



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

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

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

Thailand

Tilleke & Gibbins

Nandana Indananda



Nuttaphol Arammuang



1 Patent Enforcement

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

The Central Intellectual Property and International Trade (IP&IT) Court in Bangkok, Thailand, is a specialised Court that has exclusive jurisdiction over various civil and criminal proceedings, including patent enforcement. The IP&IT Court was established by the Act for the Establishment of and Procedure for the Intellectual Property and International Trade Court B.E. 2539 (1996), and its procedures are set out in the Civil Procedure Code, the Criminal Procedure Code and the Rules for Intellectual Property and International Trade Cases B.E. 2540 (1997).

There are generally two means available for a patent owner to enforce a patent against an alleged infringer, depending on whether the patent owner wishes to seek civil or criminal remedies. If a patent owner desires to enforce their patent rights through criminal proceedings, the patent owner may launch a criminal case by involving specialised police enforcement teams to conduct searches and seizures of evidence of infringement. However, such specialised police enforcement teams are unlikely to participate unless presented with strong evidence of infringement. On the other hand, if a patent owner prefers to enforce their patent rights by way of civil remedies, the patent owner may choose to first issue warning notices of infringement to the infringer before proceeding to launch a civil infringement case. A civil proceeding is commenced against an alleged infringer by filing a Complaint Form with the IP&IT Court detailing the patent infringement claim.

Regardless of the type of remedies sought, gathering evidence of infringement before commencing action is crucial, particularly due to the lack of a formal discovery process in Thailand. There is, however, a limited form of document disclosure available under the Civil Procedure Code which involves bringing a motion before the Court to seek disclosure of an identified document by another party. The Court will grant such a motion if the Court is of the opinion that the evidence is relevant to the case. If the other party fails to comply with such document disclosure orders, an admission by the other party will be deemed as to the facts of the document.

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

As described in question 1.1, there are generally two ways in which a patent owner can enforce a patent against an alleged infringer.

Criminal Proceedings

After the specialised police enforcement teams agree to participate in the patent infringement case, the relevant police personnel will submit a request to the IP&IT Court for a search and seizure order. Pursuant to the order, if evidence of infringement is found, the alleged infringer will be charged and asked to submit a plea. If the alleged infringer pleads not guilty, the designated investigation officer(s) will take evidence from both parties and submit an opinion to the public prosecutor as to whether or not to prosecute. The criminal case will proceed to the IP&IT Court if the public prosecutor agrees with the investigation officer's findings and a *prima facie* case against the alleged infringer can be established and demonstrated. Thereafter, the Court will set out trial dates.

Civil Proceedings

In a civil proceeding, enforcing a patent against an alleged infringer commences with the filing of a written Complaint Form by the plaintiff(s) with the IP&IT Court, and serving of a copy of the Complaint Form along with a summons issued by the Court on the defendant(s). The Complaint Form must detail which patent and which claim or claims of the patent are being allegedly infringed. In response, the defendant(s) may reply with a defence of non-infringement by filing an Answer to the Complaint with the IP&IT Court and serving the Answer to the Complaint on the plaintiff(s). A Counterclaim for patent invalidity may also be filed along with the Answer to the Complaint. If a Counterclaim is filed, the plaintiff(s) may reply by filing an Answer to the Counterclaim with the IP&IT Court and serving the Answer to the Counterclaim on the defendant(s). In general, the mode of service by a party dictates the deadline for the reply by the other party. If service is in person, then the receiving party will be entitled to 15 days in which to file an Answer. If service is by mail, then the served party will be entitled to 30 days in which to file an Answer. Deadlines for an Answer to the Complaint, Counterclaim and Answer to the Counterclaim are extendible at the discretion of the Court.

