

Table of contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Nota autorului | VII |
| List of commonly used abbreviations | IX |
| Introducere | 1 |
| Relația dintre dreptul proprietății intelectuale și dreptul european al drepturilor omului | 1 |
| Introduction | 5 |
| The relationship between Intellectual Property Rights Law and Human Rights Law | 5 |
| Intellectual Property Rights as understood by the present research | 7 |
| Material Interests in Intellectual Property Rights as understood by the present research | 10 |
| Direct and indirect protection of the material interests in IPRs under the ECHR | 12 |
| Methodology | 13 |
| Sources, authorities and miscellanea | 19 |
| Structure, summary of arguments and novelty of the present research | 22 |
| Part I | |
| Direct Protection of Material Interests in Intellectual Property Rights under the European Convention on Human Rights | 25 |
| Introduction to Part I | 25 |
| Chapter I.1. | |
| A Human Rights compatible justification for Intellectual Property Rights' protection | 27 |
| <i>Introduction to Chapter I.1.</i> | 27 |

Subchapter I.1.1. A historic analysis of Human Rights compatible justifications for Intellectual Property Rights protection _____ 28
Introduction to Subchapter I.1.1. _____ 28

Section I.1.1.1. Earliest Intellectual Property Rights manifestations until the invention of the printing press _____ 29

Section I.1.1.2. Intellectual Property Rights’ evolution after the printing press _____ 35

Subsection I.1.2.1. The Venetian moment in Intellectual Property Right history _____ 35

Subsection I.1.1.2.2. The British moment in Intellectual Property Right history. The first British statutes on Intellectual Property Rights _____ 38

Subsection I.1.1.2.3. The American experience of early Intellectual Property protection _____ 46

Subsection I.1.1.2.4. French Intellectual Property law before and after the French Revolution _____ 48

Section I.1.1.3. The international period in Intellectual Property protection: The Paris and Berne Conventions _____ 54

Section I.1.1.4. The global and post-global period in Intellectual Property protection. Global and European developments _____ 59

Subsection I.1.1.4.1. Global developments _____ 59

Subsection I.1.1.4.2. European developments _____ 60

Conclusions to Subchapter I.1.1. _____ 63

Subchapter I.1.2. A property-centred paradigm of Intellectual Property Rights as Human Rights. Philosophical and economic foundations of Intellectual Property Protection _____ 66
Introduction to Subchapter I.1.2. _____ 66

Section I.1.2.1. Philosophical foundations of Intellectual Property Rights under a property-based paradigm. The Lockean labour theory _____ 68

Section I.1.2.2. Philosophical foundations of Intellectual Property Rights under a property-based paradigm. The German Idealist perspective _____ 74

Subsection I.1.2.2.1. Kant _____ 75

Subsection I.1.2.2.2. Fichte _____ 77

Subsection I.1.2.2.3. Hegel _____ 79

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Conclusions to Section I.1.2.2.</i> _____ | 82 |
| Section I.1.2.3. Economic foundations of Intellectual Property Rights _____ | 82 |
| Subsection I.1.2.3.1. An inherent tension between the public good and the monopoly aspect of Intellectual Property Rights _____ | 83 |
| Subsection I.1.2.3.2. Economic justifications for stronger Intellectual Property protection _____ | 88 |
| <i>Conclusions to Subchapter I.1.2.</i> _____ | 93 |
| <i>Conclusions to Chapter I.1.</i> _____ | 94 |

Chapter I.2. Direct protection of material interests in Intellectual Property Rights under Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 to the Convention _____ **95**

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Introduction to Chapter I.2.</i> _____ | 95 |
|---|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| Subchapter I.2.1. The specificity of the European Court of Human Rights’ analysis on the applicability of Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 and its consequences _____ | 96 |
|--|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Introduction to Subchapter I.2.1.</i> _____ | 96 |
|--|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| Section I.2.1.1. The specificity of the European Court of Human Rights’ analysis of “existing possessions” under Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 _____ | 97 |
|--|----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Section I.2.1.2. The specificity of the European Court of Human Rights’ analysis of “legitimate expectations” under Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 _____ | 103 |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Section I.2.1.3. The specificity of the European Court of Human Rights’ standard of proof under Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 and its applicability to both natural and legal persons _____ | 108 |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Conclusions to Subchapter I.2.1.</i> _____ | 112 |
|---|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Subchapter I.2.2. Material Interests in Intellectual Property Rights as “existing possessions” under Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 _____ | 113 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Introduction to Subchapter I.2.2.</i> _____ | 113 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Section I.2.2.1. The earliest IPR cases to come before the Strasbourg institutions. Patents as protected by A1P1 _____ | 115 |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Section I.2.2.2. Further Intellectual Property Law-related cases reach the European Commission of Human Rights. | |
| Extensions beyond patents _____ | 124 |
| Section I.2.2.3. Enter the European Court of Human Rights. | |
| First judgments of the European Court of Human Rights as regards IPR-related protection under Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 to the Convention _____ | 133 |
| Subsection I.2.2.3.1. <i>Dima v. Romania</i> _____ | 133 |
| Subsection I.2.2.3.2. <i>Melnychuk v. Ukraine</i> _____ | 140 |
| Subsection I.2.2.3.3. <i>Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal</i> _____ | 144 |
| <i>Division I.2.2.3.3.1. The Facts in Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal</i> _____ | 144 |
| <i>Division I.2.2.3.3.2. The European Court of Human Rights' Chamber Judgment in Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal</i> _____ | 147 |
| <i>Division I.2.2.3.3.3. The European Court of Human Rights' Grand Chamber Judgment in Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal</i> _____ | 154 |
| <i>Division I.2.2.3.3.4. The Joint Concurring Opinion and The Joint Dissenting Opinion in The European Court of Human Rights' Grand Chamber Judgment in Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal</i> _____ | 169 |
| Conclusions to Subsection I.2.2.3.3. _____ | 181 |
| Conclusions to Section I.2.2.3. _____ | 184 |
| Section I.2.2.4. Post-Anheuser-Busch Inc. v. Portugal | |
| European Court of Human Rights Intellectual Property Rights-related Cases _____ | 186 |
| Subsection I.2.2.4.1. <i>Bălan v. Moldova</i> _____ | 186 |
| Subsection I.2.2.4.2. <i>Rapoš v. Slovakia</i> _____ | 192 |
| Conclusions to Section I.2.2.4. _____ | 195 |
| Conclusions to Subchapter I.2.2. _____ | 196 |
| Conclusions to Chapter I.2. _____ | 202 |
| Conclusions to Part I _____ | 205 |

