

Licensing 2010**Contributing editors**

Bruno Floriani and
Alexander Konigsberg,
Lapointe Rosenstein Marchand
Melançon LLP

Business development manager
Joseph Samuel

Marketing managers

Alan Lee
George Ingledew
Edward Perugia
Robyn Hetherington
Dan White
Tamzin Mahmoud
Ellie Notley

Subscriptions manager

Nadine Radcliffe
Subscriptions@
GettingTheDealThrough.com

Assistant editor

Adam Myers

Editorial assistant

Nick Drummond-Roe

Senior production editor

Jonathan Cowie

Chief subeditor

Jonathan Allen

Production editor

Joanne Morley

Senior subeditor

Kathryn Smuland

Subeditors

Ariana Frampton
Charlotte Stretch
Peter Beech

Editor-in-chief

Callum Campbell

Publisher

Richard Davey

Licensing 2010

Published by
Law Business Research Ltd
87 Lancaster Road
London, W11 1QQ, UK
Tel: +44 20 7908 1188
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910
© Law Business Research Ltd
2010

No photocopying: copyright
licences do not apply.

ISSN 1759-9830

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of February 2010, be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by
Encompass Print Solutions.
Tel: 0870 897 3239

Law**Business****Research**

Overview Alexander S Konigsberg and Bruno Floriani <i>Lapointe Rosenstein Marchand Melançon LLP</i>	3
Albania Gjergji Gjika and Jonida Beqiri <i>Drakopoulos Law Firm</i>	5
Australia John Sier, Marianne Dunham and Darren Sommers <i>Mason Sier Turnbull</i>	11
Brazil Alysson H Oikawa <i>Bhering Advogados</i>	17
Canada Bruno Floriani, Allen Israel and Samara Sekouti <i>Lapointe Rosenstein Marchand Melançon LLP</i>	23
China Yi Wenhui and Liu Yuping <i>Hylands Law Firm</i>	30
Ecuador Maria Rosa Fabara Vera <i>Fabara & Guerrero</i>	35
France Delphine Touboul and Emmanuel Schulte <i>Bersay & Associés</i>	40
Germany Stefan Abel and Pascal Böhner <i>Bardehle Pagenberg</i>	47
Greece Eleni Lappa <i>Drakopoulos Law Firm</i>	52
India Diljeet Titus <i>Titus & Co, Advocates</i>	57
Israel Zvi N Tamir <i>Zvi Tamir & Co</i>	63
Japan Kozo Yabe and Masakazu Hoshino <i>Yuasa and Hara</i>	70
Korea Sun Ryung Kim <i>Kims and Lees</i>	75
New Zealand Stewart Germann <i>Stewart Germann Law Office</i>	81
Poland Bartłomiej Kochlewski <i>Patpol</i>	86
Romania Andra Filatov <i>Drakopoulos Law Firm</i>	91
Russia Vyacheslav Khayryuzov and Konstantin Chromenkov <i>Noerr</i>	97
South Africa Pieter CR Venter, Victor Williams and Janusz Luterek <i>Hahn & Hahn Inc</i>	104
Spain Anna Viladàs Jené and Jorge Ledesma Ibáñez <i>Roca Junyent</i>	109
Sweden Göran Antonsson and Jonas Näsman <i>Sandart & Partners Advokatbyrå</i>	114
Switzerland Andrea Mondini and Philipp Groz <i>Schellenberg Wittmer</i>	121
Taiwan Simon Hsiao <i>Wu & Partners, Attorneys-at-Law</i>	127
United Kingdom Lewis Cohen, Mark Abell and Will Parsloe <i>Field Fisher Waterhouse LLP</i>	133
United States please see www.gettingthedealthrough.com	

Brazil

Alysson H Oikawa

Bhering Advogados

Overview

- 1 Are there any restrictions on the establishment of a business entity by a foreign licensor or a joint venture involving a foreign licensor, and are there any restrictions against a foreign licensor entering into a licence agreement without establishing a subsidiary or branch office?

Among the principles outlined by the Brazilian Federal Constitution, companies duly organised and existing under Brazilian law may not generally be subject to any discrimination based on the nationality of its partners or shareholders. As a result, foreign companies may participate in a company incorporated in Brazil, except for certain activities where the law places specific restrictions, for instance: post office services, aviation, health services, nuclear energy, banking and insurance, broadcasting, and exploration of natural resources. Nonetheless, such limitations do not usually affect international licensing agreements.

