

WINDS FROM JAPAN

The Licensing Executives Society Japan

“IP Bridge” – Strategic IP Utilization

By Shigeharu Yoshii *



IP monetization is a hot and important topic that is on our minds, and “IP Bridge” has been mentioned in many respected magazine articles. “IP Bridge” was founded last July by several participating corporations, chiefly the Inno-

vation Network Corporation of Japan, Inc., to participate in the evolving IP market, but not by the means predicted or expected as in those articles. While we have \$300 million entrusted and invested, this is not for threatening and proceeding with litigation or extracting settlements. IP Bridge has a far greater objective than becoming another PAE or privateer on behalf of our investor corporations (most famously Panasonic): IP Bridge is determined to become the center for promoting open innovation in Japan.

In recent years, there has been a growing sense of urgency in Japan regarding doing something about the vast amount of dormant IP that Japanese companies, universities and institutions have accumulated, but have under-utilized. As businesses continue to face a tepid Japanese consumer market, or a tough export market, licensing and sales of IP, especially patents, has become an important source of income. IP monetization is a new concept and practice in Japan. In the past, it was frequently outsourced to foreign NPEs and PAEs.

IP Bridge is a Japanese NPE but not a PAE. Like any other normal business, IP Bridge will not hesitate to litigate as needed, but there are many other ways to get the most value out of one's IP. I like to think of IP Bridge as a PIE--a Patent Innovation Entity. The name came about as part of a joke, but in all

seriousness, the goal is to promote the creation of innovative products, services and even new markets. We want to expand and make more of the proverbial pie that NPEs are accused of taking slices out from operating companies. Monetization offers rights-holders the means to procure funds needed to further their businesses and R&D. One of the primary means by which we hope to achieve this is by bridging together IP owners with entities that are willing and able to commercialize the IP.

Indeed, IP Bridge's purpose is to become the intermediary for trading rights to under-utilized or neglected IP, for the purpose of commercialization. And, as mentioned earlier, there is an abundance of such IP in Japan. This is the consequence of a history of IP being developed or acquired principally for producing goods and services. While IP are still the foundation of what companies sell to consumers, much IP lays dormant because the IP was not as essential to the core business of the company that developed it. The reasons for this vary from poor planning, to commercial failure. Yet, as we all know, “one person's trash is another's treasure.” There is much neglected IP that has commercial potential. This is what IP Bridge will focus on bringing to the fore, and onto the market.

IP Bridge is able to provide entrepreneurs with the tools, managerial advice, and IP in order for new businesses to be successful. Rights-holders will be fairly compensated for any resulting capital gains. My experience suggests that numerous dormant patents may be organized into portfolios that can form the core foundation for new companies. I can briefly mention a recent example of how viable non-core IPs can become a part of a successful spinoff company. Xerox carefully selected and spun off some non-core IPs and formed “ContentGuard, Inc.” as a joint venture with Microsoft. It was eventually sold to Time Warner, yielding Xerox a large profit. Our company is named “IP Bridge” to capture our

intent to be the nexus between rights-holders and the entrepreneurs.

There is frequently a disconnect between corporate management and a company's IP. This issue has two aspects: The human aspect and the balance sheet aspect. Most publicly listed Japanese companies lack directors that have any IP background. Strategic management decisions are made by the board of directors. The lack of a board member with a grasp of the scope of the company's IP holdings often leads to strategic decisions that are not based upon the strength of their IP. As for the balance sheet, unless IP was acquired from another person or company, the company's native-developed IP will not be valued and included as an asset. The expenditure on R&D will be listed, however, under cost/liability. Therefore, directors and managers can easily be blind to the value of their own IP.

I have more than ten years of experience as a turn-around manager. I was able to convert fixed costs to variable costs and reduce overall costs, improve production efficiencies, rework supply chains to reduce inefficiencies and costs, and many other things. Yet when these did not achieve the desired results, I

turned to the balance sheet and worked on means to list unvalued IP as an asset.

Just as a firm that owns its office building can liquidate it, and then rent the space it occupies, IP can also be converted into a liquid asset. Even ten years ago liquidating one's real property and then leasing back the space was considered a questionable practice in Japan, but today it is one of many respectable means for businesses to improve their liquid asset holdings. Monetizing IP to achieve liquidity should similarly become a standard business practice.

