



# ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

## Patents 2015

**5th Edition**

A practical cross-border insight into patents law

Published by Global Legal Group, in association with CDR, with contributions from:

Abreu Advogados

Adams & Adams

Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

Armengaud & Guerlain

BARDEHLE PAGENBERG Studio Legale Casucci Ferretti STP

Beuchat, Barros & Pfenniger

Bird & Bird LLP

Bloomfield Advocates & Solicitors

Daniel Advogados

Delacour

Edwards Wildman Palmer LLP

Elzaburu

Fiebinger Polak Leon Attorneys-at-Law

Griffith Hack Lawyers

IP & Law Kancelaria Rzeczników Patentowych

J.Markieta, M.Zielińska-Łazarowicz Sp. Partnerska

Kadasa & Partners

Lee International IP & Law Group

Mehmet Gün & Partners

OLIVARES

Patrinos & Kilimiris

PCK Perry + Currier Inc. | Currier + Kao LLP

Pepeljugoski Law Office

Pham & Associates

REIMANN OSTERRIETH KÖHLER HAFT

Rouse & Co. International

Schellenberg Wittmer Ltd

Subramaniam & Associates

SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan

Tilleke & Gibbins

TIPLO Attorneys-at-Law

Vasil Kisil & Partners

Whitney Moore Solicitors

Wikborg Rein



# GLG

Global Legal Group

**Contributing Editor**  
Katharine Stephens,  
Bird & Bird LLP

**Head of Business Development**  
Dror Levy

**Account Directors**  
Antony Dine,  
Florjan Osmani

**Senior Account Managers**  
Maria Lopez, Oliver Smith,  
Rory Smith

**Sales Support Manager**  
Toni Wyatt

**Sub Editor**  
Amy Hirst

**Senior Editor**  
Suzie Levy

**Group Consulting Editor**  
Alan Falach

**Group Publisher**  
Richard Firth

**Published by**  
Global Legal Group Ltd.  
59 Tanner Street  
London SE1 3PL, UK  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720  
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk  
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

**GLG Cover Design**  
F&F Studio Design

**GLG Cover Image Source**  
iStockphoto

**Printed by**  
Ashford Colour Press Ltd.  
August 2014

Copyright © 2014  
Global Legal Group Ltd.  
All rights reserved  
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-910083-13-0  
ISSN 2044-3129

**Strategic Partners**



## General Chapters:

1	<b>The New EC Technology Transfer Agreements Block Exemption Regulation</b> – Richard Eccles, Bird & Bird LLP	1
2	<b>Gulf Co-operation Council Countries – Patent Landscape</b> – Sara Holder & Mohammad Jomoa, Rouse & Co. International/Kadasa & Partners (in association with Rouse & Co. International)	6

