

Index

- abstraction levels in IP, 100–101
 in copyright, 101–106
 patent law, 106–109
 trademark/trade names law, 109–111
- achievement, in intellectual property, 51–55
- acciones in personam*, 43–46, 123–125
- acciones in rem*, 43–46, 55–60, 123–125
- African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR), 182–184
- Alexander, Gregory, 18–19
- alienability, of intellectual property rights, 127–131
- American Convention on Human Rights (ACHR) Article 21, 155–157, 165–167, 177
- analog distribution, copyright protection and, 115–121
- Anheuser-Busch, Inc. v. Portugal* (Grand Chamber), application no. 73049, 146–153, 159, 171–177, 192–197
- Aristotle, 39–41
- Ashby Donald v. France*, application no. 36769/08, 189–192
- assets, intellectual property rights as, 68–71, 126–199
 alienability vs. inalienability of, 127–131
- American Convention on Human Rights Article 21, 155–157
- CJEU case law on fundamental rights vs., 184–189
- fundamental rights vs., 182–197
- international investment law and, 157–161
- justification of rights and, 192–199,
- right to exclude or right (privilege) to use and, 161–167
- structuring of property rights and, 197–199
- takings and expropriation rules and, 180–182
- transfers and securitization of, 131–138
- assignment of IP, transfers and securitization and, 131–138
- avoiders, IP boundaries and, 99
- balancing paradigm
 European Court of Human Rights case law and, 189–192
- fundamental rights vs. IPR and, 184–189
- justification of rights and, 192–197
- takings/expropriations violations and, 174, 175–177
- Balan v. Moldova* Application no. 19247/03, 146–153, 174–175
- behavioral economics, 20
- Bentham, Jeremy, 15–21
- Berne Convention for the protection of artistic works, 87–92
 copyright law and, 115–121
- takings/expropriations violations and, 175–177
- use/exploitation concept and, 112–114
- Bettina Z* case, 105–106
- bilateral international treaties (BITs), 157–161
- Birks, Peter, 56 n. 51
- boundaries of IP, 95–100, 131–138
- British Statute of Queen Anne, 114 n. 64
- builders, IP boundaries and, 99
- bundle of sticks approach
 common law and, 5–6
- copyright law and, 121–123
- property theory, 43–46
- Burk, Dan, 107–108
- business-related intellectual property, 51–55
 justification of rights and, 95

- Calabresi, Guido, 24–26, 127–131
Campbell v. James 104 U.S. 358 (1882), 142–146
Canon Kabushiki Kaisha and Metro Goldwyn-Mayer Inc., 109–111
 carry-over effect, IPR as assets, 126–127
 Cervantes, Miguel de, 114 n. 64
 charity proviso, labor theory and, 31–33
 civil law, unitary property concepts, 5–6
 Coase Theorem, 23–24
 Commerce Directive (EU), 184–189
 competing interests principle, fundamental rights vs. IPRs as assets and, 192–197
 concrete object, vs. legal object, 55–60
conditio sine qua non perspective, copyright law, 119
 conduct-related IP, 66–67
 constitutional property, 4–5
 control of use concept, 171–177
 takings/expropriation violations as, 175–177
 copied material
 copyright law and, 115–121
 transferability of, 138–141
 copyright protection
 abstraction levels in, 101–106
 alienability in, 127–131
 economic and moral rights in, 84–85, 192–197
 exploitation and, 114–121
 property rights and, 184–189
 takings clause and, 142–146
 use/exploitation concept in, 111–123
Coty Germany GmbH v. Stadtsparkasse Magdeburg, ECLI:EU:C:2015:485, 188–189
 Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), 4–5
 Deckmyn case, 105–106
 digital distribution rights cases, 115–121
 European Union Charter of Human Rights Article 17, 153–155
 ‘function test’ of, 121–123
 fundamental rights vs. IPRs, case law involving, 184–189, 192–197
 ‘Metall auf Metall’ case, 51–55
