

**International  
Comparative  
Legal Guides**



# Trade Marks

# 2024

**13<sup>th</sup> Edition**

Contributing Editors:

**Nick Aries & Charlotte Colthurst**  
Bird & Bird LLP

**glg** Global Legal Group

## Expert Analysis Chapters

- 000** **What Lies Ahead? The End of EU Law Supremacy and its Impact on UK Trade Mark Law**  
Dan Breen & Nick Aries, Bird & Bird LLP
- 000** **Trade Dress Protection Continues to Evolve in the United States**  
Ron DiCerbo, McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
- 000** **Title TBC**  
Authors TBC, Arochi & Lindner

## Q&A Chapters

- 000** **Brazil**  
Ludmer Law: Eduardo Ludmer
- 000** **Cameroon**  
NICO HALLE & Co. LAW FIRM: Vanessa Halle-Fonguh
- 000** **Cayman Islands**  
HSM IP Ltd.: Huw Moses, Mrinali Menon & Kate Cleary
- 000** **China**  
Jones & Co.: Yixian Chen & Paul Jones
- 000** **Croatia**  
Korper & Partneri Law Firm: Iva Kuštrak Managić, Valentina Šokec, Josipa Bakalić & Dina Korper Žemva
- 000** **Cyprus**  
Koushos Korfiotis Papacharalambous LLC:  
Eleni Papacharalambous & Georgina Charalambous
- 000** **France**  
AtlantIP: Axel Doucerain
- 000** **Germany**  
Meissner Bolte: Bettina Hart & Jeannette Lewandowski
- 000** **Greece**  
Voelkel Kataliakos Roussou Law Office:  
Anna Roussou & Dr. Henning Voelkel
- 000** **India**  
LexOrbis: Manisha Singh & Ritika Agarwal
- 000** **Indonesia**  
Pillari ELK: Primastuti Purnamasari
- 000** **Israel**  
Ehrlich, Neubauer & Melzer (EN&M): Authors TBC
- 000** **Italy**  
ATAX&Legal: Filippo Canu, Lara Cazzola & Marco Botteghi
- 000** **Jamaica**  
DunnCox: Joanne Wood Rattray & Kelly Akin
- 000** **Japan**  
Fukami Patent Office, P.C.: Yoshitake Kihara & Miki Tomii
- 000** **Korea**  
Lee International IP & Law: Dong-Hwan Kim, Min-Hee Kim & Ji-Hyun Kim
- 000** **Macau**  
BN Lawyers: Bruno Nunes
- 000** **Malta**  
Camilleri Preziosi: Steve Decesare & Alexia Valenzia
- 000** **Mexico**  
OLIVARES: Alonso Camargo, Víctor Ramírez & Santiago Pedroza
- 000** **Netherlands**  
Legaltree: Marjolein Driessen
- 000** **Nigeria**  
G. Elias: Fred Onuobia SAN, Similoluwa Oyelude, Japhet Eneh & Oluwatosin Jinadu
- 000** **Philippines**  
V&A Law: Katrina V. Doble, Danielle Francesca T. C. San Pedro & Maria Patricia P. Cruz
- 000** **Portugal**  
Inventa: Vítor Palmela Fidalgo & João Pereira Cabral
- 000** **Spain**  
Arochi & Lindner: Miriam Anidjar Mogeda
- 000** **Switzerland**  
Birgelen Wehrli Rechtsanwälte: Authors TBC
- 000** **Taiwan**  
TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law: J. K. Lin & H. G. Chen
- 000** **Ukraine**  
ADVANCE PARTNERS: Oleg Zhukhevych, Olga Danish & Olga Kreshchenko
- 000** **United Kingdom**  
Bird & Bird LLP: Charlotte Colthurst & Nick Aries
- 000** **USA**  
Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu, P.C.: Karen Lim & Richard Lehv

# Taiwan



J. K. Lin



H. G. Chen

TIPLO Attorneys-at-Law

## 1 Relevant Authorities and Legislation

### 1.1 What is the relevant trade mark authority in your jurisdiction?

The relevant trade mark authority is the Taiwan Intellectual Property Office (TIPO).

### 1.2 What is the relevant trade mark legislation in your jurisdiction?

The Taiwan Trademark Act (Trademark Act) was first enacted and promulgated on May 6, 1930.

The current Trademark Act was amended and promulgated on November 30, 2016 and became effective on December 15, 2016.

