Falco Privatstiftung
and
Thomas Rabitsch
v.
Gisela Weller-Lindhorst

C-533/07
23 April 2009

Jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters – Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 – Special jurisdiction – Article 5(1)(a) and second indent of Article 5(1)(b) – Concept of 'provision of services' – Contract assigning intellectual property rights

OPERATIVE PART:

1. The second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters, is to be interpreted to the effect that a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants its contractual partner the right to use that right in return for remuneration is not a contract for the provision of services within the meaning of that provision.

2. In order to determine, under Article 5(1)(a) of Regulation No 44/2001, the court having jurisdiction over an application for remuneration owed pursuant to a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants to its contractual partner the right to use that right, reference must continue to be made to the principles which result from the case-law of the Court of Justice on Article 5(1) of the Convention of 27 September 1968 on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters, as amended by the Convention of 26 May 1989 on the Accession of the Kingdom of Spain and the Portuguese Republic.

EXCERPT FROM THE REASONS:

1 This reference for a preliminary ruling concerns the interpretation of Article 5(1)(a) and the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (OJ 2001 L 12, p. 1).

2 The reference was made in proceedings between Falco Privatstiftung, a foundation established in Vienna (Austria), and Mr Rabitsch, residing in Vienna (Austria), on the one hand and Ms Weller-Lindhorst, domiciled in Munich (Germany), on the other hand, concerning, first, the performance of a contract pursuant to which the applicants in the main proceedings have licensed the defendant in the main proceedings to market, in Austria, Germany and Switzerland, video recordings of a concert and, second, the marketing, without any contractual basis, of audio recordings of the same concert.

Falco Privatstiftung
i
Thomas Rabitsch
protiv
Gisele Weller-Lindhorst

C-533/07
23. travnja 2009.

Sudska nadležnost te priznanje i ovrha odluka u građanskim i trgovačkim stvarima – Uredba (EZ) br. 44/2001 – posebna nadležnost – članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (a) i (b) druga alineja – pojam pružanja usluga – ugovori kojima se prenose prava intelektualnog vlasništva

IZREKA:

1. Članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (b) drugu alineju Uredbe (EZ) br. 44/2001 Vijeća od 22. prosinca 2000. o sudskoj nadležnosti i priznanju i ovrsi odluka u građanskim i trgovačkim stvarima treba tumačiti tako da ugovor kojim nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva svom ugovornom partneru daje pravo korištenja tog intelektualnog vlasništva uz naknadu, nije ugovor o pružanju usluga u smislu te odredbe.

2. Koji je sud prema članku 5. stavku 1. podstavku (a) Uredbe br. 44/2001 nadležan za odlučivanje o tužbi radi plaćanja naknade koja se duguje na temelju ugovora kojim nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva dopušta svom ugovornom partneru pravo njegova korištenja i nadalje se treba procijeniti prema načelima koja proizlaze iz sudske prakse Suda uz članak 5. stavak 1. Konvencije od 27. rujna 1968. o sudskoj nadležnosti i ovrsi sudskih odluka u građanskim i trgovačkim stvarima u inačici izmijenjenoj Konvencijom od 26. svibnja 1989. o pristupanju Kraljevine Španjolske i Portugalske Republike.

IZ OBRAZLOŽENJA:

1 Zahtjev za prethodnom odlukom odnosi se na tumačenje članka 5. stavka 1. podstavaka (a) i (b) druge alineje Uredbe br. 44/2001 Vijeća od 22. prosinca 2000. o sudskoj nadležnosti i priznanju i ovrsi odluka u građanskim i trgovačkim stvarima (SL 2001, L 12, str. 1).

2 Taj zahtjev postavljen je u okviru sudskog spora koji je pokrenula privatna zaklada Falco Privatstiftung sa sjedištem u Beču (Austrija) i gospodin Rabitsch, s prebivalištem u Beču (Austrija), protiv gospođe Weller-Lindhorst, s prebivalištem u Münchenu (Njemačka), u kojem se s jedne strane radi o ispunjenju ugovora kojim su tužitelji iz glavnog postupka tuženiku iz glavnog postupka dopustili da u Austriji, Njemačkoj i Švicarskoj stavi u promet videosnimke koncerta, a s druge strane o puštanju u promet tonskih snimki tog koncerta bez ugovorne osnove.

Legal context

The Brussels Convention

3 Article 5(1) of the Convention of 27 September 1968 on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (OJ 1978 L 304, p. 36), as amended by the Convention of 26 May 1989 on the Accession of the Kingdom of Spain and the Portuguese Republic (OJ 1989 L 285, p. 1, 'the Brussels Convention') provides:

'A person domiciled in a Contracting State may, in another Contracting State, be sued:

(1) in matters relating to a contract, in the courts for the place of performance of the obligation in question; …'

Regulation No 44/2001

4 Recital 2 in the preamble to Regulation No 44/2001 states:

'Certain differences between national rules governing jurisdiction and recognition of judgments hamper the sound operation of the internal market. Provisions to unify the rules of conflict of jurisdiction in civil and commercial matters and to simplify the formalities with a view to rapid and simple recognition and enforcement of judgments from Member States bound by this Regulation are essential.'

5 Recital 11 in the preamble to Regulation No 44/2001 is worded as follows:

'The rules of jurisdiction must be highly predictable and founded on the principle that jurisdiction is generally based on the defendant's domicile and jurisdiction must always be available on this ground save in a few well-defined situations in which the subject-matter of the litigation or the autonomy of the parties warrants a different linking factor. …'

6 Recital 12 in the preamble to Regulation No 44/2001 provides:

'In addition to the defendant's domicile, there should be alternative grounds of jurisdiction based on a close link between the court and the action or in order to facilitate the sound administration of justice.'

