

**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ON
PARALLEL IMPORTATION**

Prof. M. Hawin, S.H., LL.M., Ph.D.

GADJAH MADA UNIVERSITY PRESS

TABLE OF CASES

- A. Bourjois & Co. v. Katzel*, 275 F. 539 (2d Cir. 1921).
- Adams v. Burke*, 84 U.S. (17 Wall.) 453 (1873).
- Apollinaris Co. Ltd. v. Scherer*, 27 F. 18 (C.C.S.D.N.Y. 1886)
- Aristoc Ltd v. Rysta Ltd* [1962] RPC 65.
- Atari Inc. and Futuretronics Australia Pty Ltd v. Fairstar Electronics Pty Ltd* (1982) 50 ALR 274.
- Attorney General v. Wellcome Foundation Ltd.*, 1992-1 HKC 158; 1992 HKC LEXIS 316.
- Beecham v. International Products* [1968] RPC 129.
- Beecham Group Ltd v. Shewan Tomes (Traders) Ltd* [1968] RPC 268.
- Betts v. Willmot* (1871) LR 6 Ch App 239.
- BMG Music v. Perez*, 952 F. 2d 318 (9th Cir. 1991), cert. Denied, 112 S. Ct. 2997 (1992).
- Bobbs-Merrill v. Strauss*, 210 U.S. 339 (1908).
- Boesch v. Graff*, 133 U.S. 697 (1890).
- Bristol-Myers Squibb v. Paranova*, Cases C-427, 429, & 436/93, 1996 ECJ CELEX LEXIS 5769.
- Castrol Ltd v. Automotive Oil Supplies Ltd* [1983] RPC 315.
- CBS v. Charmdale*, [1980] 2 All ER 807.
- Centrafarm v. Sterling*, Case 15/74, 1974 ECJ CELEX LEXIS 926.
- Centrafarm B.V. v. Winthrop*, Case 16/74, 1974 ECJ CELEX LEXIS 927.
- Champagne Heidsieck v. Buxton Champagne* [1930] 1 Ch. 330.

Class One Video Distributors Sdn Bhd & Anor v. Chanan Singh Sher Singh & Anor, 1997 MLJ LEXIS 298; 1997-5 MLJ 209.

Colgate-Palmolive Ltd & Anor v. Markwell Finance Ltd & Anor [1989] RPC 497.

Columbia Broadcasting System Inc. v. Scorpio Music Distributors Inc, 569 F. Supp. 47 (ED Pa. 1983) aff'd without opinion 738 F. 2d 424 (3d Cir. 1984).

Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. v. United Aircraft Engineering Corp. 266 F. 71 (2d Cir. 1920).

Cyrix Corp. v. Intel Corp., 846 Supp. 522, 539-40 (E.D. Tex.) affirmed, 42 F. 3d 1411 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Delphic Wholesalers Pty Ltd v. Elco Food Co. Pty Ltd (1987) 8 IPR 545.

Deutsche Grammophon v. Metro, Case 78/70, 1971 ECJ CELEX LEXIS 791.

Featherstone v. Ormonde Cycle Company, 53 F. 110 (C.C.N.Y. 1892).

Fender Australia Pty Ltd v. Bevk (1989) 15 IPR 257.

Ferrero U.S.A., Inc. v. Ozak Trading, Inc., 753 F. Supp. 1240, 1244 (D.N.J.), aff'd, 19 U.S.P.Q. 2d (BNA) 1468 (3d Cir. 1991), rev'd on other grounds, 953 F. 2d 44 (3d Cir 1991).

Griffin v. Keystone Mushroom Farm, inc. 453 F. Supp. 1283, 1285 and 1286 (E.D. Pa. 1978).

Hoffman-La Roche, 1978 E.C.R.

Holiday v. Mattheson, 24 F. 185 (S.D.N.Y. 1885).

IHT International Heiztechnik v. Ideal Standard, C-9/93, 1994 ECJ CELEX LEXIS 3608.

Intel Corp. v. ULSI Sys. Tech., Inc., 995 F. 2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Interstate Parcel Express Co. Pty. Ltd. V. Time-Life International (Nederlands) B.V. (1977) 138 C.L.R. 534.

Irving's yeast-Vite Ltd v. Horsenail (1934) 51 R.P.C. 110.

Jazz Photo Corp. v. International Trade Commission, 264 F. 3d 1094 (Fed. Cir. 2001), cert. denied, 122 S. Ct 2644 (2002).

Keeler v. Standard Folding-Bed Co., 157 U.S. 659.

Kendal v. Winsor, 62 U.S. 322 (1858).

K. Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc., 486 U. S. 281 (1988).

L'anza Research International v. Quality King Distrib., Inc. 98 F. 3d. 1109 (9th Cir. 1996).

Lackner Co. v. Quehl Sign Co., 145 F. 2d 932 (6th Cir. 1944).

Jap-Auto Products v. BBS Kraftfahrzeug Technik, Case no. Heisei 7 (wo) 1988, Hanrei Jiho (Sup. Ct., July 1, 1997).