## 2 Application for a Trade Mark

### 2.1 What can be registered as a trade mark?

Any sign with distinctiveness, which may consist of words, designs, symbols, colours, three-dimensional shapes, motions, holograms, sounds or any combination thereof, can be registered as a trade mark.

### 2.2 What cannot be registered as a trade mark?

There is no sign that would be refused registration in Taiwan so long as it is distinctive enough.

### 2.3 What information is needed to register a trade mark?

The following information is needed:

- A scanned copy of the Power of Attorney.
- Specification of goods/services sought for registration.
- The filing date and application number of the corresponding priority application (if priority is claimed pursuant to the corresponding World Trade Organization (WTO) member country's trade mark application).
- A scanned copy of the certified copy of the corresponding priority application (if priority is claimed pursuant to the corresponding WTO member country's trade mark application).
- The date of the first display of the goods or services and the name of the exhibition (if priority is claimed pursuant to the exhibition).

- The exhibition priority document (if priority is claimed pursuant to the exhibition).
- A print (not less than 5cm and not exceeding 8cm in length and width) of the mark.

### 2.4 What is the general procedure for trade mark registration?

The trade mark registration procedure and estimated timeframe are provided below:

- The applicant files the application.
- It takes approximately nine months to receive an official decision.
- The registration fees must be paid within two months from the day after the approval decision has been received.
- It takes approximately one month to receive the registration certificate after the payment of the registration fees.

### 2.5 How is a trade mark adequately represented?

Traditional trade marks:

- A traditional trade mark should be presented in a still, two-dimensional image.

Non-traditional trade marks:

- Three-dimensional trade mark: Such mark should be presented by views depicting the three-dimensional shape of the trade mark. The applicant shall furnish a description explaining the three-dimensional shape. The reproduction may use broken lines to show the manner, placement or context in which the trade mark is used on the designated goods or services with a description explaining such broken lines.
- Colour trade mark: Such mark does not have to be claimed using an internationally recognised colour code and can be presented by a sample of the colour(s). The reproduction may use broken lines to show the manner, placement or context in which the colour is, or the colours are, used on the designated goods or services. The matter shown by the broken lines is not part of the trade mark. The applicant shall furnish a description explaining such broken lines.
- Sound trade mark: Such mark should be represented by a musical notation on a stave, numeric music score or written explanation.
- Motion trade mark: Such mark can be presented by still images of the varying process of the moving images. The applicant shall furnish a description explaining the movement in sequential order.

- Hologram trade mark: Such mark can be presented by the perspective drawing(s) of the hologram. The applicant should provide a description stating the hologram. For a hologram that generates different representations because of different perspective views, the description should include the changes of the different perspective drawings.
- Repeating-pattern trade mark: Such mark can be presented by the pattern structure and serial arrangement. Also, the trade mark may be displayed in dotted lines showing the manner, position or context it is used on the designated goods or services; in particular, how the repeating-pattern trade mark is used on a specific portion of goods indicating the actual use should be clearly explained in the trade mark description; however, the dotted lines should not be part of the trade mark.
- Smell trade mark: Such mark should be presented in written explanation. The applicant may submit product samples, product packages, and articles related to the services provided in actual use, or test papers with the smell, etc., as the specimens of a smell trade mark applied for registration.
- Position trade mark: Such mark can be presented by broken lines to show the position where the trade mark is actually applied on the goods or services, and a clear description of the trade mark itself and how and where the trade mark is used on the goods or services.

## 2.6 How are goods and services described?

Goods and services are classified according to the Nice Classification system. Most of the class headings will be considered too broad/indefinite in meaning to be acceptable for registration purposes; it is necessary to specify the goods or services. It is not permissible to claim “all goods in class”.

## 2.7 To the extent ‘exotic’ or unusual trade marks can be filed in your jurisdiction, are there any special measures required to file them with the relevant trade mark authority?

The measures required to file non-traditional trade marks are given in question 2.5. In filing an application for registration of other non-traditional trade marks that are not given in question 2.5, the applicant must furnish the reproduction of the proposed trade mark. If the reproduction does not clearly and completely present the trade mark, a description or even specimen(s) thereof should be provided in order to precisely define the scope of the rights and to enable third parties to ascertain the registered trade mark and its scope of rights according to the publication of the trade mark registration.

