

# *Lahore*

## Patents, Trade Marks & Related Rights Bulletin

Bulletin by: **Dr Dimitrios G Eliades**, Barrister, Brisbane

---

Contents of this issue	Page
------------------------	------

### Federal Court – Patent Cases

Patent ownership — employee entitlement — whether intellectual property created pursuant to the terms of employment — whether patent addressing liver carcinomas through use of microspheres was owned by University or by its employed professor — duty to research — duty to invent — whether implied term in employment contract giving ownership to university — intellectual property policy of the University — funding — <i>University of Western Australia v Gray</i> .....	5
Application for revocation — validity — claim to <i>d</i> -enantiomer (clopidogrel), pharmaceutically acceptable salts and addition salts of <i>d</i> -enantiomer, pharmaceutical compositions containing <i>d</i> -enantiomer and a process for preparation of <i>d</i> -enantiomer — prior art patents describe and claim the racemate and the enantiomers — process for obtaining enantiomers well known and non-inventive — whether disclosure of salts of the racemate discloses salts of the enantiomers — whether <i>d</i> -enantiomer novel — whether pharmaceutically acceptable salts and addition salts of the <i>d</i> -enantiomer novel-selection patents — whether lack inventive step — starting point for applying common general knowledge of skilled addressee — “problem and solution” approach — whether manner of manufacture — <i>Apotex Pty Ltd v Sanofi-Aventis</i> .....	8

Application for interlocutory injunction to restrain respondents from selling, offering for sale or distributing goods — whether serious question to be tried — whether balance of convenience favours the grant of an injunction — whether damages are an adequate remedy — whether contravention of s 52 or s 53(a) or (c) of the Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth) — whether infringement by supply of s 117 — whether third applicant’s patent infringed by process of “cross-bottling” — whether infringement s 120 of the Trade Marks Act 1995 (Cth) where goods retain marks of original manufacturer — change of venue from West Australian District Registry to Victoria District Registry — considerations of justice, efficiency and administration of the Court — *Schutz DSL (Australia) Pty Ltd v VIP Plastic Packaging Pty Ltd* ..... 10

Application to amend patent — whether amendments allowable under s 102(1) and s 102(2) of the Patents Act 1990 (Cth) — claimed invention relates to the form of the compound — whether a real and reasonably clear disclosure of the feature of “individual needles” in the patent specification — discretion under s 105 of the Act — whether Court should exercise discretion to refuse amendments — whether full and frank disclosure of reasons for amendment — amendments add new claims but do not delete existing claims — *Apotex Pty Ltd v Les Laboratoires Servier (No 2)* ..... 13

Costs — application to amend patent dismissed — amendments allowable under s 102 of the Patents Act 1990 (Cth) — amendments refused by exercise of discretion under s 105 of the Patents Act 1990 (Cth) — whether costs should be discounted in favour of party seeking amendment — *Apotex Pty Ltd v Les Laboratoires Servier (No 3)* ..... 14

Plant Breeder’s Rights — Sweetheart Cherry tree — whether there was a breach of non-propagation agreement — orders by consent — restraints on propagation, sale, importation — orders of restraint and admission by consent — *Fleming’s Nurseries Pty Ltd v Hannaford* ..... 15

Interlocutory injunctions — whether respondents/cross-claimants established prima facie case of infringement of patent to warrant injunction — whether prima facie case of infringement to warrant injunction displaced in circumstances where the applicant/cross-respondent has established a prima facie case that patent is invalid — question of balance of convenience — generic products complicating the question of potential assessment and damage to market — *Alphapharm Pty Ltd v Wyeth*..... 16

Syringes for use with medical injector systems — alleged infringement of patent — application for interlocutory injunction — alleged invalidity of patent on ground of obviousness — construction of claims — whether serious question to be tried — balance of convenience — interlocutory relief granted — *Medrad Inc v Alpine Medical Pty Ltd* ..... 17

Costs in a proceeding — success by the applicant in unjustified threats case — patent infringement and infringement of a registered design — cross-claim for relief based upon infringement and a further cross-claim by the applicant asserting invalidity of the patent on a number of grounds — consideration of an offer to compromise — consideration of O 23, r 11 of the

Federal Court Rules and the principles guiding the exercise of discretion in the disposition of costs as to either the claims or issues within the claims — <i>Uniline Australia Ltd ACN 010 752 057 v SBriggs Pty Ltd ACN 007 415 518 (No 2)</i> .....	18
---	----

**IP Australia – Patent cases**

Request under s 104 of the Patents Act 1990 — response to adverse findings — Request under s 104 of the Patents Act 1990 to amend the specification by Lynx Engineering Consultants Pty Ltd — opposition by Bradken Resources Pty Ltd.....	20
Amendment of patent specification — whether compliance with s 102(1) and 102(2)(a) and (b) of the Patents Act.....	20
Application for extension of term in relation to pharmaceutical substance-opposition — found not pharmaceutical substance per se .....	21
Opposition proceedings — application to file statement of grounds and particulars.....	22
Application — opposition — request for re-examine of patent — s 97 Patents Act 1990 (Cth) .....	22
Request for an extension of time — s 223 of the Patents Act — failure to pay 6 <sup>th</sup> year renewal fee.....	23
Shape marks — whether mark inherently adapted to distinguish — three dimensional seahorse shaped confectionary — use of trade mark — whether the use of the sea horse shape distinguished goods as those of applicant for registration — presumption of registrability under the Trade Marks Act 1995 — whether applies where ground of refusal of registration is s 41(2) — standard of proof on appeal under s 35 — whether refusal to register should be upheld only if court satisfied that mark should clearly not be registered — <i>Chocolaterie Guylian NV v Registrar of Trade Marks</i> .....	24
Trade Practices — misleading or deceptive conduct — comparative advertising — acoustic protection devices — whether report on comparative merits of devices contained misleading representations — <i>Polaris Communications Pty Ltd v Dynamic Hearing Pty Ltd</i> .....	26
<i>Polaris Communications Pty Ltd v Dynamic Hearing Pty Ltd (No 2)</i> [2009] FCA 1111; BC200908947 (30 September 2009).....	27

**IP Australia – Trade Mark cases**

Whether inherently incapable to distinguish — evidence of use provided.....	29
Opposition — whether goods of the same description.....	30
Cross oppositions — none successful — no deceptive similarity .	31
Application for extension of time to file evidence — basis of extension was bona fide negotiations — objected to by trade mark applicant denying negotiations on foot .....	32
Application for registration — mark identical in sound to registered mark — concern of confusion to public likely .....	32
Question of whether good were of the same description — whether soy bean-based extracts and soy bean-based beverages were goods of the same description as processed vegetables.....	33



Application to remove mark from the register — non-use —  
discretion under s 101(3) of the Trade Marks act 1995 (Cth) —  
broad discretion — relevant public interest to make it reasonable  
to exercise the registrar’s discretion .....