Thereafter, the Court will set a date for the meeting of the parties for the purpose of determining the possibility of dispute resolution between the parties. If both parties are committed to litigation in the IP&IT Court, the Court will proceed to set out the issues to be tried in the case. In the settlement of issues meeting, the Court will also set the number of witnesses allowed by each party, the witness testimony dates, and the deadlines for pre-trial procedures, including the conducting of experiments to prove infringement, submission of each party's evidence list and submission of evidence particulars.

Due to the availability of deadline extensions of the pleadings, along with the increasingly heavy case loads of the IP&IT Court

judges, it is difficult to estimate the duration of time for proceedings to reach trial from commencement. On average, the time will range between 6 months and 18 months.

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

Although a patent is presumed valid, patent validity can be challenged by any person. In an infringement lawsuit, the defendant(s) may either:

1. merely raise a defence of patent invalidity in the Answer to the Complaint without initiating a patent invalidity action; or
2. file the Answer to the Complaint together with a Counterclaim to invalidate the patent in dispute.

This means that a defence of patent invalidity can be raised in the same case and at the same Court as the plaintiff files the Complaint against the defendant.

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

At the settlement of issues meeting, if the parties have not reached an agreement on the issues set out in the pleadings, the Court will set out the issues to be decided in the case. This occurs after submissions of the Complaint by the plaintiff(s), the Answer to the Complaint and Counterclaim (if any) by the defendant(s) and the Answer to the Counterclaim by the plaintiff(s), and before the submission of each party's evidence list. Each party may submit technical evidence if detailed in their respective evidence lists, and such technical evidence may include documentary evidence, physical evidence and expert witness reports.

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

As a matter of procedure, arguments and evidence are presented by way of witness testimony. Prior to the trial, a party who brings its witness is permitted to submit an Affidavit in lieu of direct testimony. Witness testimonies in the IP&IT Court will commence with a cross-examination by the opposite party's litigator, followed by a re-examination by the same party's litigator. Proceedings are conducted strictly in the Thai language. Foreign witnesses may use interpreters during their testimonies in the IP&IT Court.

An amendment of the pleaded arguments before the trial is acceptable, by filing a motion before the day of the settlement of issues meeting, or not less than 7 days before the day of taking evidence in cases without a settlement of issues meeting. An amendment of the pleaded arguments during the trial may be possible if the parties can show reasonable cause for the late submission, or where the amendment involves public order or the correction of an insignificant error or mistake. Prior to granting the request for such amendment, a motion for amendment is required to be served to the opposing party at least three days before the day fixed for examination of the motion, and the Court will inquire with the opposing party as to whether they are opposed to such request. The final decision will be made by the Court.

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

Pleadings generally take about 3 to 6 months. A settlement of issues meeting is typically scheduled shortly thereafter. Trial dates

generally commence within 12 months of the settlement of issues meeting. Witness testimonies for both parties may take from 2 months to 6 months. Thereafter, closing statements by each party are generally due for submission to the IP&IT Court within 1 to 2 months of the last trial date. A judgment is typically rendered about 3 to 6 months after the deadline for submission of closing statements. In summary, patent infringement cases generally span 18 to 36 months from the submission of the pleadings to the time of judgment.

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

At present, no specialist judges have specialised technical backgrounds in the IP&IT Court. However, it is important to note that a quorum of the IP&IT Court must consist of two professional judges and one associate judge. The associate judge will usually be selected due to his or her expertise in intellectual property fields in order to assist the professional judges with technical aspects of the case.

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

In accordance with the Patent Act, only a patentee or a transferee of a patent from the patentee can bring an infringement action in the IP&IT Court. In regard to revocation of a patent, a party challenging the validity of the patent must be able to demonstrate that the party is an interested party. There are no declaratory proceedings in Thailand.

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

A limited form of document disclosure is available under the Civil Procedure Code by bringing a motion before the IP&IT Court seeking disclosure of an identified document by the other party. If the Court is of the opinion that the evidence is relevant to the case, the Court will issue a summons order for the other party to file the original evidence with the Court. If the other party fails to comply with such document disclosure orders from the Court, an admission by the other party will be deemed as to the facts of the document.

