Licensing 1005

Law Library 2005

CANSIMO LAW

Edited by Brian G. Brunsvold Clark Boardman Company, Ltd.

Copyright © 1983 by Clark Boardman Company, Ltd. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

ISSN: 0731-5783

ISBN: 0-87632-329-8

1983 Licensing Law Handbook

The Clark Boardman

Licensing Law Library

Licensing Law and Business Report Edited by Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner

Manual on Licensing Procedures in Member Countries of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Prepared under the auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Manuel des Procédures de Cession de Licences dans les Pays Membres de la Commission Économique pour L'Europe des Nations Unies Prepared under the auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

The Law and Business of Licensing: Licensing in the 1980s Edited by Robert Goldscheider and Tom Arnold (Volumes 1 and 2)

1982 Technology Management Handbook by Robert Goldscheider

Licensing in Foreign and Domestic Operations by Lawrence J. Eckstrom (Volumes 1, 2 and 3)

Eckstrom's Licensing in Foreign and Domestic Operations: The Forms and Substance of Licensing (Volumes ★ and ★ ★) by Robert Goldscheider

Forms and Agreements on Intellectual Property and International Licensing

by L. W. Melville (Volumes 1 and 2)

Arbitration and the Licensing Process
Edited by Robert Goldscheider and Michel de Haas

1983 Licensing Law Handbook Edited by Brian G. Brunsvold

About the Contributors

Brian G. Brunsvold, a partner in Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, is also a Professorial Lecturer in Law at the National Law Center, George Washington University, where he teaches a graduate course in patent and know-how licensing. He is co-author and co-editor of The Law and Business of Patent and Know-How Licensing (1975, 1978 and 1980), and is author of a column on licensing law developments in the Journal of the Licensing Executives Society. Mr. Brunsvold has extensive experience in negotiating, drafting, and litigating license agreements, and has lectured on licensing for the American Management Association, the World Trade Institute, the Patent Resources Group, the Practising Law Institute, and Vanderbilt University Law School.

John A.B. Leask is a Director of Chloride International Limited and the in-house counsel to the Chloride Group. Chloride is primarily a manufacturer of automotive and industrial batteries, with factories in thirty countries, licensees in others, and trading in both product and production machinery worldwide, including the COMECON countries. Before Chloride, Mr. Leask worked for ITEK Corporation as Director of International Operations, and he was previously Sales Manager of the After Market activities of Girling Ltd., probably the world's leading automotive brake manufacturer, after having served as Legal Adviser to the same company. Mr. Leask has attended both the Harvard and London Business Schools.

Kenneth E. Payne is a partner in Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner. From 1971 to 1973 he was the Assistant General Counsel for the U.S. Department of Commerce. Mr. Payne was named a U.S. Department of State delegate in 1974 to the Inter-American Commission on Science and Technology Transfer and is presently active in matters of technology transfer to developing countries at the United Nations, particularly the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). Mr. Payne has written and lectured for the Practising Law Institute, the Licensing Executives Society, and others. Mr. Payne has served as Secretary and Vice President, International, of the Licensing Executives Society USA/Canada. He was recently elected President-elect of that organization.

Vance A. Smith is Associate General Counsel-Technology and Assistant Secretary of the Rexnord Corporation. He coordinates Rexnord's total

worldwide licensing activities. Before joining Rexnord in 1976 as Patent Manager, Mr. Smith was an attorney with General Electric and Monsanto. Mr. Smith is a member of the Licensing Executives Society, has chaired the Education Committee, and currently is one of its trustees. Mr. Smith is an expert in international technology transfer matters and has lectured at a number of seminars. He holds degrees in mathematics, from Miami University, and physics and law, from the University of Louisville.

David S. Urey is General Attorney-Patents for U.S. Steel Corp. and devotes nearly all of his time to licensing matters for the corporation. He formerly was Group Patent Counsel for Litton Industries and also practiced law with a Washington, D.C., firm. He is a Trustee of the Licensing Executives Society and also serves as Chairman of the Technology Transfer Committee. He was Assistant Editor and contributing author for LES' *United States/Eastern Europe—Technology and Patents* published in 1977. He is currently a member of the Advisory Panel of the Office of Technology Assessment, which is preparing a report on "Patents and the Commercialization of New Technology." He received his law degree from George Washington University and his undergraduate degree from Northwestern University.

Preface

1983 Licensing Law Handbook is the fifth volume in a projected annual series. In 1979, it was felt that a periodic collection of recent articles dealing with current developments and problems in the law and business of licensing would be of benefit to licensing professionals. The result was the publication of 1979 Licensing Law Handbook.