7 Recital 19 in the preamble to Regulation No 44/2001 states:

'Continuity between the Brussels Convention and this Regulation should be ensured, and transitional provisions should be laid down to that end. The same need for continuity applies as regards the interpretation of the Brussels Convention by the Court …'

8 The rules on jurisdiction laid down by Regulation No 44/2001 are set out in Chapter II thereof, consisting of Articles 2 to 31.

9 Article 2(1) of Regulation No 44/2001, which forms part of Section 1 of Chapter II, entitled 'General provisions', states:

'Subject to this Regulation, persons domiciled in a Member State shall, whatever their nationality, be sued in the courts of that Member State.'

10 Article 3(1) which appears in the same section, provides:

'Persons domiciled in a Member State may be sued in the courts of another Member State only by virtue of the rules set out in Sections 2 to 7 of this Chapter.'

11 Article 5, which appears in Section 2, entitled 'Special jurisdiction', of Chapter II of Regulation No 44/2001, provides:

'A person domiciled in a Member State may, in another Member State, be sued:

(1) (a) in matters relating to a contract, in the courts for the place of performance of the obligation in question;

Pravni okvir

Bruxelleska konvencija

3 Člankom 5. stavkom 1. Konvencije od 27. rujna 1968. o sudskoj nadležnosti i ovrsi sudskih odluka u građanskim i trgovačkim stvarima (SL 1972, L 299, str. 32) u inačici izmijenjenoj Konvencijom od 26. svibnja 1989. o pristupanju Kraljevine Španjolske i Portugalske Republike (SL L 285, str. 1) (u daljnjem tekstu: Bruxelleska konvencija) određeno je kako slijedi:

"Osoba s prebivalištem u nekoj državi potpisnici može biti tužena u drugoj državi potpisnici:

1. u sporovima iz ugovora pred sudom mjesta u kojemu je obveza o kojoj je riječ ispunjena ili je trebala biti ispunjena …"

Uredba br. 44/2001

4 Druga uvodna izjava Uredbe br. 44/2001 glasi:

"Određene razlike između nacionalnih propisa koji uređuju nadležnost i priznanje sudskih odluka sprječavaju neometano djelovanje unutarnjega tržišta. Nužno je da države članice koje ova Uredba obvezuje usvoje propise za ujednačavanje pravila o sukobu nadležnosti u građanskim i trgovačkim stvarima te za pojednostavljivanje formalnosti radi brzog i jednostavnog priznanja i ovrhe sudskih odluka."

5 U jedanaestoj uvodnoj izjavi Uredbe br. 44/2001 navodi se kako slijedi:

"Propisi o nadležnosti moraju biti visoko predvidljivi i utemeljeni na načelu da se nadležnost uglavnom utvrđuje prema prebivalištu tuženika, pri čemu takva nadležnost mora uvijek postojati, osim u nekim točno određenim slučajevima, u kojima je zbog predmeta spora ili stranačke slobode ugovaranja opravdana neka druga poveznica. …"

6 Dvanaesta uvodna izjava Uredbe br. 44/2001 glasi:

"Osim prebivališta tuženika moraju postojati alternativne osnove za nadležnost, utemeljene na bliskoj vezi između suda i spora ili radi olakšavanja pravilnog suđenja."

7 U devetnaestoj uvodnoj izjavi Uredbe br. 44/2001 stoji:

"Kako bi se osigurao kontinuitet između Bruxelleske konvencije i ove Uredbe potrebno je donijeti prijelazne odredbe. Kontinuitet je potreban i u pogledu tumačenja Bruxelleske konvencije od strane Suda Europskih zajednica…"

8 Odredbe o nadležnosti iz Uredbe br. 44/2001 sadržane su u Poglavlju II koje se sastoji od članaka 2. do 31.

9 Člankom 2. stavkom 1. Uredbe br. 44/2001, koji je sastavni dio Odjeljka 1. ("Opće odredbe") u Poglavlju II., određeno je kako slijedi:

"Podložno odredbama ove Uredbe, osobe s prebivalištem u nekoj državi članici mogu biti tužene, bez obzira na njihovo državljanstvo, pred sudovima te države članice."

10 Člankom 3. stavkom 1. Uredbe br. 44/2001, koji se nalazi u istom odjeljku, predviđeno je kako slijedi:

"Osobe s prebivalištem u nekoj državi članici mogu biti tužene pred sudovima neke druge države članice samo prema odredbama odjeljaka 2. – 7. ovog poglavlja."

11 Člankom 5. Uredbe br. 44/2001, koji potpada pod Odjeljak 2. ("Posebna nadležnost") Poglavlja II., određeno je sljedeće:

"Osoba s prebivalištem u nekoj državi članici može biti tužena u drugoj državi članici:

(b) for the purpose of this provision and unless otherwise agreed, the place of performance of the obligation in question shall be:

– in the case of the sale of goods, the place in a Member State where, under the contract, the goods were delivered or should have been delivered,

– in the case of the provision of services, the place in a Member State where, under the contract, the services were provided or should have been provided,

(c) if Article 5(b) does not apply then Article 5(a) applies;

…

(3) in matters relating to tort, delict or quasi-delict, in the courts for the place where the harmful event occurred or may occur;

…'

The dispute in the main proceedings and the questions referred for a preliminary ruling

12 It is apparent from the order for reference that the applicants in the main proceedings request payment of royalties, calculated by reference to the, partially known, amount of sales of video recordings of a concert. They also request that the defendant in the main proceeding be ordered to provide an account of all sales of video and audio recordings and to pay the resulting supplementary royalties. In support of their claims, the applicants in the main proceedings rely on, with regard to the video recordings, the provisions of the contract between them and their contractual partner and, with regard to the sales of audio recordings, a copyright infringement, there being no contractual basis in that regard.