## Country Question and Answer Chapters:

3	<b>Australia</b>	Griffith Hack Lawyers: Wayne Condon & Eliza Jane Mallon	9
4	<b>Austria</b>	Fiebinger Polak Leon Attorneys-at-Law: Constantin Kletzer & Christian Maitz	17
5	<b>Brazil</b>	Daniel Advogados: Rana Gosain	25
6	<b>Canada</b>	PCK Perry + Currier Inc.   Currier + Kao LLP: Stephen Perry & Peter Bormann	32
7	<b>Chile</b>	Beuchat, Barros & Pfenninger: Andrés Melossi	38
8	<b>Denmark</b>	Delacour: Johnny Petersen	43
9	<b>France</b>	Armengaud & Guerlain: Catherine Mateu	49
10	<b>Germany</b>	REIMANN OSTERRIETH KÖHLER HAFT: Klaus Haft & Tobias J. Hessel	55
11	<b>Greece</b>	Patrinos & Kilimiris: Constantinos Kilimiris & Tassos Kilimiris	60
12	<b>India</b>	Subramaniam & Associates: Hari Subramaniam	65
13	<b>Ireland</b>	Whitney Moore Solicitors: Aoife Murphy & Robin Hayes	72
14	<b>Italy</b>	BARDEHLE PAGENBERG Studio Legale Casucci Ferretti STP: Giovanni F. Casucci & Niccolò Ferretti	78
15	<b>Japan</b>	Anderson Mori & Tomotsune: Yasufumi Shiroyama & Makoto Ono	84
16	<b>Korea</b>	Lee International IP & Law Group: Seong-Ki Kim & Yoon Suk Shin	90
17	<b>Kosovo</b>	PEPELJUGOSKI CONSULTING L.L.C.: Dr. Valentin Pepeljugin & Ana Pepeljugin	98
18	<b>Macedonia</b>	Pepeljugin Law Office: Dr. Valentin Pepeljugin	105
19	<b>Mexico</b>	OLIVARES: Alejandro Luna & Cesar Ramos, Jr.	112
20	<b>Nigeria</b>	Bloomfield Advocates & Solicitors: Tolushuwa Oyebokun	119
21	<b>Norway</b>	Wikborg Rein: Ingvild Hanssen-Bauer & Lars Erik Steinkjer	125
22	<b>Philippines</b>	SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan: Enrique T. Manuel & Vida M. Panganiban-Alindogan	131
23	<b>Poland</b>	IP & Law Kancelaria Rzeczników Patentowych J. Markieta, M.Zielińska-Łazarowicz Sp. Partnerska: Jarosław Markieta & Małgorzata Zielińska-Łazarowicz	137
24	<b>Portugal</b>	Abreu Advogados: João Veiga Gomes & João Gonçalves Assunção	144
25	<b>Saudi Arabia</b>	Kadasa & Partners (in association with Rouse & Co. International): Sara Holder & Mohammad Jomoa	151
26	<b>South Africa</b>	Adams & Adams: Russell Bagnall & Pieter Visagie	157
27	<b>Spain</b>	Elzaburu: Colm Ahern	165
28	<b>Switzerland</b>	Schellenberg Wittmer Ltd: Andrea Mondini & Philipp Groz	169
29	<b>Taiwan</b>	TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law: J. K. Lin & H. G. Chen	177
30	<b>Thailand</b>	Tilleke & Gibbins: Nandana Indananda & Nuttaphol Arammuang	184
31	<b>Turkey</b>	Mehmet Gün & Partners: Selin Sinem Erciyas & Filiz Toprak Esin	190
32	<b>Ukraine</b>	Vasil Kisel & Partners: Oleksiy Filatov & Tetiana Kudrytska	197
33	<b>UAE</b>	Rouse & Co. International: Sara Holder	204
34	<b>United Kingdom</b>	Bird & Bird LLP: Neil Jenkins & Audrey Horton	209
35	<b>USA</b>	Edwards Wildman Palmer LLP: Ralph Loren	217
36	<b>Vietnam</b>	Pham & Associates: Pham Vu Khanh Toan	223

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

### Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

# Taiwan



J. K. Lin



H. G. Chen

## TIPLO Attorneys-at-Law

### 1 Patent Enforcement

#### 1.1 How and before what tribunals can a patent be enforced against an infringer?

The Intellectual Property (IP) Court has jurisdiction over all patent infringement actions in Taiwan. Established on 1 July 2008 in New Taipei City, the IP Court is a specialist court intended exclusively for IP-related cases all over Taiwan. Before 1 July 2008, patent infringement cases were brought in district-level courts where the defendant was resident or located, or where infringing activities took place. Infringement proceedings are now commenced in the IP Court by filing a complaint with details of the parties, the cause of action and the relief sought.

#### 1.2 What are the pre-trial procedural stages and how long does it generally take for proceedings to reach trial from commencement?

The pre-trial (preparatory) procedural stages include: (i) preliminary review of the complaint to ensure procedural formalities are met and if not, requirement that they be remedied where possible; (ii) first exchange of briefs (i.e. service of the complaint on the defendant and service of the defendant's answer, which may contain procedural and substantive defences); (iii) designation of a Technical Examination Officer by the court where appropriate – the court typically finds a Technical Examination Officer necessary unless the patent-in-suit relates to an easily understandable technology; (iv) second exchange of briefs (i.e. exchange of written statements setting out disputed issues and admissions); and (v) preparatory hearing to confirm the disputed issues, determine the scope and order for evidence to be presented and fix the trial schedule. In general, the pre-trial procedural stages will take about 4 to 6 months.

#### 1.3 Can a defence of patent invalidity be raised and if so how?

Yes, this is raised typically as part of the defendant's answer or other preparatory briefs, along with copies of documents supporting the grounds of invalidity. Absent exceptional circumstances, invalidity should be raised only during pre-trial (preparatory) stages.

#### 1.4 How is the case on each side set out pre-trial? Is any technical evidence produced and if so how?

Before the trial stage begins, the parties must submit written statements and supporting documents which relate to: (i) facts and arguments based on the disputed issues; (ii) factual evidence to be presented and/or investigated; (iii) if applicable, grounds of invalidity and the prior art references relied upon; (iv) experts' reports; and (v) where the parties intend to call an expert witness at trial, background information of the witness. A copy of each party's written statements will be served on the adversary and the court will generally allow appropriate time (usually 2 to 4 weeks) for the adversary to prepare their response. Where invalidity is in issue, the court may exercise discretion to order the Taiwan Intellectual Property Office (Taiwan Patent Office, TIPO) to intervene in the action to provide their technical opinion, although in practice the court rarely does this. With regard to the issue of infringement, it is also possible for the parties to request that the court designate an experienced organisation or specialist to conduct an assessment of whether the claims are infringed as contended.

