



Study Question

Submission date: May 5, 2017

Sarah MATHESON, Reporter General
Jonathan P. OSHA and Anne Marie VERSCHUUR, Deputy Reporters General
Yusuke INUI, Ari LAAKKONEN and Ralph NACK, Assistants to the Reporter General

Bad faith trademarks

Responsible Reporter: Anne Marie VERSCHUUR

National/Regional Group	Denmark
Contributors name(s)	Christian Kragelund
e-Mail contact	ckr@horten.dk

I. Current law and practice

Bad faith - prior third party use or filing

1 Does your Group's current law provide for an action against the application or registration for a trademark in a jurisdiction by a party (Party A), if that trademark or a similar sign is already used in one or more jurisdictions by another party (Party B), but is not registered in the jurisdiction where Party A has filed the trademark?

If yes, please answer questions 2) – 7). If no, please go to question 8).

Yes

Please Explain

It follows from [the Danish trademark act s. 15\(3\)\(3\)](#) that a trade mark shall not be registered if the trademark is in use abroad and certain conditions are met.

2 Is the application or registration as described under question 1) above denoted as "bad faith"? If not, what is it called?

No

It is called...

The div does not refer to "bad faith", but the trademark cannot be registered if the applicant on the date of the filing " *had, or should have had, a knowledge of the foreign trade mark.*"

3 Are the following factors relevant for proving an application or registration as described under question 1) in your jurisdiction?

Please tick or fill in all boxes as applicable to your jurisdiction. If you select "other", please describe further.

- other

Please Explain

S. 15(3(3) only applies if Party A's trademark is identical or only insignificantly distinct from Party B's trademark. A similar sign is not enough to prevent registration.

It is relevant if Party A knows or should reasonably be aware, of use of an identical or only insignificantly distinct sign abroad for identical or similar goods or services.

4 Is any one or more of the above factors sufficient on their own, or will the assessment instead always take the specific circumstances of the case into account? If one or more of those factors are sufficient on their own, please identify those factors.

Yes

Please Explain

If the applicant on the date of the filing had, or should have had, a knowledge of the foreign trademark, then it is sufficient that Party A's trademark is identical or only insignificantly distinct from a Party B's trademark and that Party B's trademark is still in use for identical or similar goods/services. These factors are not sufficient on their own, and further consideration shall be taken confer the guidelines in The Malaysian Dairy decision.

5 Which of the following factors are relevant to establishing whether there was or should have been knowledge as described under question 3) above?

Please tick or fill in all boxes as applicable to your jurisdiction. If you select "other", please describe further.

- whether the earlier sign is well known or enjoys a reputation

Please Explain

- whether there have been formal or informal dealings or contact between Party A and B (such as an agreement, written communication etc.)

Please Explain

6 Is the degree of similarity between the signs relevant? Please explain why in either case.

Yes

Please Explain

The div has a narrow scope of application as the trade marks must be identical or only insignificantly distinct.

7 Is the degree of similarity between the goods/services relevant? Please explain why in either case.

Yes

Please Explain

The goods or services must be identical or similar for the div to apply.

Repeat filings

8 Can the filing of a trademark in your Group's jurisdiction by a trademark owner for a trademark identical or similar to a trademark it already owns in that jurisdiction be refused or cancelled on the ground that the previous trademark fails to meet applicable genuine use requirements?

If yes, please answer questions 9) -11). If no, please go to question 12).

No

Please Explain

There is no such requirement under Danish law. A trade mark owner can still file a similar trademark if it fulfils all conditions, including distinctive character.

9 Is the application or registration as described under question 8) above denoted as "bad faith"? If not, what is it called?

10 Which of the following factors are relevant when assessing whether a trademark as described under question 8) should be refused or cancelled?

Please tick or fill in all boxes as applicable to your jurisdiction. If you select "other", please describe further.

11 Are the answers to questions 8) -10) above different if the previous trademark is no longer in force? Please explain.

Defensive marks

12 Is it permissible under your Group's current law to file a trademark if the trademark owner does not have any intent to use that trademark for part or all of the goods/services claimed? If not, is there a timeframe (and if so, what) for such intention to use (e.g. must the intent be to start use immediately)?