13 At first instance, the Handelsgericht Wien (Commercial Court, Vienna), before which the applicants in the main proceedings brought the matter, held that it had jurisdiction to rule on those claims, pursuant to Article 5(3) of Regulation No 44/2001. It considered that, in view of the close link between the rights relied on, its jurisdiction also covered the fees owed for the video recordings pursuant to the contract at issue, a finding which was challenged by the defendant in the main proceedings.

14 On appeal, the Oberlandesgericht Wien (Higher Regional Court, Vienna) held that Article 5(3) of Regulation No 44/2001 was not applicable to contractual rights, nor was the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) applicable, since the contract in question was not a contract for the provision of services within the meaning of that provision.

15 An appeal on a point of law having being brought before the Oberster Gerichtshof (Supreme Court), concerning only the claims in relation to the distribution of the video recordings, that court noted that the concept of 'provision of services' is not defined in Regulation No 44/2001. Referring to the case-law of the Court of Justice on the freedom to provide services and to certain directives on value added tax ('VAT') favouring a broad interpretation of the concept of services, the referring court asks whether a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants its contractual partner the right to use that right in return for remuneration is a contract regarding 'the provision of services' within the meaning of the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001. Should that be the case, the referring court raises the question of the place of provision of that service and the question whether the competent court can also rule on the payments in relation to the use of the intellectual property rights in question in another Member State or in a third country.

1. a) u sporovima iz ugovora pred sudom mjesta u kojemu je obveza o kojoj je riječ ispunjena ili u kojemu je trebala biti ispunjena;

b) u smislu ove odredbe, osim ako nije drugačije ugovoreno, mjesto ispunjenja obveze o kojoj je riječ jest:

– ako se radi o kupoprodaji robe, mjesto u državi članici u kojemu je, prema ugovoru, roba isporučena ili je trebala biti isporučena;

– ako se radi o pružanju usluga, mjesto u državi članici u kojemu su, prema ugovoru, usluge pružene ili su trebale biti pružene;

c) ako se ne primjenjuje podstavak (b), primjenjuje se podstavak (a);

…

3. u sporovima o izvanugovornoj odgovornosti za štetu ili odgovornosti koja je izjednačena s tom odgovornosti, pred sudom mjesta gdje se štetni događaj dogodio ili gdje bi se mogao dogoditi;

…"

Glavni postupak i postavljena pitanja

12 Iz odluke o postavljanju pitanja proizlazi da tužitelji iz glavnog postupka traže plaćanje naknade na temelju dijelom poznatih mjesečnih podataka o prodaji videosnimki koncerta. Osim toga traže da se naloži tuženiku iz glavnog postupka da podnese račun o ukupnom broju prodanih video i tonskih zapisa te plate dodatnu naknadu koja iz toga proizlazi. Tužitelji iz glavnog postupka svoje zahtjeve glede videozapisa zasnivaju na odredbama ugovora s ugovornim partnerom, a glede prodaje tonskih zapisa na povredi autorskih prava jer za to ne postoji ugovorna osnova.

13 U prvom je stupnju trgovački sud pred kojim su tužitelji iz glavnog postupka pokrenuli spor odlučio da je nadležan za odlučivanje o njihovim zahtjevima prema članku 5. stavku 3. Uredbe br. 44/2001. Taj je sud smatrao da se njegova nadležnost zbog uske veze između istaknutih zahtjeva proteže i na neplaćene ugovorne naknade za videosnimke, što je tuženik iz glavnog postupka osporavao.

14 U drugom stupnju *Oberlandesgericht Wien* (Viši zemaljski sud u Beču) smatrao je da se članak 5. stavak 3. Uredbe br. 44/2001 ne može primjenjivati na ugovorne zahtjeve, a ni članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (b) druga alineja te Uredbe, budući da se kod dotičnog ugovora ne radi o pružanju usluga u smislu te odredbe.

15 *Oberster Gerichtshof* (Vrhovni sud) kojem je podnesen revizijski zahtjev o pravnom pitanju samo u odnosu na distribuciju videosnimki smatra da pojam "pružanje usluga" nije definiran u Uredbi br. 44/2001. Nacionalni sud ukazao je na sudsku praksu Suda u području slobode kretanja usluga i u svezi s određenim direktivama o porezu na dodanu vrijednost koje idu u prilog širokom poimanju pojma usluga i postavio pitanje može li se ugovor kojim nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva odobrava svom ugovornom partneru korištenje tog prava uz naknadu kvalificirati kao ugovor o "pružanju usluga" u smislu članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje Uredbe br. 44/2001. Prema shvaćanju toga suda u tom se slučaju postavlja pitanje o mjestu pružanja usluge i pitanje može li nadležni sud odlučivati i o naknadi za korištenje licence u pogledu spornih autorskih prava u drugoj državi članici ili trećoj državi.

16 If jurisdiction cannot be based on the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001, the referring court considers that, by virtue of Article 5(1)(c) of that regulation, the rule set out in Article 5(1)(a) should be applied. According to the referring court, in matters involving Article 5(1)(a) of Regulation No 44/2001, the decisive factor is the place of performance of the contested obligation, pursuant to Case 14/76 *De Bloos* [1976] ECR 1497; the place of performance must be determined in accordance with the law applicable to the contract at issue in the main proceedings, in accordance with Case 12/76 *Industrie Tessili Italiana Como* [1976] ECR 1473.

17 In the light of all of the above considerations, the Oberster Gerichtshof decided to stay the proceedings and refer the following questions to the Court for a preliminary ruling:

'1. Is a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants the other contracting party the right to use that right (a licence agreement) a contract regarding "the provision of services" within the meaning of Article 5(1)(b) of [Regulation No 44/2001]?

2. If Question 1 is answered in the affirmative:

(a) Is the service provided at each place in a Member State where use of the right is allowed under the contract and also actually occurs?