#### 1.5 How are arguments and evidence presented at the trial? Can a party change its pleaded arguments before and/or at trial?

Pursuant to Article 255 of the Taiwan Code of Civil Procedure, after the service of the complaint, the Plaintiff may not amend his/her claim or raise additional claims, except in cases where: (i) the defendant agrees; (ii) the amendment or addition of the claim is based on the same transaction or occurrence; (iii) only the demand for judgment for the relief sought is expanded or reduced; (iv) a change of circumstances makes it necessary to replace the original claim with another claim; (v) the claim shall be adjudicated jointly when those who are not parties are joined as parties; (vi) the existence or non-existence of a certain legal relation, based upon which relation the case shall be decided, becomes disputed in the course of the proceeding and an additional claim for a declaratory judgment confirming such legal relation against the defendant is raised; and (vii) it would neither severely obstruct the defendant's defence nor delay litigation. Where the defendant proceeds orally on the merits without objecting to the amendment or addition of claims, he/she shall be deemed to have agreed to such amendment or addition.

It should also be noted that supplementing or rectifying factual or legal statements without changing the claim shall not be deemed an amendment or addition of claims (§256 of the Taiwan Code of Civil Procedure).

### 1.6 How long does the trial generally last and how long is it before a judgment is made available?

The trial typically consists of more than one day and may span up to 4 months. A written judgment is generally handed down by the judge 2 weeks after the trial is closed, a copy of which will be served to the parties about 10 days later.

### 1.7 Are there specialist judges or hearing officers and if so do they have a technical background?

The judges in the IP Court are all specialist judges with expertise in trying IP cases; some of the judges have a technical background. The Technical Examination Officers, who act as technical assistants to the judges, are mostly senior examiners of the TIPO and all of them have technical backgrounds, as well as experience in patent examination and assessment.

### 1.8 What interest must a party have to bring (i) infringement (ii) revocation and (iii) declaratory proceedings?

- (i) The plaintiff must be the owner of the patent, or an exclusive licensee with proper licensing registration at the TIPO.
- (ii) The claimant need not have any interest, except when the purported ground of revocation is (a) the patent application was not properly filed by all joint owners, or (b) the patent was issued to someone not legally entitled to file for the patent, only an “interested party” (e.g. a party who claims to be the legitimate applicant) can bring revocation proceedings.
- (iii) An action for a declaratory judgment confirming a legal relation may only be initiated by a party who has made a showing that he has immediate legal interest in seeking such a declaration. For example, a party who shows he is aggrieved by allegations of patent infringement or threats of infringement proceedings may bring an action for a declaration that the defendant’s claim for infringement does not exist.

### 1.9 Can a party be compelled to provide disclosure of relevant documents or materials to its adversary and if so how?

Yes. A party in a civil action may move the court to order the opposing party to produce documentary evidence in the opposing party’s possession. The motion must specify the relationship between such documentary evidence and the disputed fact to be proved, as well as the legal ground for the opposing party’s duty to produce such documents or materials. Under the Code of Civil Procedure, a party has the duty to disclose: (i) documents that such party has made reference to in the course of the proceedings; (ii) documents which the other party may require the delivery or inspection of pursuant to applicable laws; (iii) documents which were made for the interest of the other party; (iv) commercial accounting books; and (v) documents which were made in respect of matters relating to the action (the party may refuse to produce such documents on the ground of privacy or trade secrets). Where a party to a patent infringement action fails to produce relevant documents in accordance with a court order without justifiable reasons, the court may, at its discretion: (i) take the opposing party’s allegation with regard to such documents to be true; (ii) impose a fine of up to TWD 30,000 (GBP 600); and/or (iii) force production of such documents by an order of enforcement.

### 1.10 Can a party be liable for infringement as a secondary (as opposed to primary) infringer? Can a party infringe by supplying part of but not all of the infringing product or process?

The Taiwan Patent Act does not expressly provide for liabilities of a secondary infringer. Therefore no legal basis is available for claiming secondary infringement under the Patent Act. However, patent owners have attempted to rely on Article 185 of the Civil Code (joint liabilities for “instigators and accomplices” of a tort) to seek relief against secondary infringers, with success to a certain extent. For example, a person who supplies the essential parts of an infringing article (but not all of it) to the primary infringer with knowledge that they are to be used for the infringement, or a person who induces or instructs the primary infringer to engage in the act of infringement may be held jointly liable for infringement.

### 1.11 Can a party be liable for infringement of a process patent by importing the product when the process is carried on outside the jurisdiction?

Under Article 58(2) of the Patent Act, unless otherwise provided for in the Act, the patentee of a patented process shall have the exclusive right to preclude others from using such process and using, selling or importing for the above purposes the articles made through direct use of the said process without his/her prior consent. Accordingly, a party can be liable for infringement of a process patent by importing the product, even though the process is carried on outside the jurisdiction.