 takings/expropriations violations and, 175–177
 creational intellectual property, 51–55, 95
 creative labor, IP rights and, 80–84
 Data Protection Directive (EU), 184–189
Deckmyn case, 105–106
 Demsetz, Harold, 15–21
 deprivation, takings/expropriation violations as, 175–177
 digital content, copyright and, 115–121, 184–189
Dima v Romania Application no. 58472/00, 146–153
 Directive on Enforcement of IP Rights (IPRED), 184–189
 dissemination rights, copyright law and, 121–123
 distribution rights
 mandatory EU-wide exhaustion of distribution and, 184–189
 peer-to-peer file sharing and, 115–121
 domain names
 Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1–1) (ECHR) and concept of, 151–153
 takings/expropriations violations and, 171–177
 domestic law
 assets characterization of IPR and, 197–199
 international investment agreements and, 157–161
 takings/expropriation rules under, 161–167, 171–177
Dr. Zhivago case, 101–106
eBay v MercExchange, 78–80, 86–87
 economic rights, 84–85
 copyright and, 192–197
 economic structures, utilitarian justification of property, 76–80
 economies of scale, utility paradigm and, 15–21
 ‘80/80 Regulation,’ 178–180
 ‘either or solution,’ distribution rights, 115–121
 entitlements, property rights and, 24–26
 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 101–106, 168–171
 Epstein, Richard A., 33–35, 95–100
 EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, 165–167, 175–177
 EU Copyright Directive (‘Infosoc Directive’), 87–92
 file sharing and, 115–121
 fundamental rights vs., 184–189
 mandatory EU-wide exhaustion of distribution and, 184–189
 parodies and, 105–106
eudaimonia, 39–41
 EU Database Directive, 192–197
 EU law, distribution rights in, 115–121
 European Commission of Human Rights (ECommHR), 146–153

- European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)
 intellectual property and, 4–5
 mandatory EU-wide exhaustion of distribution and, 184–189
 taking and expropriation under, 146–153, 165–167
- European Copyright Directive (“Infosoc Directive”), Recital 10, 80–84
- European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
 fair balance perspective and case law of, 189–192
 fundamental rights vs. IPRs as assets and, 182–184, 192–197
 intellectual property and, 4–5
 Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1–1) (ECHR) and, 146–153
 takings/expropriations rules and, 165–167, 171–177
- European Intellectual Property Office Guidelines (EUIPO), 109–111
- European Patent Convention, Article 69, 107–108 n. 45
- European Union Charter of Human Rights, Article 17, 153–155
- EU Trade Secrets Directive, 51–55
- ex ante* perspective, justification of rights and, 192–197
- exceptions, in copyright law, 121–123
- exclusive rights, in intellectual property law, 63–66
- exhaustion doctrines, IP-protected subject matter, 138–141
- ex post* perspective, justification of rights and, 192–197
- expropriation of intellectual property rights, 141–182
 ACHR Article 21 and violation of, 177
 international investment law and, 178–180
 protected subject matter and, 142–161
 Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1–1) (ECHR) and, 171–177
 right to exclude or right (privilege) to use and, 161–167
 unlawful expropriation, cases involving, 167–180
- externalities, utility paradigm and, 15–21
- fair balance perspective
 European Court of Human Rights case law and, 189–192
 fundamental rights vs. IPR and, 184–189
 takings/expropriations violations and, 174, 175–177
- fair use criterion
 abstraction levels and, 101–106
 use/exploitation concept and, 112–114
- Filmer, Robert, 28–33
- first sale doctrines, IP-protected subject matter, 138–141
