





**QUESTION 1:** 

HOW OFTEN ARE PIS SOUGHT IN YOUR JURISDICTION?



## PREVALENCE OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS

Canada	France	China	UK
<ul> <li>Rare</li> <li>Only 25% of motions since 1995 seeking an interlocutory injunction successful</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Rarely granted 10 years ago</li> <li>Recent case law shows that judges are more inclined to grant Pls:</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Chinese courts are very cautious in issuing PIs</li> <li>New guidance was issued by the Supreme Court on 1</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Rare before 2000</li> <li>Is there an arguable case?</li> <li>Merits not relevant</li> <li>Main factor is one of economics</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Frequency has increased in last 5 years but typically outside patents</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Marketing</li><li>Recall</li><li>Provisional damages</li></ul>	Jan 2019	Applications for PIs more frequent in pharma/biotech





**QUESTION 2:** 

WHAT IS THE PROCEDURE FOR GETTING A PI?



## THE PROCEDURE FOR GETTING A PI

Canada	France	China	UK
<ul> <li>After an action is commenced – move promptly</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Prevent continuing or imminent infringement</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No one-size-fits-all solution</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>There must be a threat to infringe and full infringement</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Notice almost always</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Can started before an infringement action</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Can be an ex parte hearing if urgent</li> </ul>	action "on foot"
provided			Can file infringement
<ul> <li>Each party provides evidence</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Heard by PI judge if before, or trial judge if after an action filed</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Urgent = a time- sensitive threat which requires the court to issue PI within 48</li> </ul>	action and application for PI at the same time
<ul> <li>Cross-examinations may take place</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Oral hearing, written evidence considered</li> </ul>	hours	<ul> <li>PI (if granted) will (usually) be granted at the hearing</li> </ul>





**QUESTION 3:** 

WHAT IS THE TEST FOR DECIDING WHETHER A PI IS GRANTED?



## THE TEST FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Canada	France	China	UK
<ul> <li>RJR-MacDonald (adopting test from UK</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Preliminary assessment of :</li> </ul>	Four factors:	American Cyanamid
case American Cyanamid)	patent validity	<ol> <li>Strength of IP rights and likelihood of</li> </ol>	1. An arguable case
A prima facie case	2. patent	infringement	2. Irreparable loss
	infringement	2. Irreparable harm	3. Balance of
2. Irreparable harm	<ul> <li>Measures must</li> </ul>	3. Balance of	Convenience
3. Balance of Convenience	remain proportionate	Convenience	<ul> <li>Cross Undertaking required</li> </ul>
Convenience		4. Impact on public interest	required