### 1.12 Does the scope of protection of a patent claim extend to non-literal equivalents?

Yes. In practice, the Taiwan Court applies the “doctrine of equivalents” (the function/way/result rule) to extend protection to non-literal equivalents, provided that the accused product or process must contain corresponding elements identical or equivalent to each claimed element of the patent under the “all-elements rule”.

### 1.13 Other than lack of novelty and inventive step, what are the grounds for invalidity of a patent?

The principal grounds are:

- (i) lack of industrial applicability;
- (ii) insufficiency of disclosure in the written description (lack of enablement);
- (iii) the scope of claims is not supported by the description and drawings;
- (iv) pre-grant amendments which exceeded the scope of specification, claims or drawings originally filed;
- (v) where the patent application right was jointly owned, the application was not filed by all joint owners;
- (vi) the patent was granted to someone not entitled to file for the patent; and
- (vii) the home country of the patentee does not accept patent applications filed by Taiwan nationals.

### 1.14 Are infringement proceedings stayed pending resolution of validity in another court or the Patent Office?

No. Article 16 of Taiwan’s Intellectual Property Case Adjudication Act requires that the IP Court may not suspend or stay the proceedings pending resolution of validity in the TIPO or the Administrative Court.

### 1.15 What other grounds of defence can be raised in addition to non-infringement or invalidity?

In addition to non-infringement or invalidity, the infringer may raise the following defences: (i) no damages should be awarded due to the patent owner's non-compliance with patent marking requirements; (ii) no damages should be awarded because the defendant lacks the subjective intention or negligence on which an award of damages must be based; (iii) the patent was exhausted; (iv) the plaintiff was an exclusive licensee who did not register the licence with the TIPO; and (v) the plaintiff's claim was time-barred (see question 1.20 below).

### 1.16 Are (i) preliminary and (ii) final injunctions available and if so on what basis in each case?

Both preliminary and final injunctions are available.

- (i) A preliminary injunction (known as an "injunction maintaining the temporary status quo") is granted if the claimant can show that an injunction is necessary to prevent material harm or imminent danger or other similar circumstances exist. The factors generally considered by the court to determine whether a preliminary injunction is warranted include: (a) the likelihood of success on the merits of the case (both invalidity and infringement would be considered); (b) whether the claimant would suffer irreparable harm absent an injunction; (c) the balance of interests between both parties; and (d) the impact on the public interest (particularly in pharmaceutical cases).
- (ii) Final injunctions are typically granted if the claimant is successful at trial in establishing that (a) the patent is infringed and not invalid, and (b) the defendant is currently engaging in infringing activities or is likely to engage in infringing activities in the future.

### 1.17 On what basis are damages or an account of profits estimated?

Under Article 97 of the Patent Act, the plaintiff has three options to choose from as the basis for assessing the quantum of damages:

- (i) the method provided in Article 216 of the Civil Code; the patentee may claim damages based on the amount of the balance derived by subtracting the profit earned through exploiting the patent after infringement from the profit normally expected through exploiting the same patent, if no method of proof can be produced to prove the damage suffered;
- (ii) the profit earned by the infringer as a result of patent infringement; and
- (iii) the equivalent amount of royalty that may be collected from exploiting the invention patent under licensing.

Also, under Paragraph 2, Article 97 of the Patent Act, where the infringement is found to be intentionally committed, the court may, upon request and on the basis of the severity of the infringement, award the damages greater than the loss suffered but not exceeding 3 times of the proven loss.

### 1.18 What other form of relief can be obtained for patent infringement?

Upon the plaintiff's request, the court may order the destruction of infringing goods, raw materials and equipments used for infringing activities or other necessary disposals.

### 1.19 Are declarations available and if so can they address (i) non-infringement and/or (ii) claim coverage over a technical standard or hypothetical activity?

- (i) Declarations are available to address non-infringement, provided that the party seeking the declaratory relief has the interest indicated in question 1.8 (iii) above.
- (ii) In general, declaratory proceedings can only be initiated in respect of a disputed "legal relation" or "existence or non-existence of facts from which a legal relation arises". The court is unlikely to entertain declaratory proceedings to address claim coverage over a technical standard or hypothetical activity as the declaration sought here is not considered to be a "legal relation" or "fact from which a legal relation arises".

### 1.20 After what period is a claim for patent infringement time-barred?

The claim to seek damages for patent infringement is time-barred after a 2-year period from when the patent owner becomes aware of the infringement and the infringer, or a ten-year period from the time the infringement takes place, whichever expires earlier.

### 1.21 Is there a right of appeal from a first instance judgment and if so is it a right to contest all aspects of the judgment?