- freedom of expression, IPR vs., 189–192
- free-riding, 15–21
 creational IP and, 95–100
- full referral international investment model, 157–161
- function test, copyright law and, 121–123
- fundamental rights vs. IPR
 CJEU case law and, 184–189
 ECtHR case law and, 182–184
 fair balance perspective and, 192–197
- fungible property, 38–39
 personality and, 84–85
- government action, Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1–1) (ECHR) and concept of, 151–153
- GS Media BV v. Sanoma Media Netherlands BV et al.*, ECLI:EU:C:2016:644, 115–121
- Hand, Learned (Judge), 95–100, 101–106
- Hardin, Garrett, 15–21
- Hargrave, Francis, 18–19
- Hegel, Georg Friedrich, 35–39
 on economic and moral rights, 84–85
 personality rights, 130–131
- Heller, Michael A., 47 n. 18
- Hohfeld, Wesley N., 43–46
 nontransferability of rights and, 127 n. 2
- Home v. Department of Agriculture*, 576 U.S. ____ (2015), 14–275, 142–146
- host country, IPR protection in, 157–161
- human flourishing, 38–39
- “*Immaterialgütertheorie*” (*Immaterial Goods Theory*), 47–51
- inalienability of property rights, 24–26
 intellectual property, 127–131
- information/information law, intellectual property and, 61–63
- input/output, of IP, 61–63
- “intangible good” approach, IP boundaries and, 99–100

- intangible object approach, 46–51. *See also* tangibility
 American Convention on Human Rights Article 21 and concept of, 155–157
 asset intangibility, 69 n. 7
 creative labor and, 80–84
 object function in intellectual property and, 123–125
 Scandinavian perspective, 47–51
 takings clause and, 142–146
 transfers and securitization and, 131–138
- intellectual property
 alienability vs. inalienability, 127–131
 boundaries of, 95–100
 costs vs. benefits, 23–24
 intangibility of, 46–51
 labor philosophy, 28–35
 limits of property metaphor, 93
 structural particularities, 51–55
 takings and expropriation issues, 141–182
 transfer of IP-protected subject matter, 138–141
 utilitarian justification, 15–28
- International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), takings/ violations agreements and, 157–161, 178–180
- international copyright law
 alienability restrictions, 131
 justification of property rights and, 87–92
 transfers and securitization and, 131–138
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), 87–92
- international investment agreements (IIAs), 157–161
 takings/expropriations violations and, 178–180
- international investment law, intellectual property and, 157–161
- internet
 copyright law and file sharing on, 115–121
 IPRs vs. fundamental rights and, 184–189
- justification of rights
 alienability restrictions and, 131
 categories of justification, 86–87
 intellectual property and, 75–76, 192–197
 international context, 87–92
 structure of rights and, 95
 utilitarian grounds, 76–80
- Kaldo-Hicks criterion, utility paradigm and, 15–21
- Kant, Immanuel, 3 n. 8, 35–39
 on economic and moral rights, 84–85
 on personality rights, 35–39, 130–131
- Karnell, Gunnar, 51 n. 31
- Kinetic Concept* case, 108–109
- Kohler, Josef, 47–51
- Koktvedgaard, Mogens, 48–51, 57 n. 53
- labor theory
 intellectual property and, 35, 80–84
 property and, 18–19, 28–35
- Labour* (Zemer), 29–30
- “Lara’s Child” (Molin), 101–106
- Laserdisken ApS v. Kulturministeriet*, ECLI: EU:C:2006:549, 184–189
- law and economics movement, 18–19
- legal object concept, 47 n. 18
 concrete object vs., 55–60
 “legal things” concept, 47 n. 18
- Legislative Guide on Secured Transactions, 131–138
- legitimate expectations principle
 takings and expropriation rules and, 168–171, 180–182
 trademark protection and, 146–153
