

Kluwer Copyright Blog

The CJEU decides that punitive damages are not contrary to Directive 2004/48

Miquel Montaña (Clifford Chance) · Thursday, March 2nd, 2017

On 25 January 2017, the CJEU handed down a very interesting judgment in case [C-367/15](#), concluding that Article 13 of Directive EC 2004/48 (better known as “the Enforcement Directive”) does not prevent a national regulation from stating that when an intellectual property right (“IPR”) has been infringed, the IPR owner may claim an amount corresponding to twice the remuneration amount that the third party would have had to pay to make an authorized use of the IPR in question. This finding is interesting, as it confirms that the aim of the Enforcement Directive was simply to introduce “minimum” standards of protection across the EU, which does not prevent the national laws of Member States from conferring a higher level of protection, such as punitive damages.

In particular, the judgment highlights that the fact that although the inclusion of the concept of punitive damages into the text of the Enforcement Directive was being debated but was ultimately ruled out, does not mean that Member States cannot introduce punitive damages into their national legislation. It simply means that they are not required to do so.

No doubt, this judgment will require the courts of some Member States, such as Spain, to revisit their case law on this topic. Certainly, the clear teaching of this judgment is that national courts cannot rely on the text or negotiation history of the Enforcement Directive to reduce any wider protection resulting from national law.

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Copyright Blog, please subscribe [here](#).


Kluwer IP Law

The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer** survey showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future? [Learn how Kluwer IP Law](#) can support you.

79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

Drive change with Kluwer IP Law.

The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.



2022 SURVEY REPORT
The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer
Leading change

This entry was posted on Thursday, March 2nd, 2017 at 2:16 pm and is filed under [inter alia](#), for ensuring that EU law is interpreted and applied in a consistent way in all EU countries. If a national court is in doubt about the interpretation or validity of an EU law, it can ask the Court for clarification. The same mechanism can be used to determine whether a national law or practice is compatible with EU law. The CJEU also resolves legal disputes between national governments and EU institutions, and can take action against EU institutions on behalf of individuals, companies or organisations.">CJEU, Damages, Enforcement, European Union, Remedies You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. You can leave a response, or [trackback](#) from your own site.