Yes, the losing party (the party lost the case in whole or in part) may appeal against the judgment unfavourable to it. While it is generally considered a liberal right to contest all aspects of the judgment, the Court of Appeal will not allow a party to present a new contention or defence, unless it can be shown that the new contention or defence is based on facts that occur after the first instance judgment is handed down or could not have been presented in the first instance due to reasons not imputable to that party.

### 1.22 What are the typical costs of proceedings to first instance judgment on (i) infringement and (ii) validity; how much of such costs are recoverable from the losing party?

Costs are incurred mostly from court fees and attorney fees. A court fee is the money that the plaintiff must pay to the court when bringing an action. Court fees are part of 'litigation expenses', which can ultimately be recovered from the losing party. The amount of the court fee is approximately one per cent of the value of claim which is to be assessed at the discretion of the court. The level of attorney fees varies depending on how complicated the case is and whether invalidity is raised. The average attorney fees through to a first instance decision for an infringement action where invalidity is not in issue are in the range from TWD 500,000 to TWD 750,000 (GBP 10,000 ~ GBP 15,000); where invalidity is raised (which is the typical case), the fees range from TWD1 million to TWD1.5 million (GBP 20,000 ~ GBP 30,000). Attorney fees for the first instance are to be borne by each party themselves; they are not recoverable from the losing party.

### 1.23 For countries within the European Union: What steps are being taken in your country towards ratification, implementation and participation in the Unitary Patent Regulation (EU Regulation No. 1257/2012) and the Agreement on a Unified Patent Court? For countries outside of the European Union: Are there any mutual recognition of judgments arrangements relating to patents, whether formal or informal, that apply in your country?

Taiwan has not concluded with any other country any agreement on mutual recognition of judgment in relation to patent right. Even so,

any foreign national/entity may request from a Taiwan court the recognition of a final foreign judgment to seek compulsory execution in Taiwan. However, a Taiwan court will not recognise a foreign judgment in the following circumstances where (1) a foreign court lacks the jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of Taiwan, (2) a default judgment is rendered against the losing defendant, except in the case where the notice or summons of the initiation of action have been legally served in a reasonable time in the foreign country or have been served through judicial assistance provided under Taiwan's laws, (3) the content of the foreign judgment or the proceeding of the relevant patent lawsuit is contrary to the public order or good morals of Taiwan, and (4) no mutual recognition is conducted by and between Taiwan and the relevant foreign country. The mutual recognition refers to judgment recognition, instead of recognition of state. Generally Taiwan court recognises a foreign judgment rendered by a foreign court, unless the said foreign court does not expressly refuse to recognise a Taiwan judgment.

## 2 Patent Amendment

### 2.1 Can a patent be amended *ex parte* after grant and if so how?

Yes, by filing an application for amendment to the TIPO (answers to questions 2.1 through to 2.3 discuss only post-grant amendments). Upon approval, the amendment will be published by the TIPO in the Patent Gazette. The amendment will have retroactive effect backdated to the filing date of the patent.

### 2.2 Can a patent be amended in *inter partes* revocation proceedings?

Yes. *Inter partes* revocation proceedings are filed to the TIPO, in which the patent owner may propose an amendment or the TIPO may, at its discretion, instruct the patent owner to make the appropriate amendment. The TIPO must notify the party seeking revocation of the proposed amendment.

### 2.3 Are there any constraints upon the amendments that may be made?

In terms of post-grant amendments, the amendments can only be made in accordance with one of the following:

- (i) to delete claims;
- (ii) to narrow down the scope of claims;
- (iii) to correct erroneous descriptions or erroneous translation; and
- (iv) to clarify ambiguous descriptions.

Furthermore, the amendments must not "exceed the scope of disclosure made in the Chinese specification, claims or drawings originally filed" or "substantially expand or alter the scope of claims" in any event except for the correction on erroneous translation.

As to the correction of erroneous translation, it cannot exceed the scope of disclosure of the foreign-language specification originally submitted.

## 3 Licensing

### 3.1 Are there any laws which limit the terms upon which parties may agree a patent licence?

Yes, restrictive terms of a patent licence which result in anticompetitive effects are prohibited under the Fair Trade Act and the Fair Trade Commission Guidelines on Technology Licensing Arrangements. The following are some of the examples listed under Article 6 of the said Guidelines as potential violations of the Fair Trade Act to the extent they lessen competition or impede fair competition in the relevant market: (i) restrictive arrangements with respect to marketing methods, scope of use or trading counterparts, in order to achieve the goal of market segmentation; (ii) requirements that the licensee purchase, accept, or use other patents not needed by the licensee; (iii) requirements that the licensee exclusively grant back any improvements to the licensed patent; (iv) price-fixing; (v) restrictions on the licensee's ability to challenge the validity of the licensed patent; and (vi) limitations on output.