Like the predecessor volumes, 1983 Licensing Law Handbook succinctly alerts readers to new directions, their implications, and provides suggestions as to how practitioners and licensing professionals can cope with the wide stream of new developments in the law and business of licensing. 1983 Licensing Law Handbook has been designed so that it may be conveniently carried in a briefcase, or circulated among professionals in an office. Litigators will find it a handy means of verifying points in the courtroom.

All articles which appear in this collection are previously unpublished and authored for inclusion in 1983 Licensing Law Handbook. The following topics are highlighted: Product licensing; recent developments at the patent licensing/antitrust interface; developing markets abroad through technology transfer abroad during an economic slowdown; antitrust issues relating to research joint ventures, cross-licenses, and patent interchange agreements; licensing and reexamination; process licensing; licensing in the EEC; licensing computer programs.

It is anticipated that a new handbook will be published annually to provide, in time, a library of current developments in the licensing law field. This volume should be retained as a reference source.

The Publisher

Chapter 1

Recen Interfa		Brian G. Brunsvold and John F. Hornick	
§1.01	Intel	lectual Bases for the Recent Developments	1
-	[1]	Introduction	1
	[2]	Per se antitrust violations: nine no-no's of	
		patent licensing	3
		[a] Per se violations defined	3
		[b] Development of the nine no-no's	4
	[3]	The Antitrust Division, patents, and the nine	
		no-no's	5
	[4]	The federal courts, patents, and the nine	
		no-no's	12
	[5]	Public policy at the patent/antitrust interface	13
	[6]	Patent misuse and the antitrust laws	15
	[7]	Misuse and the competitive process	17
§1.02	Per	Se Violations According to Present Case Law	21
	[1]	Tie-ins	21
		[a] Definition and requirements	21
		[b] The origins of tie-in illegality	23
		[c] Antitrust Division view of the early	
		cases	26
		[d] Antitrust Division rejection of the per	
		se standard for tie-ins	30
		[e] The courts and tie-ins	31
		[f] The Dawson Chemical decision	31
	[2]	Products of process patents	34
	[3]	Tie-outs	36
	[4]	Resale restrictions	37
	[5]	Royalty base considerations	38
	[6]	Mandatory package licensing	39
§1.03	Pres	ent Antitrust Division Attitude Toward	

	Provisions It Previously Urged to Be Per Se	
	Violations	40
	[1] Price fixing	40
	[2] Licensee veto power	42
	[3] Exclusive grant-backs	43
§1.04	What Remains After the No-No's?	44
Chapte	er 2	
	oping Markets Abroad Through Technology Transfer g an Economic Slowdown John A.B. Leask	47
Chapte	er 3	
Produ	ct Licensing Vance A. Smith	
PART	I Timing of the Licensing Effort: an Outline	
§3.01	First Step Is To Become Familiar with the	
	Business Portfolio and Long-Term Strategies	71
§3.02	Timing in Mature Technology Licensing	72
	Timing in Developing Technologies	73
PART		
	Terms	
§3.04	Introduction	76
§3.05	Example of a Strategy	76
§3.06	Some Other Strategic Factors	86
	[1] Resources and time limitations	86
	[2] Dominant buyer	87
	[3] New and closed market strategies	87
§3.07	Some Major Factors and Terms Influencing	
	Negotiations and Price	88
	[1] Cost of R&D	88
	[2] Anticipated profits of licensee	88
	[a] Lump sum payments	90
	[b] Front end payments / disclosure fees	
	vis-à-vis running royalties	90
	[3] Exclusivity and territory	91
	[4] Minimums	91

	[5]	Sales level	91
	[6]	Associated / affiliated companies	92
	[7]	Other terms that may bear on value	92
		[a] Most favored nation clauses	92
		[b] "Component system"	93
		[c] Field of use	93
		[d] Audits / records	93
PART	III '	Sudsidiary Licensing of Products	
§3.08	Intro	oduction	93
§3.09	Tax	Aspects	94
	[1]	Ordinary income treatment	96
	[2]	U.S. foreign tax credits and tax treaties	96
		[a] Tax credits	96
		[b] Tax treaties	98
		[c] Government restrictions	98
		[d] Licensing between subsidiaries	99
		[e] Shared costs	101
	Licen	ssues Relating to Research Joint Ventures, ses, and Patent Interchange Agreements Brian	
			10.
§4.01		oduction	105
§4.02		earch Joint Ventures	106
	[1]	Statutory criteria for legality of research joint	106
		ventures	106
		[a] Analysis under Section 7 of the Clayton	106
		Act	100
		manufacturing or service venture	108
		[c] Analysis under Section 1 of the	108
		Sherman Act	110
		[d] Application of Section 1	112
	[2]	The Antitrust Guide concerning research	112
	[~]	joint ventures	115
84 03	Cros	s-Licenses and Patent Interchange Agreements	

