

CONTENTS

<i>Tables of Cases</i>	xix
<i>Tables of Legislation</i>	xlvi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	liii

I INTRODUCTION

1. General Introduction

A. What this Book is About	1.01
B. Approach and Structure	1.02
C. Bad Faith in Other Areas of Intellectual Property Law	1.04
(a) Misappropriation of other IP rights	1.05
(b) Recovery of profits and damages	1.08
(c) Domain names	1.09
D. Summary	1.12

2. The General Framework for Obtaining Trade Marks

A. Obtaining Trade Marks	2.01
(a) Two general systems	2.02
(b) First-to-use system	2.03
(c) First-to-file system	2.07
(d) Parallel terminology	2.19
(e) Cumulation	2.22
(f) Territoriality	2.23
(g) Consequences of a first-to-file-system	2.28
B. Backgrounds and Developments	2.30
(a) Free enterprise	2.31
(b) Abolishing restrictions on trade mark registration and transfer	2.32
C. Protective Measures	2.33
(a) Cross-border trade mark registration	2.34
(b) Legal protection	2.38
D. Bad Faith	2.50
(a) Positioning bad faith in the system for obtaining trade marks	2.50
(b) Positioning bad faith in the system of trade mark protection	2.53
E. Summary	2.55

II EUROPEAN TRADE MARK LAW: HARMONIZATION AND UNIFICATION

3. Legislative History

A. 1957–76: The Beginning	3.01
B. 1977–86: Negotiating the Community Trade Mark Regulation	3.03
(a) February 1978: raising the issue of bad faith: a Dutch first	3.04
(b) February 1978: acquiescence and bad faith	3.05
(c) May 1982: an Italian request to combat trade mark piracy	3.06
(d) December 1982: a Danish proposal for bad faith	3.07
(e) December 1982: rejecting the Benelux provision	3.08
(f) October 1984: adopting the German proposal of bona fide intent-to-use	3.09
C. 1986–8: Negotiating the Trade Mark Directive	3.10
(a) July 1986: determining the level of harmonization	3.12
(b) October 1986: a Dutch demand for a general provision against bad faith	3.17
(c) December 1986: a Danish proposal concerning knowledge of foreign prior use	3.18
(d) October 1987: the bad faith provisions find their way into the Directive	3.19
(e) November 1987: French opposition to article 2A–4G	3.20
(f) November 1987: bad faith instead of ‘knowing or ought to have known’	3.22
(g) December 1988: the final text of articles 3–2D and 4–4G	3.24
D. 1986–93: Finalizing the Community Trade Mark Regulation	3.25
(a) May 1987: bad faith instead of bona fide intent-to-use	3.27
(b) September 1987: French and Danish objections	3.29
(c) October 1987: bad faith does not equal ‘not in good faith’	3.32
(d) 1988–93: the final text of article 51–1B	3.33
E. Useful or Useless? The Relevance of Legislative History	3.35
F. Evaluation	3.40
G. Summary	3.41

4. The Trade Mark Directive

A. Aspects Common to Articles 3–2D and 4–4G	4.01
(a) Aim and scope of harmonization	4.02
(b) Form and result: refusal, opposition, or cancellation	4.07
(c) Territoriality	4.08
(d) Bad faith in the Directive: the absence of a definition and the presence of some preliminary clues	4.11
(e) Bad faith and acquiescence	4.24
(f) Bad faith and unauthorized registration by agents or representatives	4.27