If yes, please answer question 13). If no, please go to question 14).

Yes

Please Explain

There is no use requirements in Danish law during the filing of a trademark, but the trademark can be revoked after registration if the proprietor of a registered trade mark has not put the trade mark to genuine use within a period of five years from the termination of the registration procedure or if such use has been suspended during an uninterrupted period of five years, see [s. 25\(1\) of the Danish trademark act](#).

13 Is the application or registration as described under question 12) above denoted as "bad faith"? If not, what is it called?

No

It is called...

It is not denoted as "bad faith", but called "genuine use"

Other

14 Does any other conduct in respect of trademarks, as an independent ground for action, amount to bad faith ¹⁶ under your Group's current law? If so, what conduct and how is it denoted, ie as "bad faith" or something else?

¹⁶ Including fraud within the context of this Study Question, as explained on p. 1 at paragraph 5.

No.

Type of proceedings

15 In which proceedings can the grounds, insofar as they are available under your Group's current law, described in your response to questions 1), 8), 12) and 14) above be invoked in your jurisdiction?

Please tick or fill in all boxes as applicable to your jurisdiction. If you select either of the last two boxes, please describe further.

- opposition proceedings (before the trademark/IP office)

Please Explain

- a cancellation action (before the trademark/IP office)

Please Explain

- court proceedings concerning a bad faith registration

Please Explain

II. Policy considerations and proposals for improvements of your current law

6.a Could any of the following aspects of your Group's current law be improved?

The possibility of taking action against the application or registration of a trademark in a jurisdiction by a Party A, if that trademark or a similar sign is already used in one or more jurisdictions by a Party B, but is not registered in the jurisdiction where Party A has filed the trademark

Please tick or fill in only the applicable box. If you select "yes", please explain.

Yes

Please Explain

The wordings of the div is not equivalent to the trade mark directive 2008/95 art. 4(4)(g) and the Danish div has been interpreted to have a more narrow scope of application.

This difference is problematic as the Court of Justice of the European Union has ruled in C-320/12 that art. 4(4)(g) does not allow Member States to introduce a system of specific protection of foreign marks which differs from the system established by that provision and which is based on the fact that the person making the application for registration of a mark knew or should have known of a foreign mark.

Thus, the wordings and the scope of application of the Danish trademark act s. 15(3)(3) must be changed in order for the law to comply with the EU.

6.b Could any of the following aspects of your Group's current law be improved?

The possibility of taking action against or refusing the refiling of a trademark by a trademark owner as described above under question 8) above

Please tick or fill in only the applicable box. If you select "yes", please explain.

No

Please Explain

6.c Could any of the following aspects of your Group's current law be improved?

The possibility of taking action against or refusing the filing of a trademark by a trademark owner without an intent to use such for part or all of the goods/services claimed as described above under question 12) above.

Please tick or fill in only the applicable box. If you select "yes", please explain.

No

Please Explain

6.d Could any of the following aspects of your Group's current law be improved?

The possibility of taking action against other conduct as described in your response to question 14) above.

Please tick or fill in only the applicable box. If you select "yes", please explain.

No

Please Explain

17 Are there any other policy considerations and/or proposals for improvement to your current law falling within the scope of this Study Question?

No.

Proposals for harmonisation

18 Does your Group consider that harmonisation in any or all of the four areas described in question 16) above is desirable?

If yes, please respond to the following questions without regard to your Group's current law.

Even if no, please address the following questions to the extent your Group considers your Group's current law could be improved.

Yes

Please Explain

Harmonisation of the areas would provide for a more effective protection as companies would not be able to have their signs registered in jurisdictions without bad faith-rules. A harmonisation of the protection of foreign trade marks is especially desirable as it seems unjust to protect foreign signs in countries that would not grant the same protection to Danish trade marks.

19 Does your Group consider there should be a harmonised definition of bad faith?
Please tick or fill in only the applicable box. If you have different reasons for selecting "no" or "yes" to those identified, please explain.

Yes; such would increase the level of legal certainty

Please Explain

Bad faith - third party use or filing

20 Should it be possible to take action against the application or registration for a trademark in a jurisdiction by a Party A, if that trademark or a similar sign is already used in one or more jurisdictions by a Party B, but is not registered in the jurisdiction where Party A has filed the trademark?
If yes, please answer questions 21) – 25). If no, please go to question 26).