## 2.8 Is proof of use required for trade mark registrations and/or renewal purposes?

Proof of use is not required for such purposes.

## 2.9 What territories (including dependents, colonies, etc.) are or can be covered by a trade mark in your jurisdiction?

A trade mark registered in Taiwan can only be protected in Taiwan.

## 2.10 Who can own a trade mark in your jurisdiction?

Any juridical or natural person, business or group can own a Taiwanese trade mark.

## 2.11 Can a trade mark acquire distinctive character through use?

A trade mark can acquire distinctive character through use. Generally speaking, it needs at least three years of use and advertising in Taiwan to acquire distinctive character.

## 2.12 How long on average does registration take?

It takes about 10 months from filing to registration if there is no objection from the examiner.

## 2.13 What is the average cost of obtaining a trade mark in your jurisdiction?

In addition to attorneys’ fees, the official fees (NT\$) for one application in one class are quoted below:

### Filing fees

#### Goods

- NT\$3,000.00 if the designated goods are under 20 items; and
- NT\$200.00 for each additional item if over 20 items.

#### Services

- NT\$3,000.00; and
- NT\$500.00 for each additional service if in excess of five services in subclass “retail services of specific goods” in class 35.

#### Registration fees

- NT\$2,500.00

## 2.14 Is there more than one route to obtaining a registration in your jurisdiction?

Except by filing an application in Taiwan, there is no other route to obtaining a registration in Taiwan.

## 2.15 Is a Power of Attorney needed?

A scanned copy of the Power of Attorney (simply signed by an authorised person) is required.

## 2.16 If so, does a Power of Attorney require notarisation and/or legalisation?

Neither notarisation nor legalisation is required.

## 2.17 How is priority claimed?

The following documents and information are needed to claim priority pursuant to the corresponding WTO member country’s trade mark application:

- Filing date and application number of the corresponding priority application: Must be stated at the time of filing the Taiwanese application.

- A certified copy of the corresponding priority application: must be submitted within three months after the Taiwanese application is filed; an extension of time to file the certified copy is not permitted.

The following documents and information are required to claim priority pursuant to the exhibition:

- The date of first display of the goods or services and the name of the exhibition: must be stated at the time of filing the Taiwanese application.
- Exhibition priority document: must be submitted within three months after the Taiwanese application is filed; an extension of time to file the priority document is not permitted.

### 2.18 Does your jurisdiction recognise Collective or Certification marks?

Taiwan recognises Collective and Certification marks.

A Collective trade mark is a sign that serves to indicate goods or services of a member in an association, society or any other group that is a juridical person and to distinguish goods or services of such member from those of others who are not members.

A Certification mark is a sign that serves to certify a particular quality, accuracy, material, mode of manufacture, place of origin or other matters of another person's goods or services by the proprietor of the Certification mark, and to distinguish the goods or services from those that are not certified. Only a juridical person, group or government agency that is competent to certify another person's goods or services is eligible to apply for registration of a Certification mark.

## 3 Absolute Grounds for Refusal

### 3.1 What are the absolute grounds for refusal of registration?

The principal absolute grounds for refusal of registration are provided below:

- A trade mark that is non-distinctive.
- A trade mark that is exclusively necessary for the goods or services to be functional.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to the national flag, national emblem, national seal, military flags, military insignia, official seals, or medals of the Republic of China (ROC), or the state flags of foreign countries, or the armorial bearings, national seals or other state emblems of foreign countries communicated by any member of the WTO under paragraph 3 of Article 6ter of the Paris Convention.
- A trade mark that is identical to the portrait or name of Dr. Sun Yat-Sen or the head of state.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to the mark of a government agency of the ROC or an official exhibition held thereby, or the medal or certificate awarded thereby.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to the armorial bearings, flags, other emblems, abbreviations, and names of international intergovernmental organisations or well-known domestic or foreign institutions undertaking business for public interest, and hence likely to mislead the public.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to official signs and hallmarks indicating control and warranty adopted by domestic or foreign countries, and designated to identical or similar goods or services.
- A trade mark that is contrary to public policy or to accepted principles of morality.