B. Interpreting Bad Faith	4.28
(a) Approaches	4.29
(b) Interpretation of bad faith: diverging views in previous dissertations	4.34
(c) Interpretation of bad faith: towards a preliminary ruling by the ECJ	4.41
C. Specifics of Article 4–4G	4.47
(a) Stricter conditions for extra-territorial bad faith protection	4.48
(b) Likelihood of confusion	4.50
(c) Foreign trade mark use	4.54
D. Summary	4.56
5. The Community Trade Mark Regulation	
A. Introduction	5.01
(a) General characteristics	5.02
(b) Brief evaluation of the CTM system	5.05
B. Article 52–1B CTMR: Invalidating a CTM on the Basis of Bad Faith	5.07
(a) Procedural aspects	5.08
(b) Territorial limitations	5.14
(c) Bad faith in the Regulation: the absence of a definition and the presence of some preliminary clues	5.19
(d) Bad faith and acquiescence	5.31
(e) Bad faith and unauthorized registration by agents or representatives	5.32
C. OHIM on Bad Faith	5.35
(a) Diverging definitions	5.36
(b) Various trends	5.50
D. Diverging Views in the Member States: The CTM Courts and Literature on Article 52–1B	5.65
(a) Three High Court decisions and one referral to the ECJ: <i>Decon</i> , <i>The Colour of Élégance</i> , and <i>Goldhase</i>	5.66
(b) Early incidental references to bad faith by the Community courts: <i>Nu-Tride</i> and <i>Henkel</i>	5.70
(c) Important trends in the Member States	5.71
E. EU Enlargement and Bad Faith	5.73
F. Summary	5.76
 III THE DIRECTIVE IN THE MEMBER STATES: IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERPRETATION	
6. Benelux: Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg	
A. Background	6.01
B. Implementation of Article 3–2D TMD?	6.03
C. The Benelux Provision: Article 2.4F	6.04

D. Prior Use in the Benelux Countries (Article 2.4F–1)	6.08
(a) Bad faith of the trade mark applicant	6.09
(b) Prior use in good faith	6.13
(c) Additional requirements on prior use	6.19
E. Prior Use outside the Benelux Countries (Article 2.4F–2)	6.21
(a) Bad faith of the trade mark applicant	6.23
(b) Prior use in good faith	6.25
(c) Additional requirements on prior use	6.26
F. Other Examples of Bad Faith	6.27
G. Procedural Aspects	6.30
H. The (In)applicability of Unfair Competition Law	6.31
I. Non-Compliance with the Directive?	6.33
J. Summary	6.35
7. Germany	
A. Implementation of Article 3–2D TMD	7.01
B. Interpretation	7.05
(a) The initial aim of the German legislator: autonomous interpretation and a new beginning	7.05
(b) The approach by the German courts: old news	7.07
(c) Knowledge of prior use alone insufficient for finding bad faith	7.17
(d) Bad faith: subjective concept, objectified assessment	7.20
(e) Other suggestions of bad faith	7.23
(f) Cross-border trade mark grabbing	7.25
C. Procedural Aspects	7.26
D. Overlap	7.28
E. Summary	7.32
8. France	
A. No Implementation of Articles 3–2D or 4–4G TMD	8.01
B. Reclaiming Fraudulent Trade Mark Applications on the basis of Article 712–6 CPI	8.02
(a) 1964–91: <i>fraus omnia corrumpit</i>	8.03
(b) 1991–present: article 712–6 CPI	8.04
C. <i>Fraus Omnia Corrumpit</i> Revisited	8.08
D. Cross-border Trade Mark Grabbing	8.10
E. Non-compliance with the Directive?	8.11
F. Summary	8.14

9. Italy	
A. Implementation of Article 3–2D TMD	9.01
B. Interpretation	9.03
(a) Bad faith: abuse of title, violation of business ethics, and a residual concept	9.03
(b) Bad faith as a subjective legal concept	9.05
(c) Intent to harm or obstruct	9.06
(d) Knowledge of prior use	9.07
(e) Cross-border trade mark grabbing	9.08
C. Procedural Aspects	9.09
D. Summary	9.10
10. United Kingdom	
A. Implementation of Article 3–2D TMD	10.01
(a) Introducing s3(6) TMA	10.01
(b) The law’s explanatory notes	10.02
B. Interpretation	10.03
(a) Introduction	10.03
(b) <i>Gromax</i> : dishonesty and other violations of standards of acceptable commercial behaviour	10.06
(c) <i>China White</i> : getting rid of Robin Hood	10.07
(d) <i>Ajit Weekly</i> and <i>World Cup Willie</i> : getting to grips with the combined test	10.10
(e) Between knowledge and dishonesty	10.12
(f) Lack of bona fide intent-to-use?	10.18
(g) Celebrity trade mark grabbing	10.22
(h) Broad or restrictive interpretation?	10.23
(i) Other suggestions of bad faith	10.24
(j) Cross-border trade mark grabbing	10.26
C. Procedural Aspects	10.31
D. Passing Off	10.32
E. Summary	10.33
11. Ireland	
A. Implementation of Article 3–2D TMD	11.01
B. Interpretation	11.02
(a) Relying on <i>Gromax</i> : dishonesty and other violations of standards of acceptable commercial behaviour	11.02
(b) Knowledge of prior use	11.03
(c) Lack of bona fide intent-to-use?	11.04
(d) Cross-border trade mark grabbing	11.05
C. Procedural Aspects	11.07
D. Summary	11.08