A foreign licensor that plans to carry out its activities in Brazil basically has two alternatives. One is to establish a Brazilian business entity in accordance with and to be governed by local norms and headquartered in our territory. This would include entering into joint ventures structured in the form of a Brazilian company.

The other option is to set up a direct operation in Brazil (eg, through a branch or representative office). This is not generally advisable, since this is subject to accounting and credit restrictions, as well as governmental authorisation. Official examination is usually long and discretionary, and the proper legal instrument for the granting of authorisation is a Presidential Decree. For this reason the vast majority of foreign companies chooses to establish local subsidiaries or to acquire corporate interest in a Brazilian company, with either a majority or minority stake.

Foreign licensors should also bear in mind that they must appoint and retain an attorney who is duly qualified and domiciled in Brazil, and with powers to represent them in administrative and judicial proceedings, including receipt of summons.

Kinds of licences

- 2 Identify the different forms of licence arrangements that exist in your jurisdiction.

Licensing is generally understood as an agreement under which the owner of an intellectual property right (IPR) grants authorisation to its use without an effective transfer of ownership. Licences are granted for a determined period of time and within a determined territory, on a remunerated or free-of-charge basis. A licensor may grant a licence in Brazil to practically any intangible asset, including patents, industrial designs, trademarks and copyrights.

The Brazilian Industrial Property Law (Law No. 9,279 of 14 May 1996 – BIPL) presents the general provisions on technology transfer agreements, which are further regulated by Normative Act No. 135 of 15 April 1997 of the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI).

Normative Act No. 135 specifies the following categories of agreement that involve transfer of technology: licensing of rights (use

of trademarks or exploitation of patents or industrial designs), the acquisition of technological knowledge (supply of technology and rendering of technical assistance services) and franchise agreements.

The Brazilian Copyright and Neighbouring Rights Law (Law No. 9,610 of 19 February 1998 – BCL) determines that the economic rights of the author may be wholly or partly transferred by means of a licence agreement. In contrast, the moral rights of the author are inalienable and irrevocable, meaning they cannot be transferred, licensed or waived. Specifically in relation to the licensing of computer programs, provisions are found in the Brazilian Software Law (Law No. 9,609 of 19 February 1998 – BSL).

In addition to the above, it is possible to negotiate authorisations to use one's image, likeness, voice and name (commonly referred to in other jurisdictions as 'rights of publicity'). These individual assets fall under the category of personality rights, which are protected under several bodies of Brazilian law, namely the Federal Constitution and the Civil Code (Law No. 10.406 of 10 January 2002).

Law affecting international licensing

- 3 Does legislation directly govern the creation, or regulate the terms, of an international licensing relationship? Describe any such requirements.

Licensing agreements that involve transfer of technology, as defined by Normative Act No. 135, must be submitted for the approval of INPI. The governmental endorsement does not serve as a condition of validity of the agreement between the contracting parties. Nonetheless, the licence will only become binding upon third parties after the approval is published in INPI's Official Gazette. This effect has a definite impact on the enforceability of the licensed rights and exclusivity clauses by the local licensee. INPI's approval is also mandatory for the remittance abroad of payments and tax deduction of such payments by the licensee.

INPI performs a discretionary examination of technology transfer agreements, often applying interpretations that are internally consolidated but not found in any established legislation. Although mostly deprived of consistent legal basis, INPI's understandings must be carefully evaluated on the negotiation of licensing agreements, in particular those involving foreign licensors.

An example of such understandings imposes limitations on payments of fees, at least with respect to agreements between local subsidiaries and a foreign company with a majority stake. Based on a complex set of tax rules mainly dating from the late 1950s, INPI restricts the remittance of payments to percentages that vary from 1 per cent to 5 per cent over the fixed price per unit sold or in relation to net sales. These percentages were originally established for tax deduction purposes by the Brazilian Ministry of Finance's Ordinance No. 436 of 30 December 1958 and may vary in accordance to the industry or technology area involved.

The BIPL prescribes that both the rights holder and the applicant may enter into a licensing agreement. However, payments will only be allowed after the licensed right has been duly patented or registered before INPI.

Moreover, although our legal system generally accepts that parties are free to determine the term of the licensing agreement, INPI will only approve it for the period of validity of the licensed industrial property right. In the case of trademark registrations, successive recordation amendments will be necessary for each renewal. Agreements involving the transfer of know-how (non-patented technology) must have a maximum term of five years, which may be extended for another five years, provided that technical justifications are submitted and accepted by INPI.