Yes

Please Explain

21 Which of the following should be relevant factors for proving an application or registration as described under question 20)?
Please tick or fill in all relevant boxes. If you select "other", please describe further.

- Party A knows, or should reasonably be aware, of use of an identical or similar sign abroad for identical goods or services

Please Explain

- Party A knows, or should reasonably be aware, of use of an identical or similar sign abroad for similar goods or services

Please Explain

22 Should any one or more of the above factors be sufficient on their own, or should the assessment instead always take the specific circumstances of the case into account? If one or more factors should be sufficient on their own, which should they be?

These factors are not sufficient on their own, and further considerations shall be taken confer the guidelines in The Malaysian Diary decision.

23 Which of the following should be relevant when establishing whether there was or should have been knowledge as described above under question 21) above?
Please tick or fill in all relevant boxes. If you select "other", please describe further.

- whether the earlier sign is well known or enjoys a reputation

Please Explain

- whether there have been formal or informal dealings or contact between Party A and B (such as an agreement, written communication etc.)

Please Explain

24 Should the degree of similarity between the signs be relevant? Please explain why or why not.

Yes

Please Explain

The degree of similarity between the signs should be relevant as it is a factor in deciding whether or not Party A was aware of the use and if the registration for the sign will have a harmful effect on Party B's enterprise.

25 Should the degree of similarity between the goods/services be relevant? Please explain why or why not.

Yes

Please Explain

The degree of similarity between the goods should be relevant, because the further the goods are from each other, the less likely it is that the registration will harm Party B's enterprise. If the similarity of the goods was not relevant, it would severely limit the availability of signs to use as trademarks.

Repeat filings

26 Should it be possible to refuse or cancel the filing by a trademark owner of a trademark identical or similar to a trademark it already owns in your Group's jurisdiction on the grounds that it fails to meet applicable genuine use requirements?

If yes, please answer questions 27) – 28). If no, please go to question 29).

No

Please Explain

27 Which of the following factors should be relevant when assessing whether a trademark as described under question 26) above should be refused or cancelled?

Please tick or fill in all relevant boxes. If you select "other", please describe further.

28 Should the answers to questions 26) - 27) above be different if the previous trademark is no longer in force? if so, how?

Defensive marks

29 Should it be permissible to file a trademark if the trademark owner does not have any intent to use that trademark for part or all of the goods/services claimed? If not, should there be a timeframe (and if so, what) for such intention to use (e.g. must the intent be to start use immediately)? Please explain.

The current Danish law provides a timeframe for genuine use. As intent of use is difficult to prove at the time of the registration and it is practical that the trademark owner have time to introduce the sign on the market, the best solution seems to be to allow the filing of a trademark without examining intent of use and establish a timeframe for genuine use.

Other

30 Should any other conduct in respect of trademarks, as an independent ground for action, amount to bad faith ¹⁷? If yes, please explain.

¹⁷ Including fraud within the context of this Study Question, as explained on p. 1 under paragraph 5 above.

No. It seems like the majority of the bad faith scenarios are covered by the previous provisions.

Type of proceedings

31 In which proceedings should it be possible to invoke the grounds described in your response to questions 20), 26), 29) and 30) above, inasfar as they should be grounds for action in your view?

Please tick or fill in all boxes. If you select either of the last two boxes, please describe further

- opposition proceedings (before the trademark/IP office)

Please Explain

- a cancellation action (before the trademark/IP office)

Please Explain

- court proceedings concerning a bad faith registration

Please Explain

Other

32 Please comment on any additional issues concerning bad faith (or equivalent concepts) in the context of trademark law you consider relevant to this Study Question.

N/A

Please indicate which industry sector views are included in part "III. Proposals of harmonization" on this form:

Please enter the name of your nominee for Study Committee representative for this Question (see Rule 12.8, Regulations of AIPPI). Study

Committee leadership is chosen from amongst the nominated Study Committee representatives. Thus, persons not nominated as a Study Committee representative cannot be in the Study Committee leadership.
Christian Kragelund