### 3.2 Can a patent be the subject of a compulsory licence and if so how are the terms settled and how common is this type of licence?

Yes, an invention patent (but not utility model and design patents) can be the subject of a compulsory licence. Under Article 87 of the Patent Act, the TIPO may grant a compulsory licence to an applicant on one of the following grounds: (i) in order to cope with national emergencies; (ii) to make non-profit use of a patent for enhancement of public welfare; (iii) if the applicant has failed to reach a licensing agreement with the patentee after making commercially reasonable offers to the patentee; or (iv) if a judgment or Fair Trade Commission decision confirmed that the patentee has engaged in anticompetitive conduct with respect to exercise of its patent rights. The grantee of a compulsory licence should pay to the patentee "appropriate compensation", which is to be determined by the TIPO in the event that the parties fail to settle the amount. Compulsory licences are not so common in Taiwan; it is our understanding that only two compulsory licences have been granted by the TIPO to date.

## 4 Patent Term Extension

### 4.1 Can the term of a patent be extended and if so (i) on what grounds and (ii) for how long?

According to Article 50 of the Patent Act §53 (came into force on January 1, 2013), for an invention patent directed to a pharmaceutical or agrichemical(s), or the manufacturing process thereof, of which the exploit needs to obtain a regulatory approval pursuant to other acts or regulations (e.g. marketing authorisation required under the Pharmaceutical Affairs Act), if the regulatory approval is obtained after the publication of the concerned invention patent, the patentee may apply for one and only one extension of the patent term of said invention patent based on the first regulatory approval. Said regulatory approval is only allowed to be used once for seeking patent term extension. Also, the term "pharmaceutical" set forth in the provision does not include any veterinary drug.

It should be noted that the extension of the patent term approved shall not exceed the length of time when the patent cannot be exploited because of absence of the regulatory approval concerned from the central government authorities in charge of the business.

If the time needed to obtain said regulatory approval exceeds five years, the granted patent term extension shall be five years.

## 5 Patent Prosecution and Opposition

### 5.1 Are all types of subject matter patentable and if not what types are excluded?

Article 24 of the amended Patent Act (which came into force on January 1, 2013), stipulates that an invention patent shall not be granted in respect of any of the following: (1) animals, plants, and essential biological processes for the production of animals or plants, except processes for producing microorganisms; (2) diagnostic, therapeutic and surgical methods for the treatment of humans or animals; and (3) inventions contrary to public order or morality.

### 5.2 Is there a duty to the Patent Office to disclose prejudicial prior disclosures or documents? If so, what are the consequences of failure to comply with the duty?

No. Although the Enforcement Rules of the Patent Act provide that applicants “may submit prior art materials related to the claimed invention”, they do not have a duty to disclose prejudicial prior disclosures or documents.

### 5.3 May the grant of a patent by the Patent Office be opposed by a third party and if so when can this be done?

No. A challenge of the grant of a patent by a third party can only be achieved through revocation proceedings brought at the TIPO.

### 5.4 Is there a right of appeal from a decision of the Patent Office and if so to whom?

Yes, decisions of the TIPO can be appealed to the Appeal Board of the Ministry of Economic Affairs on the grounds that the decision is illegal and/or inappropriate; decisions of the Appeal Board can be further appealed to the IP Court on the grounds that the decision is illegal.

### 5.5 How are disputes over entitlement to priority and ownership of the invention resolved?

Issues as to entitlement to priority are generally determined by the TIPO during prosecution of the patent application. The applicant may appeal the TIPO’s decision to the Appeal Board of the Ministry of Economic Affairs. Disputes over ownership (e.g. as between joint inventors, employer and employee or non-related parties) are often brought before the TIPO during revocation proceedings, but the TIPO tends to advise the parties to seek resolution of the dispute through a civil action where the rules of evidence investigation can better facilitate examination and determination of contested facts.

### 5.6 Is there a “grace period” in your country and if so how long is it?

Yes, there is a “grace period” in Taiwan and it is 6 months from the date of the occurrence of events (Paragraph 3 of Article 22 of the Patent Act).

## 5.7 What is the term of a patent?

The term of a patent is as follows: for invention patents, 20 years from filing; for utility model patents, 10 years from filing; and for design patents, 12 years from filing.

## 6 Border Control Measures

### 6.1 Is there any mechanism for seizing or preventing the importation of infringing products and if so how quickly are such measures resolved?

