

CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Intellectual Property Reports

- Ainsworth Game Technology Ltd v IGT** (IP Aust — M Kirov) (2011) **93.532**
Apple Inc v Samsung Electronics Co Ltd (FCA — Bennett J) (2011) **93.441**
Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Trading Post Australia Pty Ltd
 (ACN 001 821 156) (FCA — Nicholas J) (2011) **93.358**
Australian Mud Company Pty Ltd v Coretell Pty Ltd (FCAFC — Full Court) (2011) **93.188**
- Blu-Ray Disc Association, Re** (IP Aust — H Wilson) (2011) **93.273**
Brand Developers Ltd v Ezibuy Ltd (NZHC — Asher J) (2011) **93.143**
- Celgene Corporation, Re** (IP Aust — S D Barker) (2011) **93.309**
- Dance (Q) Australia Pty Ltd v Avant Media Pty Ltd** (IP Aust — H Wilson) (2011) **93.282**
Delnorth Pty Ltd, Re (IP Aust — X Gisz) (2011) **93.326**
Dommett v Zebra Research Pty Ltd (IP Aust — O L Hagggar) (2011) **93.316**
- Elecon Australia Pty Ltd** (ACN 099 879 517) **v Brevini Australia Pty Ltd** (ACN 060 007 150)
 (NSD 1430 of 2009) (FCAFC — Full Court) (2011) **93.174**
Elecon Australia Pty Ltd (ACN 099 879 517) **v PIV Drives GmbH** (NSD 1429 of 2009) (FCAFC —
 Full Court) (2011) **93.174**
- Inverness Medical Innovations Inc v MDS Diagnostics Ltd** (NZHC — Woodhouse J) (2009) **93.14**

(Continues on p ii of cover)

CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED — *continued*

John I Haas Inc v S S Steiner Inc (IP Aust — N Howard) (2011) **93.568**

Myall Australia Pty Ltd v RPL Central Pty Ltd (IP Aust — S K Aggarwal) (2011) **93.1**

Newspaper Licensing Agency Ltd v Meltwater Holding BV (EWCA Civ — Full Court) (2011) **93.341**

NV Sumatra Tobacco Trading Company v New Zealand Milk Brands Ltd (NZCA — Full Court) (2011) **93.156**

Optical 88 Ltd v Optical 88 Pty Ltd (ACN 060 355 437) (FCAFC — Full Court) (2011) **93.202**

Parmenter, Re (IP Aust — G Powell) (2011) **93.292**

Paypal Inc v Credibanc Pty Ltd (IP Aust — D Lyons) (2011) **93.561**

Phone Directories Company Australia Pty Ltd v Telstra Corporation Ltd (IP Aust — T E Williams) (2011) **93.513**

Q Dance Australia Pty Ltd v Avant Media Pty Ltd (IP Aust — H Wilson) (2011) **93.282**

South African Airways Pty Ltd v Virtuoso Ltd (IP Aust — I Thompson) (2011) **93.494**

Spotless Group Ltd (ACN 004 376 514) v Blanco Catering Pty Ltd (ACN 007 977 497) (FCA — Mansfield J) (2011) **93.235**

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART

- ABB Asea Brown Boveri Ltd v ABB Grain Ltd (2001) 54 IPR 415; [2001] ATMO 123, distinguished 93.532
- Austereo Pty Ltd v DMG Radio (Aust) Pty Ltd (2004) 209 ALR 93; 61 IPR 257; [2004] FCA 968, applied 93.532
- Australian Broadcasting Corporation v O'Neill (2006) 227 CLR 57; 229 ALR 457; [2006] HCA 46, applied 93.441
- Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Channel Seven Brisbane Pty Ltd (2009) 239 CLR 305; 255 ALR 1; 80 IPR 497; [2009] HCA 19, applied 93.358
- Blount Inc v Registrar of Trade Marks (1998) 83 FCR 50; 40 IPR 498; [1998] FCA 440, applied 93.532
- Butcher v Lachlan Elder Realty Pty Ltd (2004) 218 CLR 592; 212 ALR 357; [2004] HCA 60, applied 93.358
- Clark Equipment Company v Registrar of Trade Marks (1964) 111 CLR 511; [1965] ALR 344, applied 93.532
- De Cordova v Vick Chemical Co (1951) RPC 271, applied 93.561
- George Weston Foods Ltd v Peerless Holdings Pty Ltd (1999) 48 IPR 145, distinguished 93.532
- Interpharma Pty Ltd v Commissioner of Patents (2008) 79 IPR 261; [2008] FCA 1498, applied 93.441
- Jafferjee v Scarlett (1937) 57 CLR 115; [1937] ALR 404, applied 93.561
- Malibu Boats West Inc v Catanese (2000) 180 ALR 119; 51 IPR 134; [2000] FCA 1141, applied 93.532
- McCormick & Co Inc v McCormick (2000) 51 IPR 102; [2000] FCA 1335, discussed 93.532
- Morny Ltd's Trade Marks, Re (1951) 68 RPC 131, distinguished 93.532
- Polaroid Corp v Sole Pty Ltd [1981] 1 NSWLR 491, applied 93.561
- Registrar of Trade Marks v Woolworths Ltd (1999) 93 FCR 365; 45 IPR 411; [1999] FCA 1020, applied 93.532; followed 93.494
- Rimington v Zen Do Kai Pty Ltd (2002) 57 IPR 127; [2002] ATMO 114, followed 93.532
- Sara Lee Corporation v Bali Blue Pty Ltd (2003) 59 IPR 619; [2003] ATMO 81, applied 93.532
- Sassaby Inc v Janet Cosmetics Pty Ltd (2001) 54 IPR 425, distinguished 93.532
- Saville Perfumery Ltd v June Perfect Ltd (1939) 1B IPR 440, applied 93.561
- Seven-Up Co v Bubble Up Co Inc (1987) 9 IPR 259, applied 93.561
- Shell Co of Australia v Esso Standard Oil (Australia)Ltd (1961) 109 CLR 407; [1962] ALR 304; 1B IPR 523, applied 93.561
- Sigma Pharmaceuticals (Australia) Pty Ltd v Wyeth (2009) 81 IPR 339; [2009] FCA 595, applied 93.441
- Time Warner Entertainment Co LP v Stepsam Investments Pty Ltd [2002] ATMO 93, applied 93.532
- Universal Telecasters (Qld) Ltd v Guthrie (1978) 18 ALR 531, applied 93.358; distinguished 93.358

