

Cases Published in R.P.C. [2008]

	<i>Issue No.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<p>esure INSURANCE LTD V DIRECT LINE INSURANCE PLC [2008] R.P.C. 5 (Trade mark: Application: Device mark of computer mouse on wheels for insurance and financial services: No colour limitation: Opposition: Earlier device mark of telephone on wheels for insurance and financial services: Whether mark confusingly similar: Whether likelihood of association: Whether use of later mark took unfair advantage of or was detrimental to distinctive character and repute of earlier mark: Survey evidence: Whether vitiated by manner in which survey conducted: Whether vitiated by parties' advertising campaigns: Whether threshold level for 'similarity': Whether use of the mark in opponent's distinctive colour was 'normal and fair use': Enhanced distinctiveness of earlier mark: Whether risk of unfair advantage/detriment sufficient: Whether 'fettering' a separate head of detriment: Blurring: Dilution: Comments on cross-examination: Trade Marks Registry)</p>	[2]	99
<p>esure INSURANCE LTD V DIRECT LINE INSURANCE PLC [2008] R.P.C. 6 (Trade mark: Device mark of computer mouse on wheels for insurance and financial services: Opposition: Earlier device mark of telephone on wheels for insurance and financial services: Whether likelihood of confusion: Whether later mark took unfair advantage of or was detrimental to distinctive character or repute of later mark: Registration refused: Appeal to High Court: Whether threshold limit for similarity: Whether hearing officer correct in rejecting survey evidence: Whether sufficient other evidence to establish likelihood of association: Whether mere risk of unfair advantage or detriment sufficient: Whether errors of principle in hearing officer's assessment of the evidence: Blurring: Fettering: Tarnishing: Ch.D.)</p>	[2]	143
<p>PAN WORLD BRANDS LTD V TRIPP LTD (EXTREME TRADE MARK) [2008] R.P.C. 2 (Trade mark: Application for revocation: Non-use: Mark revoked: Appeal to Appointed Person: Partial non-use admitted: Burden of proof: Standard of proof: Unchallenged evidence: Whether use 'internal use': Partial revocation: Scope of revised specification: The Appointed Person)</p>	[1]	21
<p>RAYTHEON CO'S APPLICATION [2008] R.P.C. 3 (Patent: Application: Inventory management system: Patentability: Whether invention program for computer: Application refused: Appeal to High Court: Whether permissible for Comptroller to raise new ground of objection on appeal: Whether invention method of doing business: Whether presentation of information: Costs: PC)</p>	[1]	46
<p>SIEMENS SCHWEIZ AG V THORN SECURITY LTD [2008] R.P.C. 4 (Patent: Infringement: Original text of claims in German: English translation: Construction of claims in German text and in translation: Whether German text or English translation was authentic text: Validity: Inventive step: Whether non-registration of ownership changes barred recovery of damages: Whether amendment to statutory bar retrospective: Whether transfer effected by consensual agreement or operation of law: Ch.D.)</p>	[1]	58
<p>YEDA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CO LTD V RHONE-POULENC RORER INTERNATIONAL HOLDINGS INC [2008] R.P.C. 1 (Patent: Entitlement proceedings: Referrer claiming joint ownership: Application to amend referrer's statement of case to add alternative claim to sole ownership: Whether amendment barred by two-year statutory time limit: Appeal to House of Lords: Whether necessary for referrer to invoke some rule of law giving him title to patent: Whether claim to sole ownership a new claim: Whether reference to the comptroller analogous to civil proceedings: Appeal and amendment allowed: House of Lords)</p>	[1]	1