- Lemley, Mark A., 107–108
- liability
 property rights and, 24–26
 utilitarian justification of property, 76–80
- libertarianism, property rights under, 21
- Liberty of the press* (Zemer), 29–30
- licensing agreements
 alienability vs. inalienability of IPRs and, 127–131
 takings/expropriations violations and, 174
 transfers and securitization and, 131–138
- Lilly v. Canada* case, 157–161, 179–180
- limitations, in copyright law, 121–123
- Lisbon Treaty (2009), 184–189
- Locke, John, 13–15, 80–84
 alternative interpretations of, 33–35
 international IP law and, 90–92
 moral desert theory of, 28–33
- Macaulay (Lord), 18 n. 24
- Madison, James, 18 n. 24
- margin of appreciation, fair balance principle in IPR and, 189–192

- Martin Luksan v. Petrus van der Let*, ECLI:EU:
 C:2012:65, 175–177, 180–182
 materiality, distribution rights and, 115–121
 Melamed, Douglas, 24–26, 127–131
Melnychuc v Ukraine Application
 no. 28743/03, 146–153
MercExchange, L.L.C. v. eBay, Inc., 500 F
 Supp. 2d 556, 572, 129–131
 ‘Metall auf Metall’ case, 51–55
 mixing metaphor in labor theory, 28–33
 modularity
 in property law, 26–28
 utilitarian justification of property, 76–80
 Molin, Alexander (pseud.), 101–106
 monopolies
 IPs as, 60–61
 on patents and trademarks, 55–60
 moral desert, Locke’s theory of, 28–33
 moral rights, 84–85
 multilateral trade agreements, 157–161
- natural law theory, property and, 28–33
 necessity requirement, fair balance principle
 in IPR and, 189–192
 negative rights
 takings and expropriation and, 161–167
 use/exploitation concept and, 112–114
 neighboring rights, 51–55
 utilitarian justification of property, 76–80
Neij and Kolmisoppi v. Sweden, application
 no. 40397/12, 189–197,
 net utility, of intellectual property, 13–15
Nichols v Universal Pictures, 101–106
 non-practicing entities (NPEs), 129–131
 non-scarcity paradigm. *See* scarcity/non-
 scarcity paradigm
 North American Free Trade Agreement
 (NAFTA), 157–161
- object function in intellectual property, 55–60
 intangibility and, 123–125
 property as assets and, 68–71
 objects and things, Hegel’s concept of, 37
 ownership
 alienability vs. inalienability of IPRs and,
 127 n. 2
 personality and personhood and, 35–39
 unitary property concept, 5 n. 18
- Paeffgen v Germany*, Application
 nos. 25379/04, 21688/05, 21722/05 and
 21770/05, 151–153, 171–177,
 180–182
- Palamara-Iribarne v. Chile*, decision
 22 November 2005, 155–157, 165–167, 177
 Pangea Property Partners AS (PPP), 109–111
 Pareto optimality, utility paradigm and, 15–21,
 23–24
 parodies, abstraction in copyright law and,
 105–106
 Pasternak, Boris, 101–106
 patent protection
 abstraction levels in, 106–109
 justification of rights and, 86–87
 monopolies and, 55–60
 personal property and, 78–80
 Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1–1) (ECHR) and
 concept of, 146–153
 takings clause and, 142–146
 use/exploitation concept and, 112–114
 patent trolls, 129–131
 peer-to-peer file sharing
 distribution rights and, 115–121
 fundamental rights vs. IPR and, 189–192
 Peñalvin, Eduardo, 18–19
 Penn Central doctrine, 168–171, 180–182
 Penner, James E., 55–61,
Perfect 10 Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc., 508 F.3d
 1146 (9th Cir. 2007), 1162, 115–121
 personal data, intellectual property rights vs.
 protection of, 184–189
 personality rights
 alienability and, 130–131
 property rights and, 35–39
 personal property
 fungible property and, 37
 patents and, 78–80
 personhood
 fungible vs. personal property, 84–85
 property rights and, 35–39
 Peukert, Alexander, 48–51, 192–197
*Philip Morris Brands Sàrl, Philip Morris
 Products S.A. and Abal Hermanos S.A.