Part II

Indirect protection of Material Interests in Intellectual Property

Rights under the European Convention on Human Rights _____ 209

Introduction to Part II _____ 209

Chapter II.1.

Indirect protection of Material Interests in Intellectual

Property Rights under Article 6 par. 1 of the Convention _____ 212

Introduction to Chapter II.1. _____ 212

Subchapter II.1.1. Access to a court as regards Intellectual Property

Rights and Article 6 par. 1 of the Convention _____ 217

Section II.1.1.1. Access to a court in Intellectual

Property Rights cases. Timeframe _____ 218

Section II.1.1.2. Access to a court in Intellectual

Property Rights cases. Jurisdiction _____ 227

Section II.1.1.3. Access to a court in Intellectual Property Rights

cases. International Intellectual Property Judicial Bodies _____ 229

Subsection II.1.1.3.1. Pre-Bosphorus case law _____ 231

Subsection II.1.1.3.2. Bosphorus and post-Bosphorus

case law _____ 239

Conclusions to Section II.1.1.3. _____ 249

Conclusions to Subchapter II.1.1. _____ 250

Subchapter II.1.2. Excessive duration in Intellectual Property

Rights proceedings _____ 252

Section II.1.2.1. Excessive duration which does not affect

Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 _____ 253

Section II.1.2.2. Excessive duration which can affect

Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 _____ 258

Section II.1.2.3. Excessive duration and its effective remedies _____ 267

Conclusions to Subchapter II.1.2. _____ 279

Subchapter II.1.3. Other issues under Article 6 par. 1 which

can affect Intellectual Property Rights _____ 283

Section II.1.3.1. Res Judicata and Intellectual Property Rights _____ 283

Section II.1.3.2. Domestic Courts’ Independence and Impartiality in Intellectual Property Law cases _____ 286

Section II.1.3.3. The Administration of Evidence and Orality in Intellectual Property Law cases _____ 290

Conclusions to Subchapter II.1.3. _____ 293

Conclusions to Chapter II.1. _____ 294

Chapter II.2.

Indirect protection of Material Interests in Intellectual

Property Rights through the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine _____ 299

Introduction to Chapter II.2. _____ 299

Subchapter II.2.1. The jurisprudential origins of the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine in the European Court of Human Rights’ case law. Justifications for its use _____ 303

Section II.2.1.1. The jurisprudential origins of the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine _____ 303

Subsection II.2.1.1.1. Initial application of the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine by the Strasbourg organs – origins in Article 15 of the Convention _____ 304

Subsection II.2.1.1.2. The Margin of Appreciation Doctrine, after the initial cases until 1979 – extension to further Articles of the Convention, after Article 15 _____ 306

Subsection II.2.1.1.3. The Margin of Appreciation Doctrine, applied in cases pertaining to Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 to the Convention _____ 315

Conclusions to Section II.2.1.1. _____ 317

Section II.2.1.2. Justifications for the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine _____ 318

Subsection II.2.1.2.1. Democratic legitimacy as a justification for the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine _____ 319

Subsection II.2.1.2.2. The existence of a European consensus as a justification for the margin of appreciation _____ 323

Division II.2.1.2.2.1. The European consensus – an often-used justification for the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine _____ 323

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Division II.2.1.2.2.2. Determining a “consensus” – a heterogenous approach of the European Court of Human Rights</i> | 331 |
| <i>Conclusions to Subsection II.2.1.2.2.</i> | 333 |
| Subsection II.2.1.2.3. National expertise and competence as a justification for the margin of appreciation | 334 |
| <i>Conclusions to Section II.2.1.2.</i> | 340 |
| <i>Conclusions to Subchapter II.2.1.</i> | 342 |
| Subchapter II.2.2. The Margin of Appreciation Doctrine in Intellectual Property Law cases. Effective and potential use. | 344 |
| Section II.2.2.1. Effective and potential use of the margin of appreciation by the European Court of Human Rights in intellectual property law cases tied to Article 1 of Additional Protocol No. 1 to the Convention | 346 |
| Section II.2.2.2. Effective and potential use of the margin of appreciation by the European Court of Human Rights in intellectual property law cases tied to Article 6 par. 1 of the Convention | 354 |
| Section II.2.2.3. The Margin of Appreciation Doctrine – a method of balancing Intellectual Property Rights and other fundamental rights | 360 |
| Section II.2.2.4. Other potential uses of the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine in Intellectual Property Related cases | 369 |
| <i>Conclusions to Subchapter II.2.2.</i> | 375 |
| <i>Conclusions to Chapter II.2.</i> | 377 |
| <i>Conclusions to Part II</i> | 380 |
| General conclusions | 383 |
| Concluzii generale | 397 |
| Bibliography | 405 |