- A trade mark that is likely to mislead the public as to the nature, quality, or place of origin of the goods or services.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to a geographical indication for wines or spirits in the ROC or a foreign country, and is designated to goods that are identical or similar to wines or spirits, where that foreign country concludes with the ROC an agreement, or accedes to an international treaty, to which the ROC also accedes, or has reciprocal recognition with the ROC of protection of geographical indications for wines or spirits.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to another person's registered trade mark or earlier filed trade mark and to be applied for goods or services identical or similar to those for which the registered trade mark is protected or the earlier filed trade mark is designated, and hence there exists a likelihood of confusion of relevant consumers, unless the consent of the proprietor of said registered trade mark or earlier filed trade mark to the application has been given and is not obviously improper.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to another person's well-known trade mark or mark, and hence there exists a likelihood of confusion of the relevant public or a likelihood of dilution of the distinctiveness or reputation of said well-known trade mark or mark, unless the proprietor of said well-known trade mark or mark consents to the application.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to another person's earlier used trade mark and to be applied for goods or services identical or similar to those for which the earlier used trade mark is applied, where the applicant, with the intent to imitate the earlier used trade mark, being aware of the existence of the earlier used trade mark due to contractual, regional, or business connections, or any other relationship with the proprietor of the earlier used trade mark, files the application for registration, unless the proprietor of said earlier used trade mark consents to the application.
- A trade mark that contains another person's portrait or well-known name, stage name, pseudonym, or alternative name, unless said person consents to the application.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to the name of a well-known juridical person, business or any group, and hence there exists a likelihood of confusion of the relevant public, unless said juridical person, business or group consents to the application.
- A trade mark that is an infringement of another person's copyright, patent right, or any other right, where a final judgment of the court has been rendered, unless said person consents to the application.

### 3.2 What are the ways to overcome an absolute grounds objection?

An absolute grounds refusal can be overcome through argument, acquired distinctiveness through use, and/or obtaining a letter of consent.

### 3.3 What is the right of appeal from a decision of refusal of registration from the Intellectual Property Office?

A decision can be appealed in its entirety.

### 3.4 What is the route of appeal?

The route of appeal is as follows:

- In disagreement with the TIPO's decision, an initial appeal may be filed with the Ministry of Economic Affairs

(MOEA) within 30 days, counting from the day after the TIPO's decision has been received.

- In disagreement with the MOEA's decision, an administrative suit may be instituted with the Intellectual Property and Commercial Court (IPCC) within two months, counting from the day after the MOEA's decision has been received.
- In disagreement with the IPCC's judgment, an ultimate appeal may be instituted with the Supreme Administrative Court within 20 days, counting from the next day after the IPCC's judgment has been received.

## 4 Relative Grounds for Refusal

### 4.1 What are the relative grounds for refusal of registration?

With respect to the examination of an application for trade mark registration, Taiwan adopts the "comprehensive examination system", which means that the trade mark authority *ex officio* examines all grounds for refusal including grounds regarding conflicting trade marks that involve only private interests.

### 4.2 Are there ways to overcome a relative grounds objection?

An objection can be overcome by argument, limiting the specification, a letter of consent, and/or invalidating the earlier mark.

### 4.3 What is the right of appeal from a decision of refusal of registration from the Intellectual Property Office?

A decision can be appealed in its entirety.

### 4.4 What is the route of appeal?

Please see question 3.4.

## 5 Opposition

### 5.1 On what grounds can a trade mark be opposed?

The principal grounds for opposition are given below:

- A trade mark that is non-distinctive.
- A trade mark that is exclusively necessary for the goods or services to be functional.
- A trade mark that is likely to mislead the public as to the nature, quality, or place of origin of the goods or services.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to a geographical indication for wines or spirits in the ROC or a foreign country, and is designated to goods that are identical or similar to wines or spirits, where that foreign country concludes with the ROC an agreement, or accedes to an international treaty, to which the ROC also accedes, or has reciprocal recognition with the ROC of protection of geographical indications for wines or spirits.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to another person's registered trade mark or earlier filed trade mark and to be applied for goods or services identical or similar to those for which the registered trade mark is protected or the earlier filed trade mark is designated, and hence there exists a likelihood of confusion of relevant consumers.
- A trade mark that is identical or similar to another person's well-known trade mark or mark, and hence there exists a

likelihood of confusion of the relevant public or a likelihood of dilution of the distinctiveness or reputation of said well-known trade mark or mark.

