

CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Intellectual Property Reports

Cytec Industries Inc v Nalco Company (No 4) (FCA — Burley J) (2024) 186.1

Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor (FCAFC — Full Court) (2024) 186.103

Novartis AG v Pharmacor Pty Ltd (No 3) (FCA — Yates J) (2024) 186.24

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART

- Accor Australia & New Zealand Hospitality Pty Ltd v Liv Pty Ltd (2017) 345 ALR 205; 124 IPR 264; [2017] FCAFC 56, applied 186.103
- Aktiebolaget Hässle v Alphapharm Pty Ltd (2002) 212 CLR 411; 194 ALR 485; 56 IPR 129; [2002] HCA 59, applied 186.24
- Altecnic Ltd v Reliance Water Controls Ltd [2001] 12 WLUK 261; [2001] EWCA Civ 1928, applied 186.103
- Anchorage Capital Master Offshore Ltd v Sparkes (2023) 111 NSWLR 304; [2023] NSWCA 88, considered 186.103
- Anchorage Capital Partners Pty Ltd v ACPA Pty Ltd (2018) 259 FCR 514; 351 ALR 436; 128 IPR 255; [2018] FCAFC 6, applied 186.103
- Anheuser-Busch Inc v Budejovický Budvar, Národní Podnik (2002) 56 IPR 182; [2002] FCA 390, explained 186.103
- Aristocrat Technologies Australia Pty Ltd v Global Gaming Supplies Pty Ltd (2016) 329 ALR 522; 121 IPR 150; [2016] FCAFC 22, considered 186.103
- AstraZeneca AB v Apotex Pty Ltd (2014) 226 FCR 324; 312 ALR 1; 107 IPR 177; [2014] FCAFC 99, considered 186.24
- v Apotex Pty Ltd (2015) 257 CLR 356; 323 ALR 605; 114 IPR 445; [2015] HCA 30, applied 186.24
- Bauer Consumer Media Ltd v Evergreen Television Pty Ltd (2019) 367 ALR 393; 142 IPR 1; [2019] FCAFC 71, applied 186.103
- Baume & Co Ltd v A H Moore Ltd [1958] Ch 907; [1958] 2 All ER 113; [1958] 2 WLR 797, considered 186.103
- Commissioner of Patents v Ono Pharmaceuticals Co Ltd (2022) 291 FCR 1; (2022) 165 IPR 441; [2022] FCAFC 39, considered 186.24
- Décor Corporation Pty Ltd v Dart Industries Inc (1988) 13 IPR 385, applied 186.103
- Delfi Chocolate Manufacturing SA v Mars Australia Pty Ltd (2015) 115 IPR 82; [2015] FCA 1065, distinguished 186.103
- Energy Beverages LLC v Cantarella Bros Pty Ltd (2023) 407 ALR 473; 170 IPR 281; [2023] FCAFC 44, applied 186.103
- Flexopack SA Plastics Industry v Flexopack Australia Pty Ltd (2016) 118 IPR 239; [2016] FCA 235, considered 186.103
- General Tire & Rubber Company v Firestone Tyre and Rubber Company Ltd (1971) 1A IPR 121; [1972] RPC 457, applied 186.24
- Genetics Institute Inc v Kirin-Amgen Inc (1999) 92 FCR 106; 163 ALR 761; 44 IPR 257; [1999] FCA 742, considered 186.1
- GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Healthcare Investments (Ireland) (No 2) Ltd v Generic Partners Pty Ltd (2018) 264 FCR 474; 131 IPR 384; [2018] FCAFC 71, considered 186.24
- H Lundbeck A/S v Alphapharm Pty Ltd (2009) 177 FCR 151; 81 IPR 228; [2009] FCAFC 70, considered 186.24
- Hashtag Burgers Pty Ltd v In-N-Out Burgers, Inc (2020) 385 ALR 514; 159 IPR 186; [2020] FCAFC 235, considered 186.103
- Johnson & Johnson Australia Pty Ltd v Sterling Pharmaceuticals Pty Ltd (1991) 30 FCR 326; 101 ALR 700; 21 IPR 1, applied 186.103; considered 186.103
- Keller v LED Technologies Pty Ltd (2010) 185 FCR 449; 268 ALR 613; 87 IPR 1; [2010] FCAFC 55, applied 186.103
- Kirin-Amgen Inc v Hoechst Marion Roussel Ltd (2004) 64 IPR 444; [2005] 1 All ER 667; [2005] RPC 9; [2004] UKHL 46, considered 186.24
- Marino (a pseudonym) v Bello (a pseudonym) (No 3) (2022) 408 ALR 650; [2022] NSWCA 181, considered 186.103

(Continues on p iii of cover)

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART — *continued*

Meat & Livestock Australia Ltd v Cargill, Inc (No 2) (2019) 139 IPR 47; [2019] FCA 33, considered 186.1

MMD Australia Pty Ltd v Camco Engineering Pty Ltd (2024) 181 IPR 184; [2024] FCAFC 38, considered 186.24

Nikken Wellness Pty Ltd v van Voorst (2003) AIPC ¶91-904; [2003] FCA 816, applied 186.103
Nutrasweet Australia Pty Ltd v Ajinomoto Co Inc (No 3) (2007) 73 IPR 282; [2007] FCA 966, considered 186.1

Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co Ltd v Generic Health Pty Ltd (No 4) (2015) 113 IPR 191; [2015] FCA 634, followed 186.24