This requires leadership to include IP assets in business strategies. For every department preparing their strategies, from HR to manufacturing, the leadership must integrate a company's IP strategy. Otherwise, it will be difficult to usefully and meaningfully exploit IP. When a grand business strategy is closely linked with a well-considered IP strategy, any IP inside a company can become treasure. IP Bridge will be operating under the belief that business strategy is IP strategy; one cannot be complete without the other.

~~~~~

*\*President & CEO, IP Bridge, Inc.*

---

## **Samsung v. Apple Decision by IP High Court Grand Panel**

### **Enforceability of a patent that is a subject of a FRAND declaration**

**By Shoichi Okuyama, Ph.D.\***

#### **SUMMARY**

In a DJ action filed by Apple, Samsung Electronics' Japanese patent was found valid and was infringed by some Apple products. The liability for damages was assessed under the FRAND declaration Samsung made when it entered the Japanese patent into the UMTS technical standards for mobile communications. The amount of reasonable royalty was determined under FRAND conditions to be JPY 9,955,854. Also, two decisions that resulted from preliminary injunction lawsuits concluded that Samsung's demand for injunctions on Apple products amounted to abusive use of rights and injunctions are not allowable due to the FRAND declaration.

#### **FACTS**

Apple Japan (a Japanese subsidiary of Apple Inc.) sought a declaratory judgment of non-existence of liability under a Japanese patent to Samsung Electric K.K. (a Japanese subsidiary of Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.), Japanese Patent No. 4642898, entitled "Method and apparatus for transmitting/receiving packet data using pre-defined length indicator in a mobile communication system" (corresponding to US7675941 (B2)). Samsung Electronics filed two lawsuits against Apple Japan seeking preliminary injunctions before the Tokyo District Court in April 2011 and December 2012. Apple Japan's DJ action in September 2011 was in response to these lawsuits. The IP High Court issued three decisions separately for each of these lawsuits on May 16, 2014.

In the declaratory judgment action, four Apple products were subjects of the dispute: (1) iPhone 3GS,

(2) iPhone 4, (3) iPad Wi-Fi+3G, and (4) iPad 2 Wi-Fi+3G. The products in dispute comply with UMTS Standards prepared by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), a non-governmental project set up among several standard setting organizations (SSOs). One of the SSOs involved was the European Telecommunication Standards Institute (ETSI). ETSI has an intellectual property rights policy. Samsung followed this policy and notified ETSI that intellectual property rights including the patent in dispute might be essential under the UMTS Standards with a declaration that it was prepared to grant irrevocable licenses for fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory ("FRAND") terms and conditions.

There were seven issues of contention: (1) whether claim 8 of the patent covers the Apple products, (2) whether the Apple products indirectly infringe claim 1 (method claim) of the patent under Article 101(4) and (5) of the Patent Act, (3) whether claims 1 and 8 are invalid, (4) whether the patent is exhausted with respect to the Apple products in dispute, (5) whether there was a license between Apple and Samsung on the basis of the FRAND declaration of Samsung, (6) whether the claiming of damages by Samsung amounted to abusive use of rights, and (7) the amount of damages.

As to the question of patent exhaustion (issue 3), Apple argued that the base-band chip used in the products in dispute either realizes the product of claim 8 (device for transmitting data in a mobile communication system) of the disputed patent or is used only for the purpose of realizing the invention recited in claim 1 (method for transmitting data in a mobile communication system), and therefore, this constitutes direct infringement or indirect infringement. According to Apple, Intel Corp. sold such chips to Apple under a license from Samsung and the Samsung patent had exhausted with respect to the Apple products which use the Intel chips sold under the Samsung's license. Samsung noted that a license agreement with Intel ended on June 30, 2009, and since then, Intel did not have any authorization from Samsung with respect to the patent in dispute.

Also, in the preliminary injunction lawsuits, two issues were raised: (1) whether the Apple products mentioned above infringe claim 8 of the patent, and (2) whether Samsung's demand for injunctions amounts to abusive use of rights.

## **HELD**

In the declaratory judgment action, a Grand Panel of the IP High Court found that products 2 and 4 mentioned above fall under the scope of claim 8, whereas products 1 and 3 do not, and the five grounds of invalidity Apple raised are moot. Thus, the patent in dispute was found to be valid and infringed.

As for the exhaustion theory Apple argued, since Intel did not have a valid license from Samsung and