- A trade mark that is identical or similar to another person's earlier used trade mark and to be applied for goods or services identical or similar to those for which the earlier used trade mark is applied, where the applicant, with the intent to imitate the earlier used trade mark, being aware of the existence of the earlier used trade mark due to contractual, regional, or business connections, or any other relationship with the proprietor of the earlier used trade mark, files the application for registration.

### 5.2 Who can oppose the registration of a trade mark in your jurisdiction?

Anyone can oppose the registration of a Taiwanese trade mark.

### 5.3 What is the procedure for opposition?

The procedure is as follows:

- The opposer files the opposition.
- The TIPO notifies the trade mark registrant to submit a defence within a certain time limit (normally 30 days).
- The trade mark registrant submits a defence.
- The TIPO notifies the opposer to submit supplementary opposition reasons within a certain time limit (normally 30 days).
- The TIPO issues a decision.
- The opposition is finalised if no appeal is filed.

## 6 Registration

### 6.1 What happens when a trade mark is granted registration?

The registration fees must be paid within two months from the day after the approval decision has been received. The trade mark will be registered and published after payment of the registration fees, and a registration certificate will then be issued.

### 6.2 From which date following application do an applicant's trade mark rights commence?

Trade mark rights in Taiwan commence from the date of registration.

### 6.3 What is the term of a trade mark?

The term of a trade mark is 10 years.

### 6.4 How is a trade mark renewed?

Renewal will be granted upon the filing of a renewal application and payment of the official fees.

In addition to attorneys' fees, the official fee for one application for renewal of one registration in one class is NT\$4,000.00.

The renewal application shall be made within six months before the expiration of its period. However, it is permitted to pay twice the official fees for renewal within six months after the expiration of the period.

## 7 Registrable Transactions

### 7.1 Can an individual register the assignment of a trade mark?

Yes, an individual can register the assignment of a trade mark, and such assignment shall be recorded with the TIPO.

To record an assignment, the following documents are needed:

- a scanned copy of the Power of Attorney of the Assignee signed by an authorised person; and
- a scanned copy of the Deed of Assignment signed by the parties.

### 7.2 Are there different types of assignment?

A partial assignment is possible for certain goods or services and a trade mark can be assigned with or without goodwill.

### 7.3 Can an individual register the licensing of a trade mark?

Yes, an individual can register the licensing of a trade mark, and such licence shall be recorded with the TIPO.

A licence agreement is no longer required for filing a licence application if the application is filed by the registrant. A scanned copy of the licence agreement signed by the parties is acceptable if the licence application is filed by the licensee.

### 7.4 Are there different types of licence?

A registered trade mark may be licensed by the proprietor, exclusively or non-exclusively, for all or some of the designated goods or services for which it is registered and for a particular locality.

### 7.5 Can a trade mark licensee sue for infringement?

Only an exclusive licensee is entitled, within the scope of the licence, to bring infringement proceedings in his/her own name unless otherwise prescribed in a licensing contract.

### 7.6 Are quality control clauses necessary in a licence?

Quality control clauses are not necessary in a licence.

### 7.7 Can an individual register a security interest under a trade mark?

Yes, an individual can register a security interest under a trade mark, and a creation, change, or extinguishment of a security interest shall be recorded with the TIPO.

### 7.8 Are there different types of security interest?

No, there are not.

## 8 Revocation

### 8.1 What are the grounds for revocation of a trade mark?

The principal grounds for revocation are provided below:

- Where the trade mark is altered by the proprietor in different forms from those by which it was registered or supplemented with additional notes, whereby the trade mark is identical or similar to another person's registered trade mark in relation to goods or services that are identical or similar to those for which another person's registered trade mark is designated, and hence there exists a likelihood of confusion of relevant consumers.
- Where the trade mark has not yet been put to use or such use has been suspended for a continuous period of not less than three years without proper reasons for non-use.
- Where the trade mark has become the generic mark or term, or common shape for the designated goods or services.

### 8.2 What is the procedure for revocation of a trade mark?

The procedure is as follows:

- The petitioner files a revocation petition.
- The TIPO notifies the trade mark registrant to submit a defence within a certain time limit (normally 30 days).
- The trade mark registrant submits a defence.
- The TIPO notifies the petitioner to submit supplementary revocation reasons within a certain time limit (normally 30 days).
- The TIPO issues a decision.
- The revocation is finalised if no appeal is filed.

### 8.3 Who can commence revocation proceedings?

Anyone can commence revocation proceedings.