(b) Or is the service provided where the licensor is domiciled or at the place of the licensor's central administration?

(c) If Question 2(a) or Question 2(b) is answered in the affirmative, does the court which has jurisdiction also have the power to rule on royalties which result from use of the right in another Member State or in a third country?

3. If Question 1 or Questions 2(a) and 2(b) are answered in the negative: is jurisdiction as regards payment of royalties under Article 5(1)(a) and (c) of [Regulation No 44/2001] still to be determined in accordance with the principles which result from the case-law of the Court of Justice on Article 5(1) of the [Brussels Convention]?'

The questions referred for a preliminary ruling

The first question

18 By its first question, the national court asks, essentially, whether a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants its contractual partner the right to use the right in return for remuneration, is a contract for the provision of services within the meaning of the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001.

19 First of all, it should be noted that the wording of the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001 does not of itself enable an answer to be given to the question referred, since it does not define the concept of a contract for the provision of services.

20 Consequently, the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001 must be interpreted in the light of the origins, objectives and scheme of that regulation (see, to that effect, Case C-103/05 *Reisch Montage* [2006] ECR I-6827, paragraph 29; Case C-283/05 *ASML* [2006] ECR I-12041, paragraphs 16 and 22; and Case C-386/05 *Color Drack* [2007] ECR I-3699, paragraph 18).

16 Za slučaj da se nadležnost ne može ustanoviti na temelju članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje Uredbe br. 44/2001, nacionalni sud smatra da se prema članku 5. stavku 1. podstavku (c) ove Uredbe treba primijeniti pravilo iz članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (a). U okviru članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (a) Uredbe br. 44/2001 bitno je prema presudi od 6. listopada 1976., *De Bloos* (14/76, [1976] ECR 1497) mjesto ispunjenja obveze o kojoj je riječ, a koje se prema presudi od 6. listopada 1976., *Tessili* (12/76, [1976] ECR, 1473), treba odrediti prema pravu koje se primjenjuje na ugovor.

17 Na temelju svih ovih razmatranja *Oberster Gerichtshof* obustavio je postupak i postavio Sudu sljedeća pitanja radi donošenja prethodne odluke:

1. Je li ugovor kojim nositelj prava na intelektualno vlasništvo dopušta ugovornom partneru pravo korištenja tog prava (ugovor o licenci) ugovor o "pružanju usluga" u smislu članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) Uredbe br. 44/2001?

2. Ako je odgovor na prvo pitanje potvrdan:

a) Pruža li se usluga na svakom mjestu u državi članici u kojemu je dopušteno korištenje prava prema ugovoru i u kojemu doista dolazi do korištenja prava?

b) Ili se usluga pruža u prebivalištu, odnosno u mjestu glavne uprave davatelja licence?

c) Je li sud koji je nadležan kod potvrdnog odgovora na drugo pitanje pod točkom a) ili točkom b) ovlašten odlučivati i o naknadi za korištenje licence koja proizlazi iz korištenja tog prava u drugoj državi članici ili u nekoj trećoj državi?

3. Ako je odgovor na prvo pitanje ili na drugo pitanje pod točkom a) i b) negativan, treba li se nadležnost za plaćanje naknade za korištenje licence prema članku 5. stavku 1. podstavku (a) i (c) Uredbe br. 44/2001 i nadalje određivati prema onim načelima koja proizlaze iz sudske prakse Europskog suda u vezi s člankom 5. stavkom 1. Bruxelleske konvencije?

O postavljenim pitanjima

O prvom pitanju

18 Prvim pitanjem nacionalni sud želi znati je li ugovor kojim nositelj nekog prava intelektualnog vlasništva svom ugovornom partneru odobrava pravo njegova korištenja uz naknadu ugovor o pružanju usluga u smislu članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje Uredbe br. 44/2001.

19 Prvo je potrebno konstatirati da tekst članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje Uredbe br. 44/2001 sam za sebe ne omogućuje odgovor na to pitanje, jer u toj odredbi nije sadržana definicija pojma ugovora o pružanju usluga.

20 Stoga se članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (b) druga alineja Uredbe br. 44/2001 treba tumačiti u svjetlu povijesti nastanka, ciljeva i logike ove Uredbe (usporedi u tom smislu presude od 13. srpnja 2006., *Reisch Montage,* C-103/05, [2006] ECR I-6827, točka 29., i od 14. prosinca 2006., *ASML,* C-283/05, [2006] ECR I-12041, točke 16. i 22., te od 3. svibnja 2007., *Color Drack,* C-386/05, [2007] ECR I-3699, točka 18.).

21 In that regard, it is apparent from recitals 2 and 11 in its preamble that Regulation No 44/2001 seeks to unify the rules of conflict of jurisdiction in civil and commercial matters by way of rules of jurisdiction which are highly predictable.

22 Accordingly, Regulation No 44/2001 pursues an objective of legal certainty which consists in strengthening the legal protection of persons established in the European Community, by enabling the applicant to identify easily the court in which he may sue and the defendant reasonably to foresee before which court he may be sued (see *Reisch Montage*, paragraphs 24 and 25, and *Color Drack*, paragraph 20).

23 The rules of jurisdiction laid down by Regulation No 44/2001 are founded on the principle that jurisdiction is generally based on the defendant's domicile, as provided in Article 2 thereof, complemented by the rules of special jurisdiction (see *Reisch Montage*, paragraph 22, and *Color Drack*, paragraph 21).

24 Thus, the rule that jurisdiction is generally based on the defendant's domicile is complemented, in Article 5(1) of Regulation No 44/2001, by a rule of special jurisdiction in matters relating to a contract. The reason for that rule, which reflects a desire for proximity, is the existence of a close link between the contract and the court called upon to hear and determine the case.

25 Under that rule of special jurisdiction, the defendant may also be sued in the court for the place of performance of the obligation in question, since that court is presumed to have a close link to the contract.