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 Patent Act is silent on secondary or contributory infringement. Furthermore, Thailand has yet to see a judgment acknowledging secondary or contributory infringement. However, in the case of criminal proceedings of patent infringement wherein patent infringement is a criminal offence, the Penal Code is expected to assist. Specifically, Section 84 of the Penal Code defines an instigator as whomever, whether by employment, compulsion, threat, hire, asking as a favour or instigation, or by any other means, causes another person to commit any offence. In general, a plaintiff patent owner in a criminal proceeding must prove that the alleged infringer possessed the requisite intent to commit the criminal offence of patent 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?

Thailand's Patent Act holds that, in a case involving process patents, the patent owner has the exclusive right to use the process stated in the patent, including to produce, use, sell, possess for sale, offer for sale or import into Thailand products made through the application of the patented process. In light of this, the importation of products made by the process patent is considered to be an infringement of such process patent.

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

In accordance with the Patent Act, the scope of a patent will be determined by its claims. However, a form of doctrine of equivalents does exist in the Patent Act, which allows for a plaintiff patentee to argue patent infringement even if the claims are not literally infringed.

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

In accordance with the Patent Act, an invalidation action may be brought if: (i) a patent is not new; (ii) a patent does not have an inventive step; (iii) a patent is incapable of industrial application; (iv) a patent is directed to non-patentable subject matter (naturally occurring micro-organism and their components; plants or animals or extracts of plants or animals; scientific or mathematical principles or theories; computer programmes; methods of diagnosing, treating or curing animal or human diseases; and anything contrary to public order, morals, health or safety); (v) named inventor issues; or (vi) unqualified applicant issues. It should be noted that Thailand has yet to see a judgment acknowledging lack of unity, lack of enablement or improper prosecution as sufficient grounds for patent invalidity.

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

No, they are not.

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

Thailand has yet to see a judgment in favour of an alleged infringer on any grounds of defence other than non-infringement and invalidity.

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

Preventive injunctions are available in Thailand. In accordance with the Patent Act, if there is clear evidence that a person has committed or is about to commit an act in violation of a patent owner's rights, the patent owner may apply to the IP&IT Court for an injunction against the said person to stop or refrain from committing such infringing acts.

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

Preventive injunctions are available in Thailand. In accordance with the Patent Act, if there is clear evidence that a person has

committed or is about to commit an act in violation of a patent owner's rights, the patent owner may apply to the IP&IT Court for an injunction against the said person to stop or refrain from committing such infringing acts.

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

In addition to damages and injunctive relief, the IP&IT Court may also order the destruction of the infringing goods or vesting of the infringing goods in the patent owner.

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?

Declarations are not available in Thailand.

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

There is no time-barring of a claim for patent infringement in Thailand, so long as the patent is valid, enforceable and has not expired.

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?

A decision of the IP&IT Court can be appealed to the Supreme Court (Dika Court). Appeals need not be confined to issues of law, and it is quite common for the Dika Court to re-examine the entire case. Appeals are conducted in written submission and there are no hearings (with the exception of the judgment hearing). Judgment by the Dika Court can take up to two years.

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 for patent infringement and invalidity proceedings will vary considerably depending on the complexity of the case. Parties to an infringement and validity proceeding should expect to see costs starting at about THB 1 million (USD 31,000). Although costs may be awarded against the losing party, such cost awards are typically small amounts which cannot be seen as enabling the prevailing party to recoup costs.

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?

There is no mutual recognition of judgments arrangements relating to patents that apply in Thailand.

2 Patent Amendment

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

A patent cannot be amended after being granted.

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

No, it cannot.

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

See the previous answer.