Mallenckrodt, Inc. v. Medipart, Inc., 976 F. 2d 700 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Martin's Herend Imports, Inc. v. Diamond & Gem Trading USA, Co., 112 F. 3d 1296, 1302 (5th Cir. 1997).

National Phonograph Co. of Australia Ltd. V. Menck [1911] A.C. 336.

Omega, S.A. v. Costco Wholesale Corp., 541 F.3d 982 (9th Cir. 2008).

Parfums Givenchy, Inc. v. Drug Emporium, 38 F. 3d 477 (9th Cir. 1994), cert. Denied 115 S. Ct. 1315 (1995).

Pitt Pitts v. George & Co. (1896) 2 Ch. 866 (CA).

Platt & Munk Co. v. Republic Graphic, 315 F. 2d 847 (2d. Cir. 1963).

Public Prosecutor v. Teoh Ai Nee, 1994 - 1 SLR 452, 1993 SLR LEXIS 476.

Prestonettes v. Coty, 264 U.S. 359 (1924).

Quality King Distributors, Inc. v. L'anza Research International, Inc., 523 U.S. 135 (1998).

RA & A Bailey & Co. Ltd v. Boccacio Pty Ltd (1986) 6 IPR 279.

Remus Innovation v. Hong Boon Siong, 1999 - 1 SLR 179, 1998 SLR LEXIS 97.

Remus Innovation Forschungs-Und Abgasanlagen-Produktionsgesellschaft Mbh & Anor v. Hong Boon Siong & Ors, 1995-2 SLR 148; 1994 SLR LEXIS 621.

Revlon Inc & Ors v. Cripps & Lee Ltd & Ors [1980] FSR 85.

Sanofi, S.A. v. Med. Tech Veterinarian, 565 F. Supp. 931 (D. N. J. 1983).

Sebastian International v. Consumer Contacts (PTY) Ltd., 847 F. 2d 1093 (1988).

Silhouette International Schmied Gesellschaft mbH & Co. KG v. Hartlauer Handelsgesellschaft mbH, Case C-355/96, 1998 ECJ CELEX LEXIS 6660.

Sime Darby Singapore Ltd & Anor. V. Beecham Group Ltd (1968) 2 MLJ 161.

Smith, Kline & French Laboratories Ltd v. Salim (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd [1989] FSR 407.

Societe des Manufactures des Glaces v. Tilghman's Patent Sandblast (1884) 25 Ch D 1.

Taiwan Meiji (Ming-chih) Co. v. San-pang Trading Co, (81) Tai Shang Tzu ti No. 2444 (Civil Judgment of the Sup. Ct. Oct. 22, 1992) cited in Sun A.Y., "From Pirate to Jungle King: Transformation of Taiwan's Intellectual Property Protection" (1998) 9 *Fordham I.P., Media & Ent. L.J.* 67 at 100.

Television Broadcasts Ltd & Ors v Golden Line Video & Marketing Pte Ltd [1989] 1 MLJ 201.

Top Heavy Pty. Ltd. v Killin (1996) 34 IPR 282.

Transport Tyres Sales Pty. Ltd v. Montana Tyres Rims & Tubes Pty. Ltd (1999) 43 IPR 481.

United States v. Univis Lens Co, 316 U.S. 241 (1942).

Weil Ceramics and Glass, Inc. v. Dash, 878 F. 2d 659, 666 (3d Cir. 1989).

Wellcome Foundation Ltd v Paranova Pharmazeutika Handels GmbH (C-276/05, December 22, 2008).

Winthrop Products Inc. v. Sun Ocean (M) Sdn Bhd [1988] FSR 430.

Indonesian Cases:

The Jakarta District Court's decision No. 431/1971 G (16 November 1972) on the trade marks "Kampak" and "Raja Kampak" cited in Gautama S., *Hukum Merek Indonesia* (Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 1989) at 89.

The Supreme Court's decision No. 178K/SIP/1973 (7 May 1973) on the trade marks "Kampak" and "Raja Kampak" cited in Gautama S., *Hukum Merek Indonesia* (Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 1989) at 89.

The Supreme Court's decision No. 2482/PDT/1991 (14 August 1995) on the trade marks "Silver Queen" and "Majestic" cited in Maulana I.B.,

Perlindungan Merek Terkenal di Indonesia dari Masa ke Masa (Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 1999) at 130.

The Supreme Court's decision No. 1489 K/PDT/1991 (22 February 1995) on the trade marks "Sony" for electronics and "Sony" for plastic products cited in Maulana I.B., *Perlindungan Merek Terkenal di Indonesia dari Masa ke Masa* (Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 1999) at 81.

The Supreme Court's decision No. 487 PK/PDT/1992 (30 March 1995) on the trade mark "Guess" cited in Maulana I.B., *Perlindungan Merek Terkenal di Indonesia dari Masa ke Masa* (Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 1999) at 164.

The Supreme Court's decision No. 485 PK/PDT/1992 (20 September 1995) on the trade mark "Christian Dior" cited in Maulana I.B., *Perlindungan Merek Terkenal di Indonesia dari Masa ke Masa* (Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 1999) at 164.