### 8.4 What grounds of defence can be raised to a revocation action?

The main grounds of defence may include:

- Non-similarity between two parties' trade marks.
- No likelihood of confusion in the case.
- The trade mark is not used in a form as registered but should be considered genuine use because its identity remains the same according to the general social concept.

### 8.5 What is the route of appeal from a decision of revocation?

Please see question 3.4.

## 9 Invalidity

### 9.1 What are the grounds for invalidity of a trade mark?

Please see question 5.1.

### 9.2 What is the procedure for invalidation of a trade mark?

The procedure is as follows:

- The petitioner files an invalidation petition.
- The TIPO notifies the trade mark registrant to submit a defence within a certain time limit (normally 30 days).
- The trade mark registrant submits a defence.

- The TIPO notifies the petitioner to submit supplementary invalidation reasons within a certain time limit (normally 30 days).
- The TIPO issues a decision.
- The invalidation is finalised if no appeal is filed.

### 9.3 Who can commence invalidation proceedings?

Only an interested party can commence invalidation proceedings.

### 9.4 What grounds of defence can be raised to an invalidation action?

The main grounds of defence may include:

- Non-similarity between two parties' trade marks.
- No likelihood of confusion in the case.
- The cited mark is not well known in Taiwan in cases where the invalidation action is based on the well-known status of such mark.
- The disputed mark is not filed in bad faith.
- The disputed mark is inherently distinctive or has acquired distinctiveness through use.

### 9.5 What is the route of appeal from a decision of invalidity?

Please see question 3.4.

## 10 Trade Mark Enforcement

### 10.1 How and before what tribunals can a trade mark be enforced against an infringer?

According to the Trademark Act, a trade mark owner may initiate criminal and/or civil action against an infringer in Taiwan. In the event of trade mark infringement, a trade mark owner may initiate a civil action with the IPCC to seek infringement removal and damages. Alternatively, the trade mark owner may file a criminal complaint for violation of the Trademark Act with the district prosecutor's office that has jurisdiction in the place where the suspected infringer has his/her domicile or where he/she commits the violation of the Trademark Act.

### 10.2 What are the key pre-trial procedural stages and how long does it generally take for proceedings to reach trial from commencement?

In Taiwan, instead of the pre-trial discovery regime adopted in the US and Europe, the preparatory proceedings should go first before the trial proceedings in a civil or criminal action with respect to a trade mark infringement. The preparatory proceedings for a civil action usually take around five to eight months, during which period the judge first examines whether the required procedural formalities are met, and the parties submit their respective arguments or move for investigation on evidence. The judge compiles and lists the disputed issues of the case. In a criminal action in regard to a trade mark infringement, the judge, during the preparatory proceedings, compiles the substantive issues and evidence presented by the parties, provides opinions with respect to the admissibility of evidence presented by the parties, and decides whether to deny/accept the motion(s) for investigation on evidence. The preparatory proceedings for a criminal action usually take around three to five months.

### 10.3 Are (i) preliminary, and (ii) final injunctions available and if so, on what basis in each case?

Yes, preliminary injunctions and final injunctions are available in Taiwan.

- A preliminary injunction is granted if the claimant can show that an injunction is necessary to prevent material harm or imminent danger or other similar circumstances. The factors generally considered by the court to determine whether a preliminary injunction is warranted include (a) likelihood of success on the merits of the case, (b) whether the claimant would suffer irreparable harm in the absence of an injunction, (c) balance of interests between both parties, and (d) impact on public interest.
- Final injunctions are typically granted if the claimant is successful at trial in establishing that (a) the trade mark is infringed (trade mark similarity and likelihood of confusion), and (b) the defendant is currently engaging in infringing activities or is likely to in the future.

### 10.4 Can a party be compelled to provide disclosure of relevant documents or materials to its adversary and if so, how?

Yes, a party in a civil action may move the court to order the opposing party to produce documentary evidence in the opposing party's possession. The motion must specify the relationship between such documentary evidence and the disputed fact to be proved, as well as the legal ground for the opposing party's duty to produce such documents or materials. Under Article 344 of the Code of Civil Procedure, a party has the duty to disclose: (a) documents to which such party has made reference in the course of the proceedings; (b) documents whose delivery or inspection the other party may require, pursuant to applicable laws; (c) documents that were prepared for the interest of the other party; (d) commercial accounting books; and (e) documents that were made in respect of matters relating to the action. The party may refuse to produce such (e) documents that involve privacy or business secrets of a party or a third person and the disclosure of such documents may result in material harm to such party or third person. Notwithstanding, in order to determine whether the party has a justifiable reason to refuse disclosure of such documents, the court, if necessary, may order the party to produce the documents and examine them in private.