such license, in any case, would not have covered Intel's subcontracting the manufacture of the chips to a third party and subsequent sale of the chips, the Court concluded that there are no grounds for Apple's arguments concerning patent exhaustion. Further, the Court noted that even if it is assumed that a license existed between Samsung and Intel and such license covered the chips in question, the enforcement of the Samsung patent would not be restricted against the manufacture and sale of the Apple products using the Intel chips under the BBS Supreme Court decision (July 1, 1997) because the Apple products that would fall within the scope of the Samsung patent were created using the chips which do not fall, by themselves, within the patent scope.

The Court also considered the meaning of the FRAND declaration under French law because ESTI IPR Policy is governed by the laws of France according to its Article 12, and concluded that merely being "prepared to grant" does not give rise to an actual license. No license agreement was established even if Samsung made the FRAND declaration.

Also, the Court held that abusive use of rights may be found for any amount of damages beyond a reasonable royalty under FRAND terms unless special circumstances are shown to exist, such as lack of willingness to take a license on the part of the other party, but no abusive use would be found if a demand for damages remains within such reasonable royalty. Even if the patent is declared essential to the technical standards, rights to obtain a reasonable royalty under the FRAND terms should not be restricted solely because the patented technology belongs to the standards. The Court then calculated the damages award to be JPY 9,955,854 or about US\$ 100,000. In the published version of the decision, important numbers are redacted to protect trade secrets. In the course of calculation, the Court noted that both parties mentioned the cumulative royalty of 5% with respect to the UMTS Standards, and used this figure. Also, the Court noted that 529 patent families are involved in the UMTS Standards, and that the Samsung's patent in dispute is not considered particularly important compared with other patents. The Court divided the cumulative royalty by 529.

For the preliminary injunction actions, the IP High Court concluded that Apple's Products 2 and 4 infringed the Samsung Patent, but demanding preliminary injunctions would be abusive use of rights, and injunctions are not allowable in view of the FRAND declaration.

## **COMMENTS**

These decisions marked the ninth instance of decisions issued by a Grand Panel since the IP High Court started in April 2005. The IP High Court can

choose a case and have it reviewed by a Grand Panel at its discretion.

The original district court panel headed by Judge Ichiro Otaka had summarily rejected Samsung's claims for both preliminary injunctions and damages as abusive use of rights, which is prohibited by Article 1(3) of the Civil Code, although the panel found the patent in dispute essential, valid and infringed. In the decision for the DJ action, the Court stated that: "The defendant violated an obligation based on the principles of good faith and trust to provide material information during the preparatory stage of a license agreement on FRAND terms concerning the patent in question and to faithfully negotiate. Also, the defendant continues to maintain, as of the date of closing arguments, petitions for preliminary injunction orders against importation and sale, etc., based on the present patent. Furthermore, it was more than two years later that Samsung reported the existence of the disputed patent to the ETSI after Samsung presented a request for technical changes that were eventually adopted as part of the technical standards. In consideration of these circumstances as well as other events that occurred during the licensing negotiations concerning the present patent, it is not allowed, as it would constitute an abusive use of rights, to enforce the right to obtain damages based on the present patent on Products 2 and 4."

The current IP High Court decision is more nuanced and gives balanced considerations to many different factors and theories, such as the nature of the IPR policy of an SSO and patent exhaustion. The calculated award of damages, about US\$100,000, is not large by any measure, but if we think of the fact

that mobile phones and many tablets now use the third generation mobile communication standards, and 3G communication is only one of many features the devices have, the award of damages that comes from only two Apple products may have to be small. In the published version of the court decision, while specific numbers used for damages calculation are redacted, there is no sign of the court's willingness to mark up an award because this is after all an infringement case.

When the IP High Court announced that a Grand Panel would review this case, it also solicited public comments on the issue of FRAND or RAND declarations and enforceability of a patent. This was the very first time any Japanese court solicited public comments on a civil case. Fifty-eight briefs were submitted to the two law firms handling these cases. As Japan does not have an amicus brief system, public comments are collected by law firms and are then submitted to the court as part of documentary evidence. The IP High Court spent two pages of its 163-page decision summarizing the submitted comments and reflecting on them.

This decision and another Grand Panel decision on patent term extensions of May 30, 2014 mark the end of the very distinguished career of "Judge" Toshiaki Iimura. He retired from the position of Chief Judge at the IP High Court on June 15, 2014 and became an attorney at law. We owe much to him for the current health of the Japanese IP system.