In addition to preliminary injunction, a patent owner may act upon the newly-added provisions of Article 97-1 ~ Article 97-4 (this took effect on March 24, 2014) to file a request in writing with the customs for detention of suspected infringing goods when he/she has a suspicion of infringement, provided that the patent owner shall present the facts of infringement and provide a cash deposit or security equivalent to the duty-paid price of the potentially infringing goods as assessed by the customs. However, the owner of the detained goods may also provide a counter security in an amount equivalent to two times the amount provided by the patent owner to have the granted request repealed. In addition, should the patent owner fail to commence an action within 12 days upon receipt of the customs’ notice and notify the customs of his/her initiation of the action, the customs will repeal the detention. Further, where court determines and establishes the infringement by a final judgment, the owner of the detained goods shall bear the cost arising from demurrage, warehousing, loading, and unloading the detained goods. On the contrary, the patent owner shall be liable for the damages caused by the detention request to the owner of detained goods if the court clears the alleged infringement by a final judgment.

## 7 Antitrust Law and Inequitable Conduct

### 7.1 Can antitrust law be deployed to prevent relief for patent infringement being granted?

While antitrust law may impose penalties (fines and/or even criminal charges) on patent owners who abuse their patent rights with anticompetitive consequences, the general view is that it cannot be deployed to render a patent invalid or unenforceable. There has never been a case where a defendant successfully relied on antitrust law to prevent relief for patent infringement being granted.

### 7.2 What limitations are put on patent licensing due to antitrust law?

See question 3.1 above.

## 8 Current Developments

### 8.1 What have been the significant developments in relation to patents in the last year?

The Taiwan Patent Act underwent its latest amendment on May 31, 2014 (which took effect on June 11, 2013) and also the amendment on January 22, 2014 (which entered into force on March 24, 2014). The main points of the 2 amendments are summarised as follows.

#### June 11, 2013 amendment:

1. In case of dual filing of an invention and a utility model application by the same applicant for the same creation of the

same day, the applicant shall indicate his/her dual filing on the same creation. If the applicant fails to do so, the invention application will not be granted (Article 32).

2. In reference to the other related IP acts and laws in Taiwan and also relevant legislation of other countries, punitive damages were added to the Taiwan Patent Act due to the intellectual property rights being intangible in a way that would cause difficulty in estimating the amount of actual damage (2nd paragraph of Article 94).
3. When exercising a utility model patent, the patentee must not issue a notice as an alert without presenting a utility model patent technical report (Article 116).

#### March 24, 2014 amendment:

To enhance patent right protection, relevant provisions with respect to border protection measures are included into the Patent Act, by which a patent owner may file a request for the Customs' detention of suspected infringing goods at the border (see question 6.1).

### **8.2 Are there any significant developments expected in the next year?**

#### Border control measures for patent right protection

The Taiwan Ministry of Economic Affairs formulated and issued the Regulations Governing Detention of Suspected Patent-Infringing Articles by Customs, which provides relevant procedures and measures in support of the added provisions of the amended Patent Act with respect to border control measures. According to the Regulations, for filing a request for detention of suspected infringing goods, the patent owner (detention requester) shall provide and submit the following information/document(s):

1. certification document(s) of a patent right and technical report for a utility model patent if the infringed patent is related to a utility model;
2. photocopy of the identity certification, certification of incorporation, or any other certification document(s);
3. infringement analysis report and description that enables the customs to identify the potentially infringing goods, and photos, catalogues, pictures, etc. of the potentially infringing goods (either in a printed document or a soft copy); and
4. description that enables the customs to identify the potentially infringing goods, such as, the name of the importer, business administration number thereof, import declaration number, type or specification of the suspected goods, possible importing date, destination, or transportation vehicle.

Based on the added provisions and the above regulations which took effect from March 24, 2014, a patent owner can request for detention of suspected infringing goods with the customs by providing the above-listed document(s) and information without obtaining a preliminary injunction order issued by the court. However, in practice, whether the patent owner will exercise his/her patent right by the above measures and how customs actually carries out the requested detention are still unknown.

### **8.3 Are there any general practice or enforcement trends that have become apparent in Taiwan over the last year or so?**

Under the current Patent Act, effective on 1 January 2013, there are some measures which will significantly influence those who will file a patent application in Taiwan.

#### 1. Corrections to erroneous translations

Corrections to erroneous translations in the Chinese specification during prosecution and post grant cannot exceed the scope of disclosure of the foreign-language specification originally submitted (Article 44, Article 67).

#### 2. Timing of filing divisional application

Applicants may file a divisional application within either of the following time limits:

- (1) within 30 days of receipt of the Notice of Allowance for parent application rendered at the primary examination stage; and
- (2) before the Final Decision for parent application rendered at the re-examination stage (if the parent application is rejected at the primary examination stage and enters the re-examination stage) (Article 34).

#### 3. Timing for submitting voluntary amendments

Applicants may submit voluntary amendments to the specification and/or claims before receiving the first Office Action from TIPO (Article 43).

