v. Commission (T-201/04) [2007] ECR II-1491	62, 152
Oscar Bronner GmbH & Co. KG v. Mediaprint Zeitungs- und Zeitschriftenverlag GmbH & Co. KG, Mediaprint Zeitungsvertriebsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG and Mediaprint Anzeigengesellschaft mbH & Co. KG. [1998], Case C-7/97	62
Painer Case C-145/10	113
Philips v. Remington Case 299/99	204
RTE v. Commission 1991 ECR II-485 [1991] Case T-69/89	151
RTE and ITP v. Commission (Magill) [1995] ECR I-743, Joined Cases C-24 and C-242/91	61-2, 64, 151
Storck v. OHIM [2006], Case C-24/05 P	204
The Gillette Company and Gillette Group Finland Oy v. LA- Laboratories Ltd Oy, Case C-228/03	232
UsedSoft GmbH v. Oracle International Corp., Case C-128/11	24, 38