~~~~~

* *Editor / Patent Attorney, Okuyama & Sasajima*

Shrimp Disease Kit Wins the Student Biz Plan Contest

By Jinzo Fujino *

LES Japan held its 37th annual conference on June 6 and 7, 2014 in Nago, Okinawa. After the completion of the conference program, one of the preliminary rounds in Japan for the 3rd LES Asia Pacific Student Business Plan Competition was held at a beach-side resort where the LESJ conference was held. Later on July 8, 2014, the other preliminary round was held in Tokyo. The winner of the preliminary round in Japan is supposed to participate in the final round in Seoul, Korea this coming November.

For the Okinawa preliminary round on July 7, 2014, four university teams registered. Three registrations were of universities in Okinawa and one from Tokyo.

However, two Okinawa teams did not show up for the oral presentation so the actual competition was between a team of the Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University (OIST) and a team of the Tokyo University of Science (TUS).

The first presenter was the TUS team from Tokyo. The team of three graduate students presented a business plan to commercialize a rail connector product called "Train Tech." Train Tech aims at the growing railway market, especially, railways for the bullet train or Shinkansen. Train Tech, when placed into an opening between the two ends of train rails, functions to absorb longitudinal extension of the rail in hot summer. When it is winter, Train Tech extends to fill the opening between the two rail ends because of the nature of inverse Perovskite.** Train

Tech is expected to result in a reduction in accidents caused by the buckling of train rails due to thermal extension. It will also substantially reduce the occurrence of noise because of the filled-in openings. Their business plan features a business model in combination with a patent licensing strategy, as well as a standardization strategy.

[** Inverse Perovskites are inorganic compounds with a perovskite structure. There exists a number of minerals whose structures can be regarded as inverse perovskite-based. The structures of sulphohalite, galeite, schairerite, kogarkoite, nacaphite, arctite, polyphite, hatrurite and related compounds are commonly considered.]

The OIST team introduced a plan to commercialize a learning system called “Halo” which provides a customized system to assist individual users to learn English. Taking into account the Forgetting Curve created by Herman Ebbinghaus, the Halo system improves the effectiveness of language learning through the Halo system. For learners of English words, for example, the Halo system issues a timely reminder to an individual user with words to remember repeatedly until the learner memorizes the words. Their service will be eventually available through the mobile device using relevant applications. Their plan seeks funds from outside. According to the plan, the Halo system can be used not only for language learners but also students of physics and math.

The other preliminary round was held on July 8, 2018 in Tokyo. Initially, there were two registrants for the Tokyo round, but only one team participated

to the oral presentation of their plan. The team comprising two Vietnamese students and one Japanese student, all of them from Tokyo University



of Marine Science and Technology, introduced a business plan for marketing a test kit for shrimp diseases. Using an advanced biotechnology, the kit detects low levels of shrimp virus, especially WSSV (White Spot Syndrome Virus) which can kill whole pond of shrimp within a day after the pond is infected. Since there are more shrimp viral diseases which lead to high mortality rate that affect the production and growth of shrimp industry, their plan sees a potential market place in shrimp producing countries. The plan includes applications for patents and expected financial support from the Philippine Government.