3 Licensing

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

Limitations regarding licensing of patent rights can be found in the Patent Act, which states that a patent licensing agreement must be made in writing and registered with the Department of Intellectual Property. Furthermore, a patent owner cannot impose upon the licensee any condition, restriction or any royalty term which is unjustifiably anticompetitive. Furthermore, a patent owner cannot require the licensee to pay royalties for the use of a patented invention after the patent has expired.

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?

In accordance with Thailand's TRIPS obligations, the Patent Act sets out a number of circumstances where a compulsory licence may be obtained. An applicant is entitled to apply to the Director General of the Department of Intellectual Property for a compulsory licence for the patent. The ability to obtain such a licence typically arises when the patented invention is not being used in Thailand, demand is not being met on reasonable terms, or the working of an improvement patent is not possible without such a licence. Furthermore, the applicant must demonstrate that unsuccessful efforts had been made to obtain a voluntary licence from the patent owner and that an agreement could not be reached within a reasonable time.

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?

The term of a patent cannot be extended in Thailand.

5 Patent Prosecution and Opposition

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

The Patent Act clearly sets forth five categories of subject matter that are non-patentable, namely any: (i) naturally occurring micro-organism and their components, or plants or animals or extracts of plants or animals; (ii) scientific or mathematical principles or theories; (iii) computer programmes; (iv) methods of diagnosing, treating or curing animal or human diseases; or (v) anything contrary to public order, morale, health or safety.

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?

There is no affirmative duty to submit or disclose prejudicial prior arts documents to the Examiner at the Patent Office. However, the Examiner is entitled to request any documents from the applicant, and the applicant must comply with such request within the set prescription time. Failure to do so would result in the application being deemed abandoned.

If a patent application claims priority to an earlier-filed application in any foreign country, the applicant will be required to submit an examination report of the earlier-filed foreign application with the Department of Intellectual Property.

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?

The Patent Act sets forth a 90-day window for a third party to file an opposition, which commences upon the publication of a patent application. Thereafter, a third party may only oppose the grant of a patent through a revocation proceeding.

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

A decision of the Department of Intellectual Property can be appealed to the Board of Patents.

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

In general, there are three relevant time periods to consider regarding the issue of entitlement disputes: (i) opposition period; (ii) after the opposition period and before granting of the patent application; and (iii) after granting of the patent.

Opposition period

Thailand provides for a 90-day opposition period which commences upon the publication of a patent application by the Department of Intellectual Property. During the opposition period, a party who believes that they, and not the applicant, are entitled to the invention may apply to the Department of Intellectual Property. If the Director General of the Department of Intellectual Property decides that the invention belongs to the party and not the applicant, then the Director General will reject the application. Thereafter and within 180 days of the final decision of the Director General, the

prevailing party may submit a new patent application for the invention and receive the original filing and publication dates.

After opposition period and before grant

There are no means of dispute resolution available during this period.

After grant

Issues as to entitlement disputes may be made before the IP&IT Court *inter partes* during infringement proceedings, revocation proceedings or as a separate entitlement case.

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

The grace period for filing an invention patent in Thailand is 12 months. The relevant laws concerning grace periods are provided in Section 6 of the Thai Patent Act B.E. 2522 (1979), as amended by the Patent Act (No. 2) B.E. 2535 (1992) and the Patent Act (No. 3) B.E. 2542 (1999).

According to Section 6(2) of the Patent Act, an invention is not new if it was described in a document or printed publication, displayed or otherwise disclosed to the public, in Thailand or in a foreign country, before the date of the application for a patent in Thailand. However, the last paragraph of Section 6 provides exemptions for:

1. disclosure of the subject matter of the invention which has been unlawfully obtained;
2. disclosure of the subject matter of the invention by the inventor; and
3. display of the inventor’s work at an international exhibition or an official exhibition, whether in Thailand or in a foreign country.

Under these exemptions, these acts shall not be considered to be a disclosure if they took place within 12 months before the application for a patent in Thailand.