 v. Oriental Republic of Uruguay*, ICSID
 Case No. ARB/10/7, 159–160, 164–165,
 178–180
Philosophy of right (Hegel), 37
 Pigou, A. C., 18–19
 plain packaging regulations, 161–167
 pluralism, property rights and, 39–41
 police powers doctrine, takings/expropriations
 violations and, 179

- positive rights, takings and expropriation and, 161–167
- possessions, concept of
 European Union Charter of Human Rights Article 17 and, 153–155
 Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1–1) (ECHR) and concept of, 146–153
 takings/expropriations violations and, 171–177
- prior tempore potior in jure* (first in time, greater in right) principle, copyright law and, 123–125
- privacy rights, intellectual property rights vs., 184–189
- private property
 defined, 4
 IPRs as assets and, 182–197
 labor theory and, 28–33
 takings clause and, 142–146
- privilege of use, takings/expropriation rules and, 161–167
- privileges system, 114–121
- Productores de música de España v. Telefónica de España SAU*, ECLI:EU:C:2008:54, 184–189
- proportization, 200–201
 IP expansion and, 3–4
- property rights
 American Convention on Human Rights Article 21 and, 155–157
 asset status, 68–71
 European Union Charter of Human Rights Article 17, 153–155
 freedom of expression and, 192–197
 intellectual property in context of, 1–9
 IPRs as assets and, 182–197
 liability and inalienability of, 24–26
 modularity in, 26–28
 personality and personhood, 35–39
 Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1–1) (ECHR) and, 146–153
 structuring of, 42–43, 66–67
 “thingness” in, 43–46
 transnational context, 3–4
- proportionality
 IPRs vs. fundamental rights and, 184–189
 property rights and, 80–84
 takings/expropriation violations, 175–177
- protected subject matter
 expropriation/takings rules and, 142–161
 interface with copies of, 138–141
 Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1–1) (ECHR), 146–153
- European Union Charter of Human Rights Article 17, 153–155
 fair balance principle and, 189–192
 property rule under, 157–161
 takings/expropriations violations and, 171–177
- public goods, utility paradigm and, 15–21
- public interest principle, takings/expropriations violations and, 174
- Rawls, John, 33–35, 80–84
- real property
 copyright law and concept of, 121–123
 intellectual property as, 13–15, 76–80
 justification of rights and, 86–87
 takings clause and, 142–146
- reliance interest
 fundamental rights vs. IPR and, 192–197
 international investment model, 157–161
- remuneration rights, in intellectual property law, 63–66
- res communes*, labor theory and, 33–35
- res nullius*, labor theory and, 33–35
- resource concept, intellectual property and, 13–15, 61–63
- right of exclusion, takings/expropriation rules and, 161–167
- rights of others principle, fair balance principle and, 189–192
- right to use, takings/expropriation rules and, 161–167
- Ross, Alf, 47–51
- Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986 (1984), 142–146, 165–167, 168–171, 180–182
- Scandinavian legal realism, 7–9
 intangibility of intellectual property of, 47–51
- scarcity/non-scarcity paradigm, 61–63
 legal object impact, 131–138
 transfers and securitization and, 137–138
 utilitarian justification of property, 76–80
- Scarlet Extended SA v. SABAM*, ECLI:EU:C:2011: 771, 184–189, 196–197
- securitization of IPRs, legal object impact, 131–138
- “server test,” digital copyright and, 115–121
- Sherwin, Emily, 69 n. 7
- SIA AKKA LAA v. Latvia*, application no. 562/05, 174
- similarity test, trademark protection and, 109–111
- single presentation requirement (SPR), 164–165, 178–180

- Sky Österreich GmbH v. Österreichischer Rundfunk*, ECLI:EU:C:2013:28, 153–155
- Smith, Adam, 18–19, 26–28
- Smith Kline*, Case No. 12633/87, 146–153
- social welfare, labor idea of IP and, 80–84
- spoilage, waste proviso on, 31–33