- 4** Are there any pre- or post-grant disclosure requirements, or any requirements to register with local authorities, with respect to any international licensing rights to be granted in your jurisdiction? Do these requirements still apply if your jurisdiction forms part of a multi-jurisdictional territory in respect of which rights are being granted?

As mentioned in question 3, international agreements that involve the transfer of technology must be examined by and registered with INPI for the purposes of enforcing third parties, remittance abroad of payments and deduction of such payments for local income tax purposes. INPI may suspend or cancel an approval if it later finds that it is not in compliance with the applicable norms.

In addition, if one of the parties to the licensing agreement is a non-resident, the signature will have to be confirmed by a notary public in accordance with the norms of that jurisdiction. The notarisation will then have to be further legalised by the local Brazilian consular representation. Legalisation may be dismissed in agreements with parties resident in countries with which Brazil has signed cooperation treaties in judiciary matters.

- 5** Are there any statutorily or court-imposed implicit obligations in your jurisdiction that may affect an international licensing relationship, such as good faith or fair dealing obligations or the obligation to act reasonably in the exercise of rights?

The Brazilian Civil Code provides for two major principles in relation to contractual relationships: the freedom to negotiate shall be based upon and limited by the social purposes of the agreement; and during the conclusion and performance of the contract, the parties must observe the principles of honesty and good faith. These general rules may serve as basis to redress perceived inequalities or rewrite provisions viewed as being abusive. In other words, when Brazilian law is applicable, a local court may analyse the purposes and conditions of the agreement based on circumstances other than the will of the parties.

- 6** Does the law in your jurisdiction distinguish between licences and franchises? If so, under what circumstances, if any, could franchise law or principles apply to a licence relationship?

Pursuant to the Brazilian Franchise Law in force (Law No. 8,955 of 15 December 1994 – BFL), franchising is a system whereby a franchisor grants to a franchisee the right to use a trademark or a patent, together with the exclusive or semi-exclusive right to distribute products or services and, eventually, also the right to use the technology of implementation and administration of business or operating system developed or owned by the franchisor, through direct or indirect remuneration, without, however, being characterised as an employment relationship.

INPI adopts a more liberal approach in the examination of franchise agreements compared to other technology transfers. For instance, since the grant of a franchise includes the use of a mark or a patent, it is required that franchisor must have, at least, filed an application for such rights in Brazil. Nevertheless, as opposed to basic trademark or patent licences, it is possible to include applications in a royalty-bearing franchise agreement. This is acceptable because remuneration on franchise agreements is not restricted to the licence itself. Rather, the franchisee is expected to pay initial affiliation fees, advertising fees and other periodical charges for the use of the system or in return for technical assistance and other services effectively rendered by the franchisor.

Intellectual property issues

- 7** Is your jurisdiction party to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property? The Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)? The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs)?

Brazil is party to all three of the aforementioned treaties.

- 8** Can the licensee be contractually prohibited from contesting the validity of a foreign licensor's intellectual property rights or registrations in your jurisdiction?

A contractual disposition that limits the free and ample exercise of a given right may possibly be considered abusive by a Brazilian court. This includes conditions preventing challenges to validity of a foreign licensor's IPR or registrations.

However, it is generally accepted that a licensee may not impose undue obstacles on foreign licensor's IPR or registrations. In addition, it is advisable to contractually prohibit the licensee from applying for registrations of the licensed rights.

- 9** What is the effect of the invalidity or expiry of registration of an intellectual property right on a related licence agreement in your jurisdiction?

The invalidity or expiry of registration of an IPR will usually be deemed cause for the termination of the licence.

- 10** Is an original registration or evidence of use in the jurisdiction of origin, or any other requirements unique to foreigners, necessary prior to the registration of intellectual property in your jurisdiction?

No such registration or evidence of use is necessary. As a rule, Brazilian law does not make any distinction based on the nationality of the applicant for registration. The only unique requirement to foreigners is to appoint and retain an attorney who is duly qualified and domiciled in our jurisdiction.

Registration and use in the country of origin becomes relevant when the priority right of the Paris Convention is applicable. In relation to trademarks, depending on the type of evidence that is provided, such factors could also support the application of article 6bis and quinques of the Paris Convention.

- 11** Are there particular requirements in your jurisdiction: for the validity of an intellectual property licence; to render an intellectual property licence opposable to a third party; or to take a security interest in intellectual property?

As mentioned in question 3, international agreements that involve the transfer of technology must be examined and registered with INPI for purposes of enforcing third parties. The licence will only become opposable erga omnes after the approval is published in INPI's Official Gazette. It must be highlighted that the recordal by INPI is not a condition for the licence agreement to be valid or even effective between the contracting parties. The importance of the official approval is mostly related to providing third parties with the opportunity to become aware of the contents of the agreement, including the exclusivity of use in a given territory.