#### 4. Submission of final notice prior to rejection

When deemed necessary, examiners may issue a final notice prior to rejection, requiring applicants to conduct the following amendment to the claims within a specific time limit:

- (1) to delete claims;
- (2) to narrow down the scope of claims;
- (3) to correct the erroneous descriptions; and
- (4) to clarify the ambiguous descriptions (Article 43).

On the other hand, a programme on "Collective Interviews for Relevant Invention Patent Applications" was set up by TIPO to step up acquisition of patent protection for R&D and innovative creations by the industry, academia and individual inventors and to facilitate the formulation of a well-established patent strategy and portfolio. The programme, which was implemented on 1 October 2012, allows applicants to file for a collective examination for their invention patents, where examiners through group interviews can quickly grasp the technical aspects in each application, thereby speeding up patent examination, with enhanced effectiveness. Through its recent announcement, TIPO relieved certain restraints from filing under this programme while reserving its sole discretion to amend or terminate the programme.

**J. K. Lin**

TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law  
7th Floor, We Sheng Building  
No. 125, Nanking East Road, Sec. 2  
Taipei 104  
Taiwan

Tel: +886 2 2507 2811  
Fax: +886 2 2508 3711  
Email: [tiplo@tiplo.com.tw](mailto:tiplo@tiplo.com.tw)  
URL: [www.tiplo.com.tw](http://www.tiplo.com.tw)

Mr. J. K. Lin became the director of TIPLo in 1997, after TIPLo's founder Mr. M. S. Lin passed away. In his earlier tenure as the director of the firm, J. K. has set out to further streamline the hierarchy of the staff and adopt an effective formula leading to significant quality improvement of TIPLo's patent, trademark and legal services that accommodates clients' intensifying need for IPR enforcement. J. K. also devotes his time to many occasions of public speaking targeted at global corporations and international societies addressing issues of IP concerns, unfair competition and others, and continues the footsteps of his late father in dedicating to *pro bono* NGOs' activities like that of the Judicial Reform Foundation, Taiwan International Law Society and Taiwan Human Right Committee, among many others. He is currently on a Board of Directors of the Asian Patent Attorneys Association/APPA, and a vice president to the APAA, Taiwan Group.

**H. G. Chen**

TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law  
7th Floor, We Sheng Building  
No. 125, Nanking East Road, Sec. 2  
Taipei 104  
Taiwan

Tel: +886 2 2507 2811  
Fax: +886 2 2505 3521  
Email: [chg013@tiplo.com.tw](mailto:chg013@tiplo.com.tw)  
URL: [www.tiplo.com.tw](http://www.tiplo.com.tw)

Mr. H. G. Chen is the Chief of the Legal Department of TIPLo. He has been practising law in Taiwan for more than 30 years. H. G. has extensive experience in the fields of intellectual property, litigation, unfair competition, dispute resolution and general corporate matters. In the late 1980s, he demonstrated primordial litigious flair by successfully representing the client in a leading trade dress case in Taiwan before the enactment of the Taiwan Fair Trade Act. He has represented various global corporate clients from Japan, the United States and Europe in patent and trademark litigation, licensing and negotiation in Taiwan and the illustrious record has won him the reputation as one of the most invincible lawyers in Taiwan. He served as the president of the Taipei Bar Association for the term of 2005.5-2006.11. He was the Director of Intellectual Property Committee of the Taipei Bar Association (1990-1993) and Taiwan Bar Association (1993-1995). He is now an executive member to the Board of Directors of the Asian Patent Attorneys Association (APAA), Taiwan Group.



台灣國際專利法律事務所

TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law (also Taiwan International Patent & Law Office) was founded in 1965 by M. S. Lin and a group of professional legal and technical associates specialising in intellectual property rights. With over four decades of evolution TIPLo is now one of the largest and most reliable intellectual property law firms in Taiwan with diversified expertise to encompass IP, as well as general legal services provided by a full service law firm. TIPLo is currently staffed by over 240 full-time members, many of whom are multilingual professionals fluent in English, Chinese, Japanese, Taiwanese and other languages. TIPLo mainly consists of three departments, namely Patent, Trademark and Legal Departments. Our patent engineers and attorneys have an average career length of more than ten years with expertise and experience covering a wide range of technical fields including electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, applied chemistry, biochemical engineering, biotechnology, pharmaceutical, semiconductor, computer technology and other emerging areas. TIPLo is a leading firm in patent and trademark prosecution, invalidation and opposition proceedings, and infringement assessment and validity appraisal. The proficiency of our Legal Department in IP enforcement, in particular infringement litigation and coordination of police raids, is also highly recognised by law enforcement institutes of all levels and the industries alike, reinforcing TIPLo as one of the most effective law firms representing the interests of its clients.

## Current titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks



59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: [sales@glgroup.co.uk](mailto:sales@glgroup.co.uk)

[www.iclg.co.uk](http://www.iclg.co.uk)