- structure of property rights, 42–43, 51–55, 66–67
- economic rights, 114–121
 - intellectual property and, 192–197
 - justification of rights and, 95
- sufficiency proviso, labor theory and, 31–33
- sui generis* rights
- EU Database Directive and, 192–197
 - labor idea of IP and, 80–84
- takings rules
- ACHR Article 21 and violation of, 177
 - intellectual property rights and, 141–182
 - international investment law and, 178–180
 - protected subject matter and, 142–161
 - right to exclude or right (privilege) to use and, 161–167
 - Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.* as violation of, 142–146, 168–171
 - violations, cases involving, 167–180
- takings violations, Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1-1) (ECHR) and, 171–177
- creative labor and, 80–84
 - of intellectual property, 13–15
 - IP-protected subject matter, transferability of, 138–141
 - object function in IP and, 55–60
 - peer-to-peer file sharing and, 115–121
 - utilitarian justification of property, 15–21
- technology, copyright and, 115–121
- temporary copying, use/exploitation concept and, 112–114
- territoriality, international investment agreements and, 157–161
- ‘thingness’ in property rights, 43–46
- third parties
- fundamental rights vs. IPR and, 187–188
 - IP boundaries and, 99
- Timothy S. Verner v. Autodesk Inc.* 621 F 3d 1102, 138–141
- Tobias McFadden v. Sony Music Entertainment Germany GmbH*, ECLI:EU:C:2016:689, 187–188
- trademarks
- abstraction levels and, 109–111
 - ICSID tribunal awards and, 159–160
 - negative rights concerning, 161–167
 - Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1-1) (ECHR) and, 146–153
 - takings/expropriations violations and, 171–177, 178–180
 - use/exploitation concept and, 112–114
 - utilitarian view of, 21–23
 - “trade-offs,” in IP regimes, 63–66
- Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual and Property Rights (TRIPS)
- exclusive and remuneration rights, 63–66
 - trademark rules in, 161–167
 - use/exploitation concept and, 112–114
- trade secrets
- labor theory and, 31–33
 - legal protection of, 51–55
 - Protocol 1 Article 1 (P1-1) (ECHR) and concept of, 151–153
 - takings rules and, 142–146, 168–171
 - utilitarian view of, 21–23
- Trade Secrets Act 1905, 170
- tragedy of the commons, 15–21
- creational IP and, 95–100
- transactors, IP boundaries and, 99
- transferability
- alienability vs. inalienability of IP and, 127–131
 - copied material vs., 138–141
 - IP-protected subject matter, 138–141
 - legal object impact, 131–138
- Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement, 87–92, 157–161
- Two Treatises of Government* (Locke), 28–33
- UK Copyright Act 1911, 115 n. 68
- unfair competition, labor theory and, 31–33
- unified property theory, boundaries of IP and, 95–100
- unitary property concepts, 5–6
- United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), 131–138
- United States, copyright law in, 115–121
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), 87–92, 182–184
- unregistered IPRs, 131–138
- UPC Telekabel Wien GmbH v. Constantin Film Verleih and others*, ECLI:EU:C:2014:192, 187–188

- US Constitution, takings clause in, 141–146,
 168–171
UsedSoft GmbH v. Oracle, ECLI:EU:C:2012:
 407, 115–121, 138–141
 use/exploitation concept in IP, 111–123
 US Patent Act, utilitarian justification of
 property, 78–80
 utilitarian justification of property, 15–28,
 76–80
 alienability and, 130–131
 costs vs. benefits, 23–24
 property doctrine vs. liability and
 inalienability of, 24–26
 trademarks and trade secrets, 21–23
 tragedy of the commons vs. free riding,
 15–21
 utility (promise) doctrine, 179–180
 WCT, distribution rights in, 115–121
 welfare, Pigou’s analysis of, 18–19
 WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT),
 87–92
Zemer, Lior, 29–30
Zoltek Corp. v. United States, 442 F.3d1345,
 1353, 168–171