As for the results, the team from the Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology won the position of a candidate to the final round of the 2014 Asia-Pacific Student Business Competition in Seoul, Korea. In 2013, a Hong Kong team won the first price in Hangzhou, China, and in 2012, a Korean team won in Tokyo, Japan. Please stay tuned to find out which team will be the champion for the 2014 contest.

~~~~~

\*Editor/ Professor, Tokyo University of Science

---

## IP News from Japan

**By Shoichi Okuyama, Ph.D.\***

### **New Chief Judge at the IP High Court**

On June 15, 2014, Judge Ryuichi Shitara was elevated to the position of Chief Judge at the Intellectual Property High Court (IP High Court), succeeding the distinguished Chief Judge Toshiaki Imura, who reached mandatory retirement age. Both are prominent leaders of the intellectual property community in Japan.

### **JPO to Examine PCT Cases from the US**

In June 2014, the Japan Patent Office announced that it had reached an agreement with the US Patent

and Trademark Office to begin a pilot project in April 2015 and prepare International Search Reports and International Preliminary Examination Reports for PCT applications filed at the USPTO. Over three years, the JPO examiners will examine up to 5,000 applications for green technologies in the English language.

### **Honda “Super Cub” Registered as a 3D Trademark**

In June 2014, Honda Motor Co., Ltd., was granted a trademark registration for motorcycles (No. 5674666) for the design of its best-selling “Super Cub” motorcycles. Honda started its line of Super Cub motorcycles in 1958. Since then, it has sold more

than 87 million worldwide to the end of March 2014. As of April 2012, more than 5,000 applications had been filed for three-dimensional trademarks without any words, and 2,082 registrations were granted according to Info-Sonar Corp. Applications for three-dimensional trademarks were first accepted in 1997 in Japan. Initially, it was very difficult to obtain trademark registrations on products themselves with the designation of such products. On November 16, 2012, the IP High Court allowed the registration of a container design of popular lactobacillus beverages, Yakult (Case No. 2010(gyo-ke)10169) for beverages, and this marked a sea change. Other three-dimensional trademark registrations for product designs include Ferrari's Registration No. 5103270 (registered on January 11, 2008) for goods including sports cars.



Picture from TM Reg. No. 5674666

### **Patent Term Extension Decisions by the IP High Court**

On May 30, 2012, a Grand Panel of the IP High Court issued four new decisions (Case Nos. 2013(gyo-ke)10195-10198) on patent term extensions, reversing the original decisions made by the Japan Patent Office (JPO).

In the Japanese patent term extension system an entire patent can be extended up to five years beyond the standard 20 years from filing if the patent claims pharmaceutical or agricultural products (Article 67, Patent Act). The extended patent is, however, effective only for the particular product or use that was the subject of government approval based on which the extension was sought (Article 68-2, Patent Act).

When patent term extensions were first allowed in 1988, the JPO initially took the position that an extension is possible only once for a patent that covers an active component of a drug for a particular efficacy and not for a patent covering formulations or dosages of the same active component for the same efficacy. The IP High Court and Supreme Court found that this practice lacks any basis in the Patent Act (IP High Court, Case No. 2008(gyo-ke)10460, etc., May 29, 2009; and Supreme Court, Case No

2009(gyo-hi)326, etc., April 28, 2011). The JPO had to amend its guidelines on patent term extensions in 2011.

Now, the new practice of the JPO has been rejected by the Grand Panel of the IP High Court. A Grand Panel is formed for cases the IP High Court considers important and is made up of the four presiding judges who head the four divisions of the IP High Court, in addition to one less senior judge.

This new case relates to the widely used anticancer drug bevacizumab (Avastin®). The patentee, Genentech, had earlier obtained approvals for 5 mg/kg and 10 mg/kg use for adults for two weeks or more in combination with a drug for ulcers due to malignant tumors, and Genentech also had previously obtained patent terms extensions for such use. Genentech then obtained four new approvals for 7.5 mg/kg use for the same drug for three weeks or longer. Genentech once again sought patent term extensions based on these new approvals, but the JPO initially rejected the extension requests because the patent does not have any claims reciting dosages, and the JPO considered the invention to have nothing to do with dosage regimen.

The IP High Court rejected the argument and canceled the JPO decision allowing additional patent term extensions. Also, in these decisions, the IP High Court noted that an extended patent would cover only a product that has the same composition (not limited to the same active component) and the same use (efficacy, administration, and dosage), and the Court noted that the coverage of the extended patent and the scope of the approval may not be identical.

When the patent term extension system started in Japan in 1988, there was a consensus among the JPO and pharmaceutical industry that only one extension would be allowed for the same active component and the same efficacy. The IP High Court and Supreme Court essentially pointed out that the statutory provisions are not in line with such consensus. Also, extensions may possibly be allowed for each governmental approval because a particular use was not allowed until such approval was granted. The JPO will now have to revise its guidelines again or statutes may have to be amended to end the confusion.

### **Apple Defeated by Individual Inventor**

The IP High Court upheld a Tokyo District Court decision that found patent infringement and granted an award of about US\$3.3 million to an individual inventor who invented and patented a technology used in Apple's iPod since July 2004. The inventor, Mr. Norihiko Saito, proposed to Apple the use of his technology for iPods in January 2004, but negotiations subsequently broke down. The patent covers Apple's "click wheel" technology. The patent in dispute was granted in 2006 (Patent No.



3852854). Both parties appealed to the Supreme Court, according to a news report. The Tokyo District Court took more than six years to hand down a decision on September 26, 2013, but the IP High

Court moved quickly and upheld the decision on April 24, 2014 (Case No. 2013(ne)10086).

~~~~~

* Editor / Patent Attorney, Okuyama & Sasajima

LES Japan 37th Annual Summer Conference 2014 in Okinawa

By Mitsuo Kariya*

LES Japan 37th Annual Summer Conference 2014 was held on 6th and 7th June 2014 in Okinawa prefecture, which is the southernmost region of Japan. The venue was “Bankoku Shinryokan” in Nago city, northern part of Okinawa’s main island. It is known as the historical venue of the "G8 Summit" in 2000. This Conference was supported by the Cabinet Office, the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, the Okinawa Prefectural Government, and the Okinawa Branch of the Japan Institute of Invention and Innovation. The total number of participants for the conference reached 250, including more than 25 participants from abroad, the highest number on record.