### 10.5 Are submissions or evidence presented in writing or orally and is there any potential for cross-examination of witnesses?

In a criminal action for trade mark infringement, in principle, arguments or written statements made out of court by any person other than the defendant of an action cannot be taken as evidence, unless they are made by such a person being cross-examined in court. Any person who testifies by providing arguments or written statements before the judge should be ordered to make an affidavit, and any false statements given by such a person will be considered perjury, as defined by the Taiwan Criminal Code. In a civil action for trade mark infringement, either party may introduce a desired witness(es) or produce evidence in written form and also move for the judge to conduct a necessary examination of the witness(es) or conduct such examination himself/herself after informing the judge.



### 10.6 Can infringement proceedings be stayed pending resolution of validity in another court or the Intellectual Property Office?

No, Article 41 of the Intellectual Property Case Adjudication Act requires that the court may not suspend or stay the proceedings pending resolution of validity by the TIPO or the Administrative Court.

### 10.7 After what period is a claim for trade mark infringement time-barred?

A damages claim for trade mark infringement is time-barred after a two-year period from the time when the trade mark owner became aware of the infringement and the infringer, or a 10-year period from the time when the infringement took place, whichever expires earlier.

### 10.8 Are there criminal liabilities for trade mark infringement?

Yes, there are criminal liabilities for trade mark infringement in Taiwan.

### 10.9 If so, who can pursue a criminal prosecution?

The trade mark owner and/or the exclusive licensee can bring a criminal action against the infringer(s).

### 10.10 What, if any, are the provisions for unauthorised threats of trade mark infringement?

Any person who commits any of the following acts, in the course of trade and without the consent of the proprietor of a registered or Collective trade mark, shall be liable to imprisonment for a period not exceeding three years and/or a fine not exceeding NT\$200,000.00:

- (1) using a trade mark that is identical to the registered or Collective trade mark in relation to goods or services that are identical to those for which it is registered;
- (2) using a trade mark that is identical to the registered or Collective trade mark and used in relation to goods or services similar to those for which the registered or Collective trade mark is designated, and hence there exists a likelihood of confusion of relevant consumers; or
- (3) using a trade mark that is similar to the registered or Collective trade mark and used in relation to goods or services identical or similar to those for which the registered or Collective trade mark is designated, and hence there exists a likelihood of confusion of relevant consumers (Article 95 of the Trademark Act).

Any person who knowingly sells or, due to an intent to sell, possesses, displays, exports, or imports infringing goods shall be liable to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year and/or a fine not exceeding NT\$50,000.00; the same penalties shall also apply to acts performed through electronic media or on the Internet (Article 97 of the Trademark Act).

## 11 Defences to Infringement

### 11.1 What grounds of defence can be raised by way of non-infringement to a claim of trade mark infringement?

A suspected trade mark infringer may assert non-infringement

by presenting the following grounds as defences: (1) the allegedly infringing mark is not identical or similar to the allegedly infringed mark and is unlikely to cause confusion; (2) the allegedly infringing mark is not used as a trade mark; (3) the allegedly infringing mark is not used for marketing purposes; or (4) the allegedly infringing mark should be cancelled or revoked.

### 11.2 What grounds of defence can be raised in addition to non-infringement?

In addition to a non-infringement allegation, the suspected infringer may assert that:

- (1) he/she properly uses the mark in dispute and should be free from the capacity of the allegedly infringed trade mark right in the following circumstances: (i) he/she indicates his/her own name, or the term, shape, quality, nature, characteristic, intended purpose, place of origin, or any other description in relation to his/her own goods or services, in accordance with honest practices in industrial or commercial matters, but does not use the mark in dispute as a trade mark; (ii) he/she uses the mark in dispute where it is necessary for the goods or services to be functional; (iii) he/she uses, with *bona fide* intent and prior to the filing date of the registered trade mark, an identical or similar mark on goods or services identical or similar to those for which the registered trade mark is protected, provided that the use is only on the original goods or services and the proprietor of the registered trade mark is entitled to request the party who uses the trade mark to add an