The same applies to a security interest taken in industrial property rights. In accordance with the BIPL, INPI shall register any limitation or onus that applies to applications, registrations or patents. The recordal of such limitations becomes effective with regard to third parties on the date of publication in the Official Gazette.

Although the validity of copyright and software licences and of authorisations deriving from personality rights does not depend on prior official registration, it is advisable that such agreements are entered in the competent Registry of Deeds and Documents. Furthermore, if

copyright or software licences are agreed between a foreign licensor and a related local subsidiary, transfer pricing restrictions may apply.

- 12** Can a foreign owner or licensor of intellectual property institute proceedings against a third party for infringement in your jurisdiction without joining the licensee from your jurisdiction as a party to the proceedings? Can an intellectual property licensee in your jurisdiction institute proceedings against an infringer of the licensed intellectual property without the consent of the owner or licensor? Can the licensee be contractually prohibited from doing so?

A foreign owner or licensor may institute such proceedings without joining the local licensee. On the other hand, the licensee may be contractually invested with powers to enforce the licensed right. In relation to patent, trademark and other technology transfer licences, the agreement will have to be registered by INPI in order to legitimise a licensee's standing to bring suit.

Without the express consent of the owner or licensor, the licensee will not be able to institute proceedings against an infringer. The licensee can also be contractually prohibited from doing so. It is advisable, however, that the licence agreement determines an obligation for licensee to cooperate with the licensor to cease third-party infringements. Even when the licensee lacks standing, it would be possible to intervene in the form of assistant (*amicus curiae*) to the foreign owner or licensor.

- 13** Can a trademark or service mark licensee in your jurisdiction sub-license use of the mark to a third party? If so, does the right to sub-license exist statutorily or must it be granted contractually? If it exists statutorily, can the licensee validly waive its right to sub-license?

Sub-licensing would only be acceptable if provided for in the original license agreement. As a rule, the right to sub-license does not exist statutorily and must be granted contractually.

- 14** Can an unregistered trademark be licensed in your jurisdiction?

In order to license its use, licensor must have at least filed an application for registration in Brazil. However, the remittance of payments from trademark licences will only be accepted after grant of a respective trademark registration by INPI. Retroactive payments before the grant of the trademark registration are not allowed.

- 15** Is your jurisdiction a 'first to file' or 'first to invent' jurisdiction? Can a foreign licensor license the use of an invention subject to a patent application but in respect of which the patent has not been issued in your jurisdiction?

Brazil follows a 'first to file' system both in relation to patents and trademarks. Some specific exceptions are prescribed by the BIPL. For instance, a person who, in good faith, prior to the filing or priority date of a patent application, was exploiting the object thereof in Brazil may assert the right to continue the exploitation in the same manner and under the same conditions as before.

Another exception is found in relation to trademarks. Pursuant to the BIPL, a person who, in good faith, had been using an identical or similar mark in Brazil for at least six months prior to the filing of the application, may claim the right of preference for the registration.

A foreign licensor may license the use of an invention subject to a pending patent application. The licensor will not be able to receive royalties until the patent is granted. However, unlike with trademark licences, retroactive payments may be admitted in respect to patent licences.

- 16** Can the following be protected by patents in your jurisdiction: software; business processes or methods; living organisms?

The BIPL expressly forbids patents over commercial, accounting, financial, educational, advertising, lottery and inspection schemes, plans,

principles or methods. It also excludes from protection living organisms, in whole or in part, as well as biological materials found in nature, even if isolated there from. In contrast, the BIPL allows patents over transgenic micro-organisms, which are defined as organisms that express, by means of direct human intervention in their genetic composition, a characteristic normally not attainable under natural conditions.

Software per se is protected under copyright, not patent. However, INPI has admitted patents that include software for processes or that integrate diverse equipments, provided that the patentability requirements of novelty, inventive steps and industrial application are met.

- 17** Is there specific legislation in your jurisdiction that governs trade secrets or know-how? If so, is there a legal definition of trade secrets or know-how? If not, how are trade secrets and know-how treated by the courts?

Trade secrets are protected under unfair competition provisions found in the BIPL. Among other conduct, a crime of unfair competition is committed by any person who discloses, exploits, or uses, without authorisation, confidential knowledge, information or data that could be used in industry, commerce or service rendering, unless such knowledge, information or data is of public knowledge or obvious to an expert in the relevant subject. The violator must have gained access to the trade secret through fraud or by means of a contractual or employment relationship, even after its termination. Therefore, if the object of the trade secret is discovered or developed by licit independent means, no infringement will be found.