[1] Use of defined terms aids analysis	117
legality	118
[3] Industrywide patent interchange agreements	122
§4.04 Summary	123
Chapter 5	
Licensing and Reexamination Arthur S. Garrett and E. Robert Yoches	
§5.01 Introduction	125
	126
[1] Requirements of the request	126
	127
[3] Determination of the request	127
[4] Preliminary statements	128
[5] Examination	129
[6] Effect of reexamination	131
§5.03 Effect of Reexamination on Licensor and Licensees	132
§5.04 Reexamination Before Licensing	134
	136
§5.06 Role of Reexamination During the Term of the	
	138
§5.07 Conclusion	139
Chapter 6	
Five Important Clauses: A Practical Guide Kenneth E.	
Payne and Brian G. Brunsvold	
§6.01 Introduction	141
§6.02 Most Favored Licensee Clause	141
[1] Impact of an infringement	143
	145
[3] Notice to the licensee	148
[4] Sample clause	149
§6.03 Indemnity Clause	151
xii	

xiii

	[1] Restrictions on liability	152
	[2] Sample clause	153
§6.04	Third Party Infringement	154
	[1] Nonexclusive license	155
	[2] Exclusive license	156
	[3] Sample clause	159
§6.05	The Best Efforts Clause	159
•	[1] Sample clause	165
§6.06	The Arbitration Clause	167
	[1] Sample clause	173
§6.07	Conclusion	173
•		
Chapte	or 7	
Спари	<i>i i</i>	
Proces	ss Licensing David S. Urey	
§7.01	Why License?	175
0	[1] Licensor's viewpoint	175
	[2] Licensee's viewpoint	176
§7.02	When to License	176
	[1] Capability of licensor	176
	[2] Life expectancy of technology	177
	[3] Development curve	178
	[4] Licensee expectations	178
	[5] Liability and reputation	179
	[6] New technology vs. new product	180
	[7] Industry patterns	181
	[8] Foreign choice	181
	[9] Other factors	181
	[10] Conclusion	182
§7.03	The Licensing Team	182
§7.04	Relationship with the Engineering Contractor	183
-	[1] Role of the engineering contractor	184
	[2] Advantages of the licensing relationship	185
	[3] Disadvantages of the licensing relationship	186
§7.05	Royalty Considerations	188
	[1] Introduction	188

	[2]	Previous royalty rate charged by licensor for	101
		similar technology	191 192
	[3]	Industry rates	192
	[4]	Royalty as a function of profitability or	192
	r = 1	savings to licensee	192
	[5]	Other factors	195
	[6]	Royalty based on plant design capacity	197
	[7]	Lump sum vs. itemized payments	197
		[a] Licensor's viewpoint	199
	[0]	[b] Licensee's viewpoint	200
	[8]	Paid-up vs. running royalties	204
07.06	[9]	Conclusionse Considerations	205
§7.06		Improvements—grant-forward/grant-back	205
	[1]		207
		[a] Scope [b] Depth and manner	209
			210
			210
	[2]	[d] Duration Techniques to maximize profits where term	210
	[2]	of agreement is limited by law or regulation	211
		of agreement is ininited by law of regulation	211
Chapt	er 8		
		n the EEC—The Practical Effects of the Legal	
Const	raints	and Their Effect on the Transfer of Technology	
John .	A.B. 1	Leask	215
Chapt	or O		
Chapi	CI)		
Licen	sino (Computer Programs: A Different Script for Each	
Audie		Brian G. Brunsvold and Robert J. Gaybrick	
§9.01		oduction	225
§9.02		Respective Interests of the Licensor and	22
		ensee of Computer Programs	226
§9.03		ensor Concerns in a Nutshell	227
	[1]	Subject matter	227
	[2]	Performance	22

	[3]	Liability	228
§9.04	Lice	nsee Concerns in a Nutshell	228
	[1]	System specifications	228
	[2]	Performance	229
	[3]	Continuity of use	229
	[4]	Confidentiality	229
§9.05	Sam	ple License Provisions	229
	[1]	Identification of licensed subject matter	230
	[2]	User definition	232
	[3]	Market subdivision	233
	[4]	Scope of authorized use	234
	[5]	Special provisions regarding DP service	
		suppliers and DP professionals	236
	[6]	Title, trade secrets, proprietary rights, and	
		copyright	238
	[7]	Delivery, acceptance, and warranty	240
	[8]	Liability for modifications of licensed	
		materials	245
	[9]	License term and termination	246
	[10]	Sublicenses	248
§9.06	Selec	ctive Licensing of Computer Software Only to	
		chasers of Hardware or Other Software—An	
	Anti	trust Problem?	249
	[1]	Cross-motions for summary judgment denied	251
	[2]	The legal issue at trial	252
	[3]	The jury verdict	253
	[4]	The court's decision	254
	[5]	Copyrighted software and trade secrets as	
		barriers to entry	255
§9.07	Con	clusion	259
Indox			261