26 In order to reinforce the primary objective of legal certainty which governs the rules of jurisdiction which it sets out, that criterion of a link is defined autonomously by Regulation No 44/2001 in the case of the sale of goods.

27 By virtue of the first indent of Article 5(1)(b) of that Regulation, the place of performance of the obligation in question is the place in a Member State where, under the contract, the goods were delivered or should have been delivered.

28 It is in the light of those considerations that it must be determined whether a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants its contractual partner the right to use that right in return for remuneration is a contract for the provision of services within the meaning of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001.

29 In that respect, as the German, Italian and United Kingdom Governments have argued in the written observations which they have submitted to the Court, the concept of service implies, at the least, that the party who provides the service carries out a particular activity in return for remuneration.

30 It cannot be inferred from a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants its contractual partner the right to use that right in return for remuneration that such an activity is involved.

31 By such a contract, the only obligation which the owner of the right granted undertakes with regard to its contractual partner is not to challenge the use of that right by the latter. As pointed out by the Advocate General in point 58 of her Opinion, the owner of an intellectual property right does not perform any service in granting a right to use that property and undertakes merely to permit the licensee to exploit that right freely.

21 Prema drugoj i jedanaestoj uvodnoj izjavi Uredbe br. 44/2001, njezin je cilj uskladiti propise o međunarodnoj nadležnosti u građanskim i trgovačkim stvarima putem propisa o nadležnosti koji su u velikoj mjeri predvidivi.

22 Uredbom br. 44/2001 na taj se način nastoji ostvariti pravna sigurnost koja se sastoji u tome da se pravna zaštita osoba s prebivalištem u Europskoj zajednici poboljša tako što tužitelj može bez poteškoća ustanoviti kojem se sudu može obratiti i što tuženik može predvidjeti pred kojim sudom može biti tužen (usporedi presude *Reisch Montage*, točke 24. i 25., te *Color Drack*, točka 20.).

23 Pravila o nadležnosti utvrđena Uredbom br. 44/2001 pri tom polaze od opće nadležnosti suda u prebivalištu tuženika prema članku 2. ove Uredbe, a dopunjuju ih pravila o posebnoj nadležnosti (usporedi presude *Reisch Montage*, točka 22., i Color Drack, točka 21.).

24 Na taj se način pravilo o nadležnosti suda u prebivalištu tuženika dopunjuje pravilom o posebnoj nadležnosti suda za sporove iz ugovora iz članka 5. stavka 1. Uredbe br. 44/2001. Razlog za ovo pravilo koje je u skladu s ciljem teritorijalne blizine leži u uskoj vezi između ugovora i suda koji odlučuje o sporu.

25 Prema ovom pravilu o posebnoj sudskoj nadležnosti, tuženik može biti tužen i pred sudom u mjestu u kojem je obveza ispunjena ili je trebala biti ispunjena, jer se polazi od uske veze između toga suda i ugovora.

26 Kako bi se osnažio glavni cilj pravne sigurnosti na kojem počivaju pravila o nadležnosti sadržana u Uredbi br. 44/2001, njome se autonomno određuje ta poveznica kod kupoprodaje robe.

27 Prema članku 5. stavku 1. podstavku (b) drugoj alineji Uredbe br. 44/2001 mjesto ispunjenja obveze jest mjesto u državi članici u kojemu su, prema ugovoru, usluge pružene ili su trebale biti pružene.

28 U svjetlu ovih razmatranja potrebno je odrediti je li ugovor kojim nositelj prava na intelektualno vlasništvo svom ugovornom partneru odobrava pravo njegova korištenja uz naknadu ugovor o pružanju usluga u smislu članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje Uredbe br. 44/2001.

29 U tom kontekstu pojam usluga, kako to ističu njemačka i talijanska vlada, kao i vlada Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva u svojim podnescima sudu, znači barem da stranka koja ih pruža obavlja određenu djelatnost uz naknadu.

30 Ugovor kojim nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva svom ugovornom partneru odobrava pravo korištenja tog prava uz naknadu ne uključuje međutim nikakvu djelatnost.

31 Takvim se ugovorom naime nositelj prava čije je korištenje prepušteno obvezuje samo da se neće protiviti tome da njegov ugovorni partner koristi to pravo. Kako je nezavisna odvjetnica iznijela u točki 58. svog mišljenja, nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva ne pruža nikakvu uslugu time što je dopustio korištenje tog prava i samo se obvezuje da će svom ugovornom partneru dopustiti slobodno korištenje tog prava.

32 In that respect, it is immaterial whether the licensee of an intellectual property right holder is obliged to use the intellectual property right licensed.

33 That analysis cannot be called into question by the arguments concerning the interpretation of the concept of 'services' within the meaning of Article 50 EC or secondary Community legislation other than Regulation No 44/2001 and the broad logic and scheme of Article 5(1) of that Regulation.

34 First, no element in the broad logic and scheme of Article 5(1) of Regulation No 44/2001 requires that the concept of 'provision of services' set out in the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of that Regulation be interpreted in the light of the Court's approach to the freedom to provide services within the meaning of Article 50 EC.

35 While that field requires, in certain circumstances, a broad interpretation of the concept of services, that approach is aimed at ensuring that as many economic activities as possible which do not fall within the scope of the free movement of goods, capital or persons do not, by virtue of being so excluded, fall outside the scope of application of the EC Treaty.

36 Under the scheme laid down by Regulation No 44/2001, the fact that a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants its contractual partner the right to use that right in return for the payment of remuneration, is not a contract for the provision of services within the meaning of Article 5(1)(b) of that Regulation, does not preclude that contract being subject to that regulation, in particular, to its other rules governing jurisdiction.