Know-how is not clearly defined by specific legislation. It is generally understood by local administrative and judicial authorities as knowledge or techniques not covered or registered as industrial property rights, used in the manufacture of goods or in the rendering of services.

- 18** Does the law allow a licensor to restrict disclosure or use of trade secrets and know-how by the licensee or third parties in your jurisdiction, both during and after the term of the licence agreement?

Foreign licensors should be aware that the INPI does not admit temporary licensing of know-how. Rather, the predominant understanding is that non-patented technology is only subject to disclosure or permanent acquisition. Therefore, the INPI will not approve contractual dispositions prohibiting local licensee to continue exploring the transferred know-how.

Non-disclosure clauses are generally admitted during the term of the licence agreement and for a reasonable period after termination. In many cases INPI has considered five years after termination as a reasonable confidentiality period.

- 19** What constitutes copyright in your jurisdiction and how can it be protected?

Copyright constitutes an arrangement of economic and moral prerogatives that the law recognises to creators of original works of authorship. The Brazilian Constitution determines that authors shall have the exclusive rights of use, publication and reproduction over their works. These exclusive economic rights may be transferred to the author's successors, for a time fixed by law.

Traditionally, the author's rights in Brazil were conceived as a part of the general legal branch of civil law, regulated in the former Civil Code of 1916. The protection was later regulated in specific norms, the most recent and in force are the BCL and the BSL.

In accordance with the BCL, intellectual works subject to protection are original creations of the mind, whatever their mode of expression or the medium in which they are fixed, tangible or intangible, known or susceptible of invention in the future. Such protectable creations include literary works, musical compositions, films, photographs, drawings, paintings, sculptures, illustrations, animations, adaptations, translations, collections, compilations and computer software.

As a general rule, the BCL sets the duration of economic rights for a period of 70 years counted from 1 January of the year following the author's death. Protection of copyright in Brazil is not subject to registration, notice or any other formalities. The granting of copyright is automatic upon creation of an original work of authorship, even if the work is not fixed in a tangible medium. Nonetheless, optional registration is recommended to evidence the date of creation of the work.

- 20** Is it advisable in your jurisdiction to require the contractual assignment of copyright by the licensee to the licensor for any artwork, software improvements and other works that the licensee may have contributed to?

It is advisable to require such assignment by the licensee to the licensor. Pursuant to the BCL, copyright assignments must be effected in writing and are interpreted in the benefit of the author. Unless otherwise agreed, copyright over works created under an employment or contractual relationship is presumed to remain with the author. This general presumption is not applicable only to rights over software, which title will belong automatically to the employer or the independent contractor. It should also be noted that assignments of future works may not exceed the term of five years.

Differently from other jurisdictions that follow the so-called 'work for hire' doctrine, in Brazil only natural persons may be considered authors for purposes of copyright protection. Initial ownership is vested in the individual who created the work, but there is an exception to that principle: the BCL defines a category of works named 'collective works'.

Collective works are those created by initiative, instructions and responsibility of an individual or a business entity that publishes them under its name or mark. They must be conceived by two or more authors whose contributions are merged into self-contained creations. Although in cases of collective works a company may be considered the initial owner of copyright, it will never be regarded as an author or co-author. Moreover, individual contributions to collective works benefit from independent copyright protection.

Software licensing

- 21** Does the law in your jurisdiction recognise the validity of 'perpetual' software licences?

The Brazilian Software Law does not provide specific restrictions on perpetual software licences.

- 22** Are there any legal requirements to be complied with prior to granting software licences? In particular, are there import or export restrictions on software?

The BSL determines that licence agreements relating to software of foreign origin must clearly state responsibility for payments of taxes and charges. As mentioned in question 11, the validity of common software licenses does not depend on prior official registration. However, technology transfer agreements involving software will be subject to approval by INPI.

- 23** Who owns improvements and modifications to the licensed software? May a software licensee obtain bug fixes, upgrades and new releases from the licensor in the absence of a contractual provision to that effect?

Pursuant to the BSL, improvements and modifications authorised by the owner of the rights over the licensed software, including their economic exploitation, belong to the authorised person that executes them, unless provided otherwise under contract. The BSL also sets out legal warranties for the end-user of software. For instance, the owner, licensor or the one that commercialises the software in Brazil is required to

provide supplementary support services for the proper operation during the term of technical validity of the respective software version.