STATUTES, RULES ETC CITED IN THIS PART

COMMONWEALTH

Evidence Act 1995			
s 81	93.358	s 14	93.532, 93.561
s 88	93.358	s 41	93.532
s 135	93.358	s 44	93.494, 93.532, 93.561
Federal Court of Australia Act 1976		s 52	93.561
s 50	93.358	s 60	93.532
Patents Act 1990		s 62(b)	93.532
s 13	93.441	s 92	93.494
s 18	93.441	Trade Marks Regulations 1995	
s 117	93.441	reg 21.15(8)	93.532
Sch 1	93.441	Trade Practices Act 1974	
Trade Marks Act 1995		s 52	93.358
s 7	93.532	s 53	93.358
s 10	93.532, 93.561	s 65A	93.358
		s 85	93.358

INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

EQUITY

Injunctions — Interlocutory injunctions — Prima facie case — Strength of prima facie case — Balance of convenience — Detriment — Adequacy of damages as remedy — Whether grant of interlocutory injunction tantamount to final relief — Preservation of status quo — Whether status quo exists in Australian tablet market — Delay — Where balance of convenience evenly weighted: *Apple Inc v Samsung Electronics Co Ltd* 93 IPR 441

EVIDENCE

Admissibility — Hearsay — Objections — Tender — Rulings — Admissions — Whether adverse to party's interest in outcome of proceedings: *Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Trading Post Australia Pty Ltd (ACN 001 821 156)* 93 IPR 358

PATENTS

Infringement — Invalidity — Novelty — Prior art base — Touch screen — Heuristics: *Apple Inc v Samsung Electronics Co Ltd* 93 IPR 441

Novelty — Inventive step — Manner of manufacture — Fair basis — Applicant filed patent application pertaining to an improved application for hop acids as anti-microbial agents — Opponent filed opposition to patent application on four grounds — Whether patent application demonstrated novelty — Whether patent showed an inventive step — Whether patent was a manner of manufacture — Whether patent specification was fairly based: *John I Haas Inc v S S Steiner Inc* 93 IPR 568

TRADE MARKS

Application — Opposition — Registration — Deceptively similar: *Paypal Inc v Credibanc Pty Ltd* 93 IPR 561

Application — Opposition — Registration — Relevant market — Deceptively similar — Reputation — Distinctiveness — Descriptive — Use — False evidence: *Ainsworth Game Technology Ltd v IGT* 93 IPR 532

Opposition to registration — Removal action — Opposition to removal — Services of the same description — Substantially identical — Deceptively similar: *South African Airways Pty Ltd v Virtuoso Ltd* 93 IPR 494

Registration — Inherent capacity to distinguish — Substantial identity — Intention to use — Applicant sought to register word mark *yellow* in relation to its goods and services — Opponent opposed registration on grounds that it was not inherently adapted to distinguish, was substantially identical to other marks and was not intended to be used — Whether applicant's mark was inherently adapted to distinguish — Whether applicant's mark and other marks were substantially identical — Whether applicant intended to use mark — Whether application was made in bad faith: *Phone Directories Company Australia Pty Ltd v Telstra Corporation Ltd* 93 IPR 513

TRADE PRACTICES

Trade and commerce — Misleading or deceptive conduct — Internet searches — Failure to distinguish between organic search results and sponsored links — Representations as to sponsorship, approval or affiliation between goods and services — Class of consumers by which likely effect of advertisements to be assessed — Whether consumers would have read advertisement as a whole — Whether consumers would have read results page as a whole — Whether advertisement incorporated hyperlink to different website into its headline — Whether representations misleading or deceptive or likely to mislead or deceive — Whether ordinary, reasonable consumers were likely to be misled or deceived as to whether sponsored links in fact advertisements — Liability of search engine — Whether search engine conveyed representations made by advertisements — Defence — Where search engine engaged in business of publishing or arranging for publication of advertisements — Whether advertisements received in ordinary course of business — Use of automation in compilation of advertisements — Whether advertisements needed to be received in completed form — Whether defence available where publisher assists in compilation of advertisement — Receipt of advertisements in ordinary course of business — Actual or constructive knowledge of contravention — Non-publication orders — Confidentiality: *Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Trading Post Australia Pty Ltd (ACN 001 821 156)* 93 IPR 358