Chapter 1

Recent Developments at the Patent Licensing/Antitrust Interface

BRIAN G. BRUNSVOLD AND JOHN F. HORNICK

§ 1.01 Intellectual Bases for the Recent Developments

[1] Introduction

For many years U.S. patent licensing practitioners have been forced to work within the confines of a patent system that has been viewed with some hostility by both the federal courts and the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. The courts consistently issued rulings that narrowed the exploitation options available to a patent owner, and the Antitrust Division promulgated a list of nine patent licensing restrictions which it considered to be per se violations of the U.S. antitrust laws.

Recently, however, a shift has occurred in judicial and administrative attitudes toward both the patent system and the relationship between that system and the antitrust laws. Several pro-patent decisions by the courts and a general renouncement by the Antitrust Division of its list of the nine per se illegal restrictions (commonly known as the nine no-no's of patent licensing) evidence this general pro-patent shift by the arbiters of antitrust legality.

In extremely oversimplified terms, the changes wrought by the courts in U.S. antitrust enforcement case law amount to a general relaxation of antitrust hostility toward nonprice vertical patent licensing restrictions. This change in judicial attitude toward patents and the exclusive legal rights embodied therein, and toward patent licensing (which is discussed in greater detail, *infra*), re-

§ 1.01[1] / Licensing

sults from a more sophisticated analysis of economics, competition, the benefits of technology to society, and the consequent need to look closely at complex modern business situations involving patents. The courts' current approach is to rely upon analysis of economic and competitive effects rather than upon rigid rules which may actually work contrary to the policy considerations that the patent and antitrust laws are designed to promote.

A general relaxation of the Antitrust Division's hostility toward vertical patent licensing restrictions also has occurred, although horizontal patent licensing restrictions generally remain exposed to rigid rules of per se illegality. Developments in the field of economics began to affect the application of the antitrust laws in the late 1970s. Thus, the economic theories now being promoted by the Antitrust Division have been known in intellectual circles for years. However, the campaign for the U.S. Presidential election of 1980 brought many of these ideas to the forefront. The development of the current attitude of the Antitrust Division toward the patent/antitrust interface is discussed at length in § 1.01[3], infra.

Although recent changes in antitrust enforcement law and policy by the courts and the Antitrust Division, respectively, are favorable to the patent licensing practitioner, these changes create legal uncertainty. The positions of the Antitrust Division seem unstable at first glance because of the politically dependent nature of the Division's leadership. Consequently, this article will focus not only on the current state of the antitrust laws as they relate to patent licensing, but will also attempt to assess the stability of the current antitrust enforcement attitudes of the federal courts and the Antitrust Division. This article presents and examines thoroughly the development and intellectual basis of current judicial and Antitrust Division attitudes toward patents and patent licensing, and the interrelationships between patent licensing, the U.S. Antitrust Laws, and the doctrine of patent misuse.

[2] Per se antitrust violations: nine no-no's of patent licensing

[a] Per se violations defined

The classic statement of the principle and rationale of per se illegality is found in *Northern Pacific Railway Co. v. United States*, 356 U.S. 1 (1958). There the U.S. Supreme Court firmly established a category of Sherman § 1 antitrust violations which, because of their "pernicious effect on competition and lack of any redeeming virtue, are conclusively presumed to be unreasonable," and therefore are deemed to be "illegal without elaborate inquiry as to the precise harm they have caused or the business excuse for their use." *Id.* at 5.

The Court justified creation of the category of per se unreasonable practices on the grounds that per se treatment:

not only makes the type of restraints which are proscribed by the Sherman Act more certain to the benefit of everyone concerned, but it also avoids the necessity for an incredibly complicated and prolonged economic investigation into the entire history of the industry involved, as well as related industries, in an effort to determine at large whether a particular restraint has been unreasonable—an inquiry so often wholly fruitless when undertaken.

Id.

At the root of the decision was an effort to further "the policy unequivocally laid down by the Act," that is, the policy of promoting and preserving free and unfettered competition. *Id.* at 4. Thus, since the Court was of the opinion that some practices—such as the nonpatent tying arrangement with which it was concerned—"inevitably" curb competition and automatically "deny competitors free access to the market for the tied product," it condemned tying arrangements as per se antitrust violations. *Id.* at 6.

Other practices had been declared to be unreasonable per se prior to the decision in *Northern Pacific*, but it was in *Northern Pacific* that the U.S. Supreme Court first clearly delineated the category of per se unreasonable practices. Thus, *Northern Pacific* is the leading case propounding the per se principle.