37 The broad logic and scheme of the rules governing jurisdiction laid down by Regulation No 44/2001 require, on the contrary, a narrow interpretation of the rules on special jurisdiction, including the rule contained, in matters relating to a contract, in Article 5(1) of that Regulation, which derogate from the general principle that jurisdiction is based on the defendant's domicile.

38 For similar reasons, it is not necessary, secondly, to interpret the concept of the 'provision of services' set out in the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001 in the light of the definition of the concept of 'services' in the Community directives on VAT.

39 As the Advocate General observed in points 71 and 72 of her Opinion, the definition of that concept provided by the directives on VAT is a negative definition which is, by its very nature, necessarily broad, since the concept of 'provision of services' is defined as any transaction which does not constitute a supply of goods. Therefore, those directives consider only two categories of economic activity as taxable transactions within the territory of the Community, namely the delivery of goods and the supply of services.

40 Under Article 5(1) of Regulation No 44/2001, when a contract for the sale of goods is not involved, jurisdiction is not determined, however, only on the basis of the rules which apply to contracts for the provision of services. In accordance with Article 5(1)(c) of that regulation, Article 5(1)(a) is applicable to contracts which are neither contracts for the sale of goods nor contracts for the provision of services.

41 Thirdly and lastly, the argument that a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants its contractual partner the right to use that right in return for remuneration is not a contract for the provision of services, within the meaning the second

32 U ovom je kontekstu nebitno je li ugovorni partner davatelja licence dužan koristiti pravo intelektualnog vlasništva čije mu je korištenje odobreno.

33 Ovaj zaključak ne može se dovesti u pitanje argumentima glede tumačenja pojma "usluge" u smislu članka 50. EZ-a ili drugih odredbi izvedenog prava Zajednice osim Uredbe br. 44/2001 i logikom i sustavom članka 5. stavka 1. ove Uredbe.

34 Kao prvo ni jedan element logike ili sustava Uredbe br. 44/2001 ne zahtijeva tumačenje pojma "pružanje usluga" u članku 5. stavku 1. podstavku (b) drugoj alineji ove Uredbe u skladu s odlukama Suda u području slobodnog kretanja usluga u smislu članka 50. EZ-a.

35 Ako su u ovom području eventualno potrebna daljnja tumačenja pojma usluge, to zato što je cilj osigurati da što više gospodarskih djelatnosti koje ne potpadaju pod opseg primjene slobode kretanja robe ili kapitala ili osoba ne bude isključeno iz primjene Ugovora o Europskoj zajednici.

36 U široj logici i sustavu Uredbe br. 44/2001 okolnost da ugovor kojim nositelj nekog prava intelektualnog vlasništva dopušta svom ugovornom partneru korištenje tog prava uz naknadu ne predstavlja ugovor o pružanju usluga u smislu članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje ove Uredbe ne sprječava da taj ugovor podliježe Uredbi, posebice njezinim ostalim odredbama o sudskoj nadležnosti.

37 Logika i sustav odredbi o nadležnosti Uredbe br. 44/2001 zahtijevaju štoviše usko tumačenje odredbi o posebnoj nadležnosti, među ostalim odredbi članka 5. stavka 1. ove Uredbe u pogledu ugovora, kojima se predviđaju iznimke od općeg načela nadležnosti suda u prebivalištu tuženika.

38 Iz sličnih se razloga i pojam "pružanje usluga" iz članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje Uredbe br. 44/2001 ne smije tumačiti kao pojam "usluge" u smislu direktiva o porezu na dodanu vrijednost Zajednice.

39 Kako je nezavisna odvjetnica istaknula u točkama 71. i 72. svog mišljenja, definicija ovog potonjeg pojma u direktivama o porezu na dodanu vrijednost jest negativna definicija koja je po svojoj prirodi nužno vrlo široka, jer se tamo pojam "pružanje usluga" definira kao svaki promet koji ne znači isporuku robe. U tim direktivama oporezivim prometom u području Zajednice smatraju se samo dvije kategorije gospodarskih djelatnosti, a to su isporuka robe i pružanje usluga.

40 U okviru članka 5. stavka 1. Uredbe br. 44/2001, sudska nadležnost u slučajevima u kojima se ne radi o ugovoru o kupoprodaji robe ne određuje se međutim samo prema pravilima koja se odnose na ugovore o pružanju usluga. Članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (a) ove Uredbe odnosi se naime u skladu s člankom 5. stavkom 1. podstavkom (c), na one ugovore koji nisu ni ugovori o prodaji robe ni ugovori o pružanju usluga.

41 Kao treće i zadnje, argument prema kojemu ugovor kojim nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva odobrava ugovornom partneru pravo korištenja tog prava uz naknadu nije ugovor o pružanju usluga u smislu članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje Uredbe

indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001, cannot be called into question by the requirement, put forward by the Commission of the European Communities, that the scope of application of Article 5(1)(b) be broadly delimited in relation to Article 5(1)(a).

42 It should be noted that it is apparent from the scheme of Article 5(1) of Regulation No 44/2001 that the Community legislature adopted distinct jurisdiction rules, first, for contracts for the sale of goods and contracts for the provision of services and, secondly, for all other kinds of contracts which are not covered by specific provisions of that regulation.

43 Extending the scope of application of the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001 would amount to circumventing the intention of the Community legislature in that respect and would have a negative impact on the effectiveness of Article 5(1)(c) and (a).

44 Having regard to all the above considerations, the answer to the first question referred is that the second indent of Article 5(1)(b) of Regulation No 44/2001 must be interpreted as meaning that a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants its contractual partner the right to use that right in return for remuneration is not a contract for the provision of services within the meaning of that provision.