The Conference started with opening remarks by Mr. Yuki Ojima, Organizing Committee, Chair and Dr. Ichiro Nakatomi, LES Japan President. Mr. Ojima selected Okinawa as one of the most exciting destinations and the hub of East Asia. Dr. Nakatomi shared his initiative on LES Japan activities with the participants. The first program of the Conference was a keynote speech, “Aiming toward the Nation Best Suited for Innovations” by Mr. Takao Kuramochi, Director General for Science, Technology and Innovation of the Policy Cabinet Office. The second program was a guest speech, “Innovation Achieved with IP – Salt of life” by Mr. Masakatsu Takayasu, President and CEO, NUTIMA-SU Inc. In a witty speech, Mr. Takayasu introduced a story of developing a patented method for producing mineral rich salt from seawater. The third program was a guest speech, “ANA Cargo Strategy -Okinawa Logistics Hub” by Mr. Satoshi Shimazaki, Senior Vice President, Solution Sales, ANA Cargo Inc. The participants learned about the various efforts for “Innovation Hub” from the distinguished speakers.

The banquet started with a congratulatory speech by Mr. Hirokazu Nakaima, Okinawa Prefectural Governor. All participants enjoyed precious moments for chatting and networking with selected drinks and a good combination of local foods and international

foods. In the middle of the banquet, Mr. Junichi Yamazaki, ex-president of LES Japan and Mr. Yasunori Otsuka, ex-vice-president of LES Japan were commended for their numerous long-term contributions to the society. The participants also enjoyed “Eisa”, “Katyusha” and “Shishimai”, Okinawa traditional arts performances.



On the second day, four workshops were organized by working groups of LES Japan. The workshops were: 1) Latest information on intellectual property matters in Singapore and Malaysia; 2) Measures to facilitate Personalized Health Care in Japan; 3) A key to success in University - Institution-Industry collaborative partnership; and 4) Uncovering the myth of patent wars on smart phones - Apple v. Samsung.

After the workshops, a panel discussion was held based on the theme of “Painting a Future of Japan with Strategic IP Utilization” by Mr. Naoki Yoshida, Partner, Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP as moderator; Mr. Takashi Suzuki, Corporate Officer, General Manager, Intellectual Property Group, HITACHI, Ltd.; Mr. Kenichi Nagasawa, Director, Group Executive, Corporate Intellectual Property and Legal Headquarters, CANON Inc.; and Mr. Shigeharu Yoshii, President & CEO, IP Bridge, Inc. Mr. Suzuki and Mr. Nagasawa discussed IP strategies for the big enterprises with renewing businesses. Mr. Yoshii discussed an IP fund’s roles. The discussions between the three panelists facilitated by Mr. Yoshida provided the participants with a lot of useful suggestions.



The conference concluded successfully with a closing speech by Mr. Chikashi Tamura, Organizing Committee, Chair-elect announcing the 2015 LES Japan Annual Summer Conference in Sendai city, Miyagi prefecture.

We look forward to seeing you next July in Sendai.

~~~~~  
\*Editor/ Licensing Director and Executive Counselor at  
GE Japan Corporation, Patent Attorney

---

## Editors' Note

This issue includes articles relating to the first government sponsored IP fund in Japan, "IP Bridge"; a high-profile IP High Court Decision on the Apple v. Samsung case; the Japan preliminary rounds for the 2014 Asia-Pacific Student Business Competition; "IP News from Japan"; and the 2014 LES Japan Annual Summer Conference.

Thank you for your support of "*Winds from Japan*". This news letter will continue to provide you with useful information on activities at LES Japan and up-to-date information on IP and licensing activities in Japan.

If you would like to refer to any back issues of our newsletters, you can access them via the following URL: <http://www.lesj.org>

(MK)

### **WINDS from Japan Editorial Board Members, 2014**

Editor in Chief:

**Mitsuo Kariya**

Editors:

**Jinzo Fujino; Shoichi Okuyama;  
Kazuaki Okimoto; Junichi Yamazaki;  
Kei Konishi; Robert Hollingshead;  
Naoki Yoshida; Takao Yagi;  
Hideko Mihara.**