- 24** May a software licensor include a process or routine to disable automatically or cause unauthorised access to disable, erase or otherwise adversely affect the licensed software?

Such processes or routines are generally allowed. In fact, the Brazilian Copyright Law specifically qualifies as an infringement the removal or modification of technical devices or encrypted signals that have been incorporated in copies of protected works to prevent or restrict unauthorised use.

- 25** Have courts in your jurisdiction recognised that software is not inherently error-free in determining the liability of licensors in connection with the performance of the licensed software?

To date, Brazilian courts do not appear to have dealt with this issue. Nonetheless, the BSL expressly prohibits provisions that exempt the contracting parties from any third-party actions arising from misuse, flaws or violation of copyright.

- 26** Have courts in your jurisdiction restricted in any manner the enforceability or applicability of the terms and conditions of public licences for open source software (ie, GNU and other public licence agreements)?

We are not aware of any court cases questioning the enforceability or applicability of public licences for open source software. In our opinion, they are enforceable provided that other legal conditions for the licensing of computer programs are met.

Royalties and other payments, currency conversion and taxes

- 27** Is there any legislation that governs the nature, amount, manner or frequency of payments of royalties or other fees or costs (including interest on late payments) in an international licensing relationship, or requires regulatory approval of the royalty rate or other fees or costs (including interest on late payments) payable by a licensee in your jurisdiction?

As mentioned in the response to question 3, INPI sets various restrictions in relation to payments resulting from an international licensing relationship. It should also be noted that Brazilian law distinguishes the compensation of know-how agreements (commonly referred to as 'technical assistance' or 'non-patented technology'). According to the tax norms in force, payments resulting from know-how agreements are technically designated as 'remuneration'. The expression 'royalties' is more commonly applied to the licensing of trademarks, patents or copyrights and franchise agreements.

- 28** Are there any restrictions on transfer and remittance of currency in your jurisdiction? Are there any associated regulatory reporting requirements?

Pursuant to the Brazilian Foreign Capital Law (Law No. 4,131 of 3 September 1962) and other applicable provisions (Ordinance No. 436 of the Ministry of Finance, Law No. 4,506 of 1964, Law 8,383 of 1991, Decree No. 55,762 of 1965 and Decree No. 3,000 of 1999), foreign investments must be registered with the Central Bank of Brazil to allow the remittance abroad of dividends, interest on equity and funds related to repatriations of capital. Foreign capital receives the same legal treatment given to national capital, in identical conditions. Any distinction not provided by law is prohibited.

Remittances related to foreign capital duly registered with the Central Bank may be effected at any time without preliminary approval of that official institution, provided that other corporate and tax

requirements are met. In relation to the remittance of royalties or other fees or costs resulting from technology transfers, the relevant agreement must be approved by INPI prior to the registration with the Central Bank.

29 In what circumstances may a foreign licensor be taxed on its income in your jurisdiction?

A foreign licensor that has not established a local operation in Brazil would only be taxed on the income generated in our jurisdiction. As a general rule, payments from sources located in Brazil to companies abroad are subject to withholding income tax. Payments resulting from technology transfer agreements and other intellectual property licenses are subject to a withholding income tax currently levied at a general rate of 15 per cent, unless a lower rate is provided for in an international treaty. Brazil has signed treaties to avoid double taxation with many countries, including: Argentina, Austria, Canada, Chile, China, France, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Portugal, Sweden, South Africa, South Korea and Spain.

Licensing agreements are subject to other taxes like the contribution for intervention in the economic domain (CIDE), service tax (ISS), and the contribution to the social integration programme and contribution for social security financing on importation (PIS/COFINS Import). However, only the responsibility for payments of the withholding income tax might be subject to negotiations of the contracting parties.

Competition law issues

30 Are practices that potentially restrict trade prohibited or otherwise regulated in your jurisdiction?

The Brazilian Antitrust Law (Law No. 8,884 of 11 June 1994 – BAL) expressly prohibits business practices that potentially restrict trade. The Brazilian Administrative Council for Economic Defense (CADE) is the authority legally responsible to examine the impact of suspicious behaviours, including contracts for the use or exploration of intellectual property rights.

The authorities of the Brazilian System for the Defense of Competition are able to restrain behaviours, if they produce or are capable of producing the following effects: (i) limitation, forgery or in any manner harm to free competition or initiative; (ii) domination of the relevant market of goods or services; (iii) arbitrary increase of profits; and (iv) abusive exercise of a dominant position. These are essential requisites for the classification of business behaviour as being anti-competitive, as well as being necessary to analyse its object, marketing structure and peculiarities, and their generated consequences.