The second question

45 In the light of the answer given to the first question, it is not necessary to answer the second question.

The third question

46 By its third question, the national court asks whether, in order to determine, pursuant to Article 5(1)(a) of Regulation No 44/2001, the court having jurisdiction over an application for remuneration owed pursuant to a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants to its contractual partner the right to use that right, reference must still be made to the principles which result from the case-law of the Court of Justice relating to Article 5(1) of the Brussels Convention.

47 The national court wishes to know, in particular, whether Article 5(1)(a) of Regulation No 44/2001 must be interpreted to the effect that, first, the concept of 'obligation' used in that Article refers to the obligation which arises under the contract and the non-performance of which is relied upon in support of the action and, secondly, the place where that obligation has or should be performed is to be determined in accordance with the law governing that obligation according to the conflict rules of the court before which the proceedings have been brought, as the Court has already held with regard to Article 5(1) of the Brussels Convention (see, respectively, with regard to the concept of 'obligation' referred to in Article 5(1) of the Brussels Convention, *De Bloos*, paragraph 13; Case 266/85 *Shenavai* [1987] ECR 239, paragraph 9; Case C-288/92 *Custom Made Commercial* [1994] ECR I-2913, paragraph 23; Case C-420/97 *Leathertex* [1999] ECR I-6747, paragraph 31; and Case C-256/00 *Besix* [2002] ECR I-1699, paragraph 44, and with regard to the place of performance of that obligation within the meaning of Article 5(1) of the Brussels Convention, *Industrie Tessili Italiana Como*, paragraph 13; *Custom Made Commercial*, paragraph 26; Case C-440/97 *GIE Groupe Concorde and Others* [1999] ECR I-6307, paragraph 32; *Leathertex*, paragraph 33, and *Besix*, paragraphs 33 and 36).

br. 44/2001 ne može se dovesti u pitanje ni zbog potrebe, kako ističe Komisija Europskih zajednica, da se područje primjene članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) široko razgraniči u odnosu na članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (a).

42 Iz logike članka 5. stavka 1. Uredbe br. 44/2001 proizlazi naime da je zakonodavac Zajednice donio različite propise o nadležnosti za ugovore o kupoprodaji robe i ugovore o pružanju usluga s jedne strane i sve druge vrste ugovora koji nisu zasebno uređeni ovom Uredbom s druge strane.

43 Proširenje područja primjene članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (b) druge alineje Uredbe br. 44/2001 značilo bi da se zaobilazi namjera zakonodavca Zajednice u tom pogledu, i to bi narušilo praktičnu učinkovitost članka 5. stavka 1. podstavaka (c) i (a).

44 Prema svemu ovome, odgovor na prvo pitanje treba biti da se članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (b) druga alineja Uredbe br. 44/2001 treba tumačiti tako da ugovor kojim je nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva svom ugovornom partneru odobrio pravo korištenja tog prava uz naknadu nije ugovor o pružanju usluga u smislu te odredbe.

O drugom pitanju

45 S obzirom na odgovor na prvo pitanje, nije potrebno dati odgovor na drugo pitanje.

O trećem pitanju

46 Svojim trećim pitanjem nacionalni sud želi znati treba li se i nadalje ocjena koji je sud prema članku 5. stavku 1. podstavku (a) Uredbe br. 44/2001 nadležan za odlučivanje o tužbi radi plaćanja naknade plative prema ugovoru kojim je nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva svom ugovornom partneru odobrio korištenje tog prava temeljiti na načelima koja proizlaze iz sudske prakse Suda u vezi s člankom 5. stavkom 1. Bruxelleske konvencije.

47 Nacionalni sud posebno želi znati treba li se članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (a) Uredbe br. 44/2001 tumačiti tako da s jedne strane pojam "obveza" u tom članku upućuje na obvezu iz ugovora čije se neispunjenje navodi kao obrazloženje tužbe i tako da se s druge strane mjesto u kojemu je ta obveza ispunjena ili je trebala biti ispunjena treba odrediti prema kolizijskim pravilima suda pred kojim je spor pokrenut, a kako je Sud već odlučio u odnosu na članak 5. stavak 1. Bruxelleske konvencije (usporedi u svezi s pojmom "obveze" u smislu članka 5. stavka 1. Bruxelleske konvencije presude *De Bloos,* točku 13., od 15. siječnja 1987., *Shenavai,* 266/85, [1987] ECR 239, točku 9., od 29. lipnja 1994., *Custom Made Commercial,* C-288/92, [1994] ECR I-2913, točku 23., od 5. listopada 1999., *Leathertex,* C-420/97, [1999] ECR I-6747, točku 31., i od 19. veljače 2002., *Besix,* C-256/00, [2002] ECR I-1699, točku 44., te u svezi s mjestom ispunjenja te obveze u smislu članka 5. stavka 1. Bruxelleske konvencije presude *Tessili,* točku 13., *Custom Made Commercial,* točku 26., od 28. rujna 1999., *GIE Groupe Concorde i dr.*, C-440/97, [1999] ECR I-6307, točku 32., *Leathertex,* točku 33., i *Besix,* točke 33. i 36.).

48 It is clear that the wording of Article 5(1)(a) of Regulation No 44/2001 is identical in every respect to that of the first sentence of Article 5(1) of the Brussels Convention.

49 In that regard, Regulation No 44/2001 is very largely based on the Brussels Convention, and in adopting that approach the Community legislature aimed to ensure true continuity, as is apparent from recital 19 in the preamble to Regulation No 44/2001.

50 While Regulation No 44/2001 is intended to update the Brussels Convention, it seeks at the same time to retain its structure and basic principles and to ensure its continuity.

51 In the absence of any reason for interpreting the two provisions differently, consistency requires that Article 5(1)(a) of Regulation No 44/2001 be given a scope identical to that of the corresponding provision of the Brussels Convention, so as to ensure a uniform interpretation of the Brussels Convention and Regulation No 44/2001 (see, to that effect, Case C-167/00 *Henkel* [2002] ECR I-8111, paragraph 49).