5.7 What is the term of a patent?

The term of a patent is 20 years from the filing date. If a patent claims priority to a first-filed patent in a foreign country, then the 20 years commences from the filing date of the first-filed foreign patent.

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?

Presently, border control measures only exist for copyright and trademark infringement.

7 Antitrust Law and Inequitable Conduct

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

Thailand has yet to see the application of antitrust law as a successful defence of patent infringement.

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

In accordance with the Patent Act, a patent owner is prohibited from imposing upon the licensee any condition, restriction or royalty that is unjustifiably anticompetitive.

8 Current Developments

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

There have not been any major developments in the past year.

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

None are expected.

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

We have not seen any new patent practice or enforcement trends over the last year.



Nandana Indananda

Tilleke & Gibbins
Supalai Grand Tower, 26th Floor
1011 Rama 3 Road, Chongnonsi, Yannawa
Bangkok 10120
Thailand

Tel: +66 2653 5879
Fax: +66 2653 5678
Email: nandana.i@tilleke.com
URL: www.tilleke.com

Nandana Indananda is a partner in Tilleke & Gibbins' intellectual property group. Before joining the firm, he was a Judge of the Thai judiciary for more than 10 years, sitting on the Central Tax Court, the Supreme Court, and the Central Intellectual Property and International Trade Court. Nandana is a graduate of Ramkhamhaeng University, where he earned both Bachelor's and Master's Degrees in Law. After being called to the Bar, he obtained scholarships from the Asia Foundation and the British Embassy to study at Hong Kong University and Leicester University, respectively. He also received a Master of Law and Information Technology from Stockholm University. Based in the firm's Bangkok office, Nandana's legal expertise includes intellectual property, international commercial transactions, e-commerce, biotechnology, and information technology laws, and he frequently lectures at various Thai universities on these subjects. Nandana has also published a number of articles in peer-reviewed legal journals.



Nuttaphol Arammuang

Tilleke & Gibbins
Supalai Grand Tower, 26th Floor
1011 Rama 3 Road, Chongnonsi, Yannawa
Bangkok 10120
Thailand

Tel: +66 2653 5878
Fax: +66 2653 5678
Email: nuttaphol.a@tilleke.com
URL: www.tilleke.com

Nuttaphol Arammuang is a senior associate in the Tilleke & Gibbins intellectual property department, where he has served as a key IP litigator for more than 10 years. Nuttaphol handles a wide range of IP litigation matters for both Thai and multinational enterprises. He has played the lead role in several landmark cases before Thailand's Intellectual Property and International Trade Court (IP&IT Court), including the Landmark Case of 2008, as awarded by Asia IP. Although his expertise focuses on patent litigation in Thailand, Nuttaphol's experience covers all types of IP litigation, including trademarks, copyrights, computer crimes, trade secrets, domain names, and commercialisation matters. He is an active lecturer at Thai universities and a regular author for several global publications. Nuttaphol is a registered patent agent, and in 2011 he completed the JPO/IPR Training Course for Patent Experts.

Tilleke & Gibbins

Tilleke & Gibbins is a leading regional law firm with over 120 lawyers practising in Bangkok, Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Jakarta, Vientiane, and Yangon. Our firm represents the top investors and the high-growth companies that drive economic expansion in Asia in the key areas of commercial transactions and M&A, dispute resolution and litigation, and intellectual property.

Our IP practice handles all aspects of intellectual property work and enjoys an international reputation in anticounterfeiting, IP litigation, strategic filing advice, and commercial IP work. Our success on our clients' behalf has led to global recognition as a leading intellectual property practice in Thailand and Vietnam by such surveys as *Managing Intellectual Property*, *Chambers Asia Pacific*, *The Legal 500 Asia Pacific*, *Practical Law Co.*, *World Trademark Review*, *Asialaw Profiles*, *Asia IP*, *Asian Legal Business*, and others.

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

www.iclg.co.uk