The Supreme Court's decision No. 1445 PK/PDT/1995 (16 July 1996) on the trade mark "Caxton" cited in Maulana I.B. *Perlindungan Merek Terkenal di Indonesia dari Masa ke Masa* (Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 1999) at 164.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	v
Table of Cases.....	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1. Research Issues	1
1.2. Structure of the Research	7
1.3. Scope of the Research	11
Chapter 2: The Nature of Parallel Importation.....	13
2.1. Introduction.....	13
2.2. Meaning of Parallel Importation	14
2.3. Various Situations in Which Parallel Importation Occurs	18
2.4. Why Parallel Importation Occurs	22
2.5. The Exhaustion Principle	24
2.5.1. <i>The Meaning of and the Rationale for the Exhaustion Principle</i>	25
2.5.2. <i>The Requirements of the Exhaustion Principle</i>	32
2.5.3. <i>The Exhaustion Principle in Relation to Parallel Importation</i>	35
2.6. Legal and Economic Arguments against and for Parallel Importation	52
2.6.1. <i>Legal Arguments against Parallel Importation</i>	52
2.6.2. <i>Legal Arguments for Parallel Importation</i>	55
2.6.3. <i>Economic Arguments against Parallel Importation</i>	60
2.6.4. <i>Economic Arguments for Parallel Importation</i>	68
2.7. Indonesian Perspective	74

2.8. Conclusion	76
Chapter 3: Analysis of Indonesian Intellectual Property Laws on Parallel Importation	79
3.1. Introduction	79
3.2. Parallel Importation in Indonesia	80
3.3. Trade Mark Law	83
3.3.1. <i>It is Uncertain Whether Parallel Importation is an Infringement of a Trade Mark</i>	83
3.3.2. <i>The Uncertainty becomes Confusing</i>	88
3.4. Copyright Law	90
3.4.1. <i>Parallel Importation is a Copyright Infringement</i>	90
3.4.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	92
3.5. Patent Law	95
3.5.1. <i>Indonesian Patent Law Prohibits Parallel Importation</i>	95
3.5.2. <i>The Underlying Rationale</i>	98
3.5.3. <i>Parallel Importation of Pharmaceutical Products</i>	102
3.5.4. <i>Uncertainties Surrounding Article 135(a)</i>	103
3.6. Conclusion	104
Chapter 4: Parallel Importation of Trade-marked Goods	106
4.1. Introduction	106
4.2. Hong Kong	107
4.2.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	107
4.2.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	117
4.3. Taiwan	119
4.3.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	120
4.3.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	126
4.4. Singapore	130
4.4.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	130
4.4.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	139
4.5. Malaysia	143
4.5.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	143
4.5.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	153

4.6. Conclusion	154
Chapter 5: Parallel Importation of Copyright Material	157
5.1. Introduction	157
5.2. Hong Kong	158
5.2.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	158
5.2.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	164
5.3. Taiwan	170
5.3.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	171
5.3.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	177
5.4. Singapore	180
5.4.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	181
5.4.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	187
5.5. Malaysia	193
5.5.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	193
5.5.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	200
5.6. Conclusion	204
Chapter 6: Parallel Importation of Patented Goods	207
6.1. Introduction	207
6.2. Hong Kong	208
6.2.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	208
6.2.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	212
6.3. Taiwan	213
6.3.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	214
6.3.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	217
6.4. Singapore	219
6.4.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	219
6.4.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	222
6.5. Malaysia	225
6.5.1. <i>Legal Position</i>	226
6.5.2. <i>Underlying Rationale</i>	230
6.6. Conclusion	234

Chapter 7: Reform of Indonesian Intellectual Property Laws on the Issue of Parallel Importation	236
7.1. Introduction	236
7.2. Trade Marks	237
7.2.1. <i>Should Indonesian Trade Mark Law allow or Prohibit Parallel Importation?</i>	237
7.2.2. <i>To what Extent should Indonesia allow the Parallel Importation of Trade-Marked goods?</i>	245
7.2.3. <i>Summary of Recommendations</i>	251
7.3. Copyright	252
7.3.1. <i>Should Indonesian Copyright Law Maintain its Prohibition on Parallel Importation?</i>	252
7.3.2. <i>Indonesian Copyright Law should Adopt the National Exhaustion Principle</i>	259
7.3.3. <i>Parallel Importation should be a Criminal Offence only within a Limited Period</i>	261
7.3.4. <i>Defence for a Parallel Importer</i>	262
7.3.5. <i>Summary of Recommendations</i>	263
7.4. Patents	263
7.4.1. <i>Should Indonesian Patent Law Maintain its Prohibition on Parallel Importation?</i>	264
7.4.2. <i>Indonesia should Change its Position on the Parallel Importation of Pharmaceutical Products.</i>	271
7.4.3. <i>To what Extent should Indonesia allow the Parallel Importation of Pharmaceutical Products?</i>	277
7.4.4. <i>Summary of Recommendations</i>	281
7.5. Conclusion	281
Chapter 8: Conclusions	284
Bibliography	291
Index	309