52 As the Italian Government has argued in its observations, the provisions of the Brussels Convention which were taken up without amendment by Regulation No 44/2001 should receive the same interpretation under the regulation, and this is all the more necessary given that the regulation replaced the Brussels Convention in relations between the Member States (see, to that effect, *Henkel*, paragraph 49, and Case C-111/01 *Gantner Electronic* [2003] ECR I-4207, paragraph 28).

53 As the United Kingdom Government has stated in its observations, the continuity of interpretation is, moreover, consistent with the requirements of legal certainty which dictate that the long-standing case-law of the Court, which the Community legislature did not intend to alter, should not be called into question.

54 In that regard, and as pointed out by the Advocate General in points 94 and 95 of her Opinion, it is apparent from the legislative history of Regulation No 44/2001, and from the structure of Article 5(1), that it was only in relation to contracts for the sale of goods and the provision of services that the Community legislature intended, first, no longer to refer to the contested obligation, but to determine the characteristic obligation of those contracts and, secondly, to define, independently, the place of performance as a connecting factor to the competent court in matters relating to a contract.

55 Consequently, it must be considered that the Community legislature intended, in relation to Regulation No 44/2001, to maintain, for all contracts other than those concerning the sale of goods and the provision of services, principles established by the Court in relation to the Brussels Convention, regarding, in particular, the obligation to take into consideration, and the determination of, the place of its execution.

56 Therefore, the scope to be given to Article 5(1)(a) of Regulation No 44/2001 should be identical to that of Article 5(1) of the Brussels Convention.

57 Having regard to all the foregoing considerations, the answer to the third question is that, in order to determine, under Article 5(1)(a) of Regulation No 44/2001, the court having jurisdiction over an application for remuneration owed pursuant to a contract under which the owner of an intellectual property right grants to its contractual partner the right to use that right, reference must continue to be made to the principles which result from the Court's case-law relating to Article 5(1) of the Brussels Convention.

48 Tekst članka 5. stavka 1. podstavka (a) Uredbe br. 44/2001 u cijelosti se podudara s tekstom članka 5. stavka 1. prve rečenice Bruxelleske konvencije.

49 Uredba br. 44/2001 u tom se podstavku u velikoj mjeri ravna prema Bruxelleskoj konvenciji, jer je zakonodavac Zajednice želio očuvati istinski kontinuitet, kako proizlazi iz 19. uvodne izjave ove Uredbe.

50 Uredba br. 44/2001 služi, doduše, aktualiziranju Bruxelleske konvencije, ali i održanju njezina ustroja i temeljnih načela te očuvanju njezina kontinuiteta.

51 Budući da ne postoji opravdani razlog za drugačije tumačenje, zahtjev koherentnosti traži da se za članak 5. stavak 1. podstavak (a) Uredbe br. 44/2001 pretpostavi isto područje primjene kao i ono u slučaju odgovarajuće odredbe Bruxelleske konvencije, kako bi se zajamčilo jedinstveno tumačenje Bruxelleske konvencije i Uredbe br. 44/2001 (usporedi u tom smislu presudu od 1. listopada 2002., *Henkel,* C-167/00, [2002] ECR I-8111, točka 49.).

52 Kako je u svojim objašnjenjima istaknula talijanska vlada, odredbe Bruxelleske konvencije koje su neizmijenjene preuzete Uredbom br. 44/2001 moraju se u okviru te Uredbe i nadalje tumačiti na isti način kao i ranije; to vrijedi tim više budući da je Uredba zamijenila Bruxellesku konvenciju u odnosima između država članica (usporedi u tom pogledu presude *Henkel,* točku 49., i od 8. svibnja 2003., *Gantner Electronic,* C-111/01, [2003] ECR I-4207, točka 28.).

53 Kako je iznijela vlada Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva u svojim razmatranjima, taj kontinuitet u tumačenju odgovara i zahtjevima pravne sigurnosti prema kojima se ustaljena sudska praksa Suda koju zakonodavac Zajednice nije želio mijenjati ne smije dovoditi u pitanje.

54 U tom pogledu, kako nezavisna odvjetnica iznosi u točkama 94. i 95. svog mišljenja, i iz pripremnih aktivnosti uz Uredbu br. 44/2001 i iz strukture njezina članka 5. stavka 1., proizlazi da je namjera zakonodavca samo kod ugovora o kupoprodaji robe i ugovora o pružanju usluga bila da s jedne strane više ne upućuje na spornu obvezu, nego da utvrdi karakterističnu obvezu kod tih ugovora, a da s druge strane autonomno odredi mjesto ispunjenja kao poveznicu za nadležni sud u sporovima iz ugovora.

55 Stoga je potrebno poći od toga da je zakonodavac Zajednice u okviru Uredbe br. 44/2001 htio za sve ugovore osim onih koji se odnose na kupoprodaju robe i pružanje usluga zadržati ona načela koja je Sud postavio u kontekstu Bruxelleske konvencije, posebno u odnosu na mjerodavnu obvezu i određenje njezina mjesta ispunjenja.

56 Stoga se članku 5. stavku 1. podstavku (a) Uredbe br. 44/2001 treba pripisati isto područje primjene kao ono koje ima članak 5. stavak 1. Bruxelleske konvencije.

57 Na temelju gore navedenih razmatranja, odgovor na treće pitanje treba biti da se i nadalje ocjena koji je sud prema članku 5. stavku 1. podstavku (a) Uredbe br. 44/2001 nadležan za odlučivanje o tužbi radi plaćanja naknade plative prema ugovoru kojim je nositelj prava intelektualnog vlasništva dopustio svom ugovornom partneru pravo da koristi to pravo treba temeljiti na načelima koja proizlaze iz sudske prakse Suda u svezi s člankom 5. stavkom 1. Bruxelleske konvencije.