12. Denmark	
A. Implementation of Article 4–4G TMD	12.01
B. Interpretation	12.05
(a) Knowledge of prior use	12.05
C. Non-compliance with the Directive?	12.07
D. Summary	12.09
13. Greece	
A. Implementation of Articles 3–2D and 4–4G TMD	13.01
B. Bad Faith and Article 3–2B NπΣ	13.02
(a) A quick look at its predecessors	13.02
(b) Interpretation	13.03
C. Bad Faith and Article 4–3C NπΣ	13.06
(a) Differences from article 4–4G TMD	13.07
(b) Interpretation	13.08
D. Non-compliance with the Directive?	13.09
E. Procedural Aspects	13.12
F. Summary	13.13
14. Portugal	
A. No Implementation of articles 3–2D or 4–4G TMD	14.01
B. Summary	14.02
15. Spain	
A. Implementation of Article 3–2D TMD	15.01
B. Interpretation	15.02
(a) Knowledge of prior use or earlier rights	15.03
(b) Other suggestions of bad faith	15.05
(c) Cross-border trade mark grabbing	15.06
C. Procedural Aspects	15.08
D. Overlap	15.09
E. Summary	15.12
16. Austria	
A. Implementation of Article 3–2D TMD	16.01
B. Interpretation	16.05
(a) Bad faith as a subjective legal concept	16.06
(b) Intent to obstruct: <i>Behinderungsabsicht</i>	16.08

(c) Knowledge of prior use	16.10
(d) Other suggestions of bad faith	16.15
(e) Cross-border trade mark grabbing	16.16
C. Procedural Aspects	16.19
D. Overlap	16.21
E. Summary	16.24
17. Finland	
A. No Explicit Implementation of Articles 3–2D or 4–4G TMD	17.01
B. The Existing Provision: Article 14–(1)7 TMKL	17.03
(a) General	17.03
(b) Requirements	17.04
(c) Knowledge of prior use	17.09
(d) Non-compliance with the Directive?	17.10
C. Summary	17.12
18. Sweden	
A. No Explicit Implementation of Articles 3–2D or 4–4G TMD	18.01
B. The Existing Provision: Article 14–(1)7 svVML	18.02
(a) General	18.02
(b) Knowledge of prior use	18.04
(c) Cross-border trade mark grabbing	18.05
(d) Non-compliance with the Directive?	18.06
(e) The draft proposal of 2001: Article 15–1(2)	18.07
C. Summary	18.10
19. The New Member States	
A. Brief Overview on Implementation	19.01
B. Brief Evaluation	19.02
IV BAD FAITH REVEALED	
20. Towards a Uniform Approach for Bad Faith	
A. Introduction	20.01
B. Big Opinions on Big Words	20.03
(a) Oh academia: previous dissertations on bad faith	20.04
(b) The oracle at the Kirchberg: the ECJ on <i>Goldhase</i>	20.10

C. Interpreting Bad Faith: <i>Goldhase</i> and beyond	20.20
(a) Preliminary observations	20.20
(b) The first factor: 'knowing of prior use'	20.22
(c) The second factor: 'intention'	20.44
(d) The third factor: 'the degree of legal protection'	20.67
(e) Other general factors	20.69
(f) Concluding observations on the Community concept of bad faith	20.80
D. Implementing Bad Faith Legislation: Between Right and Wrong	20.86
E. Back to Square One: Important Perceptions and Perspectives	20.91
(a) Practical perspective	20.93
(b) Conceptual perspective	20.94
(c) Historical perspective	20.95
(d) Systematic perspective	20.96
(e) Territorial perspective	20.98
F. Summary: Bad Faith in 60 Seconds	20.99
 <i>Bibliography</i>	 343
<i>Index</i>	357