Parker-Knoll Ltd v Knoll International Ltd [1962] RPC 265, applied 186.103

PDP Capital Pty Ltd v Grasshopper Ventures Pty Ltd (2021) 285 FCR 598; 391 ALR 608; 160 IPR 174; [2021] FCAFC 128, applied 186.103

Pfizer Inc v Commissioner of Patents (2005) 141 FCR 413; 64 IPR 547; [2005] FCA 137, considered 186.24

Re Australian Wine Importers Ltd (1889) 41 Ch D 278, applied 186.103

Reckitt & Colman (Aust) Ltd v Boden (1945) 70 CLR 84, applied 186.103

Repipe Pty Ltd v Commissioner of Patents (No 3) [2021] FCA 31, considered 186.1

Self Care IP Holdings Pty Ltd v Allergan Australia Pty Ltd (2023) 277 CLR 186; 408 ALR 195; 171 IPR 120; [2023] HCA 8, applied 186.103

Sensis Pty Ltd v Senses Direct Mail and Fulfillment Pty Ltd (2019) 141 IPR 463; [2019] FCA 719, applied 186.103

Singtel Optus Pty Ltd v Optum Inc (2018) 140 IPR 1; [2018] FCA 575, distinguished 186.103

Smith & Nephew Plastics (Australia) Pty Ltd v Sweetheart Holding Corporation (1987) 8 IPR 285, distinguished 186.103

Thompson v Australian Capital Television Pty Ltd (1996) 186 CLR 574; 141 ALR 1, considered 186.103

Trident Seafoods Corp v Trident Foods Pty Ltd (2018) 137 IPR 65; [2018] FCA 1490, considered 186.103

Woolworths Ltd v BP Plc (No 2) (2006) 154 FCR 97; 235 ALR 698; 70 IPR 25; [2006] FCAFC 132, applied 186.103

STATUTES, RULES, ETC CITED IN THIS PART

COMMONWEALTH		
Patents Act 1990		
s 7	186.24	
s 18	186.24	
s 40	186.1, 186.24	
s 70	186.24	
s 102	186.1	
s 105	186.1	
	s 138	186.24
	s 192	186.24
	Trade Marks Act 1995	
	s 60	186.103
	s 88(2)(a)	186.103
	s 88(2)(c)	186.103
	s 122(1)(a)(i)	186.103
	s 122(1)(fa)	186.103

INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

PATENTS

Infringement — Threatened infringement — Applicants owned standard patent in respect of certain pharmaceutical compositions — Applicants sought and obtained extension of standard patent — Respondent intended to supply certain pharmaceutical products entered on Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods — Applicants contended respondent had thereby threatened to infringe its patent — Respondent contended that extension of term invalid — Proper identification of person skilled in art — Proper construction of claims in specification — Distinction between compositions and complexes — Respondent did not threaten to infringe patent upon its proper construction — Disconnect between pharmaceutical substance per se relied upon by applicants in extension application for purposes of satisfying conditions with respect to patent and conditions with respect to pharmaceutical substances — Extension of term invalidly granted: *Novartis AG v Pharmacor Pty Ltd (No 3)* 186 IPR 24

Opposition — Amendment application following opposition proceedings — Whether claims in patent application found to lack clarity and support — Whether amendment application overcomes deficiencies identified in opposition proceedings — Whether discretion to grant amendment should not be exercised — Need for finality: *Cytec Industries Inc v Nalco Company (No 4)* 186 IPR 1

TRADE MARKS

Honest concurrent use — Date of any actual application for registration of trade mark irrelevant to date of hypothetical application for purposes of defence — Relevant date is date of alleged infringing conduct — Defence not available where honest adoption of unregistered mark not accompanied by non-infringing concurrent use: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

Infringement — Defences — Use of own name in good faith — Proper approach to “good faith” — Distinction between circumstances establishing presence of good faith and absence of bad faith — Defence unavailable to joint tortfeasor — Defence available to person who had used adopted name — Defence available to such person notwithstanding that rights to relevant trade mark assigned: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

Infringement — Liability — Joint tortfeasors — Corporations in commercial arrangement for licensing of trade mark in respect of promotion and sale of merchandise — Director of licensor corporation — Proper approach to liability as joint tortfeasors: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

Registrar’s discretion — Cancellation of respondent’s mark — Use of trade mark likely to deceive or cause confusion — Appellants used trade mark “Katy Perry” in relation to internationally famous performing artist — Respondent had registered trade mark “Katie Perry” in relation to small-scale luxury loungewear brand — Reputation of appellants’ mark stronger than respondent’s mark — Consumers were likely to be deceived or confused — Ground for cancellation of respondent’s mark established — Discretion to refuse cancellation not enlivened because respondent registered trade mark with knowledge of Katy Perry and her reputation and common industry practice in relation to promotion and sale of merchandise: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

Registration — Construction — Proper approach to terms used in registered trade mark — Meaning of “clothes”: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

WORDS AND PHRASES

“clothes”: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

“complex”: *Novartis AG v Pharmacor Pty Ltd (No 3)* 186 IPR 24

“compound”: *Novartis AG v Pharmacor Pty Ltd (No 3)* 186 IPR 24

“good faith”: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

“honest concurrent use”: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

“joint tortfeasor”: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

“own name”: *Killer Queen, LLC v Taylor* 186 IPR 103

“person skilled in the art”: *Novartis AG v Pharmacor Pty Ltd (No 3)* 186 IPR 24

“pharmaceutical substance per se”: *Novartis AG v Pharmacor Pty Ltd (No 3)* 186 IPR 24

“team”: *Novartis AG v Pharmacor Pty Ltd (No 3)* 186 IPR 24