31 Are there any legal restrictions in respect of the following provisions in licence agreements: duration, exclusivity, grant-back provisions and non-competition restrictions?

In order to be considered illegal, the practice must result on the anti-competitive effects mentioned in question 30. Following the rule of the reason, in this field of law there is no contractual clause deemed anti-competitive per se. The licence or the transfer of a given IPR must be analysed on a case-by-case basis within the economic context of the contracting parties and their relevant market.

Indemnification, disclaimers of liability, damages and limitation of damages

32 Are indemnification provisions enforceable? Is insurance coverage for the protection of a foreign licensor available in support of an indemnification provision?

Such provisions are enforceable and insurance cover to protect a foreign licensor is available in support of an indemnification provision

with respect to acts and omissions of the licensee.

33 Can the parties contractually agree to waive or limit certain types of damages? Are disclaimers of liability generally enforceable? What are the exceptions, if any?

Limitation of liability is generally enforceable, provided that principles of good faith and of the social function of the contract are respected. As a result, limited liability may not be accepted in cases of proven wilful misconduct, gross negligence or other wrongful act. One of the main exceptions that may affect international licensing is found in the Brazilian Consumer Protection Code (Law No. 8078 of 11 September 1990 – BCPC). The BCPC declares abusive provisions that prevent, exempt or otherwise reduce liability of a supplier of goods or services for defects or damages of any nature. The inclusion of such provisions on consumer agreement is therefore prohibited, except when the consumer is a legal entity and in justifiable situations.

Termination

34 Does the law impose conditions on, or otherwise limit, the right to terminate or not to renew an international licensing relationship; or require the payment of an indemnity or other form of compensation upon termination or non-renewal?

It is generally admitted that agreements with indefinite terms may be terminated by any party, on condition that reasonable prior notice is given. Pursuant to the Brazilian Civil Code, if, given the nature of the agreement, one party has made significant investments for its execution, unilateral termination will only take effect after a period that is reasonable with the nature and amount of the investments.

The Civil Code also determines that the debtor may request the termination of the agreement when the contractual obligations become excessively onerous, with great advantage to the other party, due to exceptional and unforeseeable events. If the contractual obligations fall upon only one party, he or she may plead the obligation to be reduced or changed, in order to avoid excessive financial burden.

35 What is the impact of the termination or expiration of a licence agreement on any sub-licence granted by the licensee, in the absence of any contractual provision addressing this issue?

In principle, termination or expiration of a licence agreement would cause the cessation of any legal effect regarding sub-licences granted by the licensee.

Bankruptcy

36 What is the impact of the bankruptcy of the licensee on the legal relationship with its licensor and any sub-licence that the licensee may have granted? Can the licensor structure its international licence agreement to terminate it prior to the bankruptcy and remove the licensee's rights?

Pursuant to the Brazilian Bankruptcy Law (Law No. 11.101, of 9 November 2005), contracts are not automatically terminated by bankruptcy. In fact, the trustee may continue the performance of the agreement when necessary to maintain and preserve the assets of the bankrupt estate. If there is no contractual provision for termination in the event of bankruptcy, the agreement remains in force. As a result, it is very common and highly advisable to include such provision in an international licensing agreement. The contract would terminate not as a result of the bankruptcy itself, but by virtue of the will of the contracting parties.

Update and trends

In August 2009, the World Trade Organization recognised the right of Brazil to use trade countermeasures against illegal cotton subsidies by the government of the United States. In December 2009 Brazil informed the WTO that it would establish something like US\$829 million-worth of annual sanctions of which US\$279 million is expected to affect IPR from US licensors. Internal legislation to raise tariffs on this area is currently under discussion and is expected to be passed by the Brazilian government in the beginning of 2010.

In October 2009 the Superior Court of Justice passed *Súmula* (summarised precedent) No. 403, which prescribes that compensation for the unauthorised use of one's image with economic or commercial purposes is not dependent on proof of actual damage.

In a unanimous decision of December 2009, the Superior Court of Justice confirmed that patents under the 'pipeline' regime have a term of 20 years counted from the date of first filing abroad.

Governing law and dispute resolution

- 37** Are there any restrictions on an international licensing arrangement being governed by the laws of another jurisdiction chosen by the parties?

Following provisions set by the Introductory Law to the Brazilian Civil Code (Decree-Law No. 4,657 of 4 September 1942), in order to qualify and govern agreements and other kinds of obligations, the law of the country where they are constituted will apply. It further stipulates that the obligation resulting from an agreement is presumed to be constituted in the place of residence of the party that makes the proposal. In view of these provisions, it is generally understood by legal commentators that the parties are not free to choose the law that will govern the licensing arrangement.

- 38** Can the parties contractually agree to arbitration of their disputes instead of resorting to the courts of your jurisdiction? If so, must the arbitration proceedings be conducted in your jurisdiction or can they be held in another?

Due to the general prohibition of choice of law rules, it is recommended that the parties agree to arbitration instead of resorting to the courts. Pursuant to the Brazilian Arbitration Law (Law No. 9,307, of 23 September 1996), the parties may freely choose the rules of law to be applied in arbitration, as long as there is no violation of good morals and public order. Arbitration proceedings may be conducted in any jurisdiction. If, however, the arbitration clause in a given agreement makes reference to the rules of a particular arbitral institution or

specialised entity, the arbitration shall be instituted and conducted in accordance with such rules, unless otherwise agreed by the parties.

- 39** Would a court judgment or arbitral award from another jurisdiction be enforceable in your jurisdiction? Is your jurisdiction party to the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards?

Court judgments or arbitral awards from other jurisdictions are enforceable in accordance with local norms and international treaties. Brazil is party to the UN Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (the New York Convention of 1958).

In order to be recognized and enforceable in Brazil, foreign judgments or arbitral awards must be submitted to the approval ('homologation') of the Superior Court of Justice, or STJ, the highest Brazilian appellate court for non-constitutional matters. The STJ will not examine the merits of the foreign decision, but will check if it complies with the following formalities: (i) the foreign decision must have been rendered by a competent judge; (ii) the parties must have been served proper notice of process or arbitration; (iii) the judgment or award must be final and in proper form for its enforcement in accordance with the laws of the jurisdiction where it was rendered; (iv) the foreign decision must be legalised by the competent Brazilian consulate and must be submitted to the STJ with a sworn translation; and (v) the judgment or award must not be contrary to Brazilian national sovereignty, public policy or good morals.

- 40** Is injunctive relief available in your jurisdiction? May it be waived contractually? May the parties waive their entitlement to claim specific categories of damages in an arbitration clause?

Injunctive relief is available in Brazil. It requires demonstration of sufficient legal basis together with probable success on the merits (*fumus boni juris*), as well as of risks that the delay would deprive the legitimate exercise of the violated right and cause irreparable harm (*periculum in mora*). The Brazilian Federal Constitution establishes the right to bring suit within the category of fundamental rights and guarantees. Pursuant to the Federal Constitution, the law shall not exclude from judicial examination any violation of or threat to a right. This legal principle poses a significant obstacle to the enforceability of contractual waivers of injunctive or other equitable relief on judicial proceedings, particularly when related to matters of public order. The right to seek relief would be within the discretion of the court. Alternatively, as mentioned in question 38, if the parties contractually agree to arbitration instead of resorting to the courts, they may, in principle, freely choose the rules of law to be applied in arbitration proceedings.

BHERING

ADVOGADOS

Pedro Bhering
Alysson H Oikawa

bhe@bheringadvogados.com.br

Avenida Rio Branco, 103, 11th and 12th floors
20040-004 Rio de Janeiro
Brazil

Tel: +55 21 2221 3757
Fax: +55 21 2224 7169
www.bheringadvogados.com.br

GETTING THE DEAL THROUGH®

Annual volumes published on:

Air Transport	Merger Control
Anti-Corruption Regulation	Mergers & Acquisitions
Arbitration	Mining
Banking Regulation	Oil Regulation
Cartel Regulation	Patents
Climate Regulation	Pharmaceutical Antitrust
Construction	Private Antitrust Litigation
Copyright	Private Equity
Corporate Governance	Product Liability
Dispute Resolution	Product Recall
Dominance	Project Finance
e-Commerce	Public Procurement
Electricity Regulation	Real Estate
Environment	Restructuring & Insolvency
Franchise	Securities Finance
Gas Regulation	Shipping
Insurance & Reinsurance	Tax on Inbound Investment
Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Telecoms and Media
Labour & Employment	Trademarks
Licensing	Vertical Agreements
Life Sciences	

**For more information or to
purchase books, please visit:
www.GettingTheDealThrough.com**



Strategic research partners of
the ABA International Section



THE QUEEN'S AWARDS
FOR ENTERPRISE
2006



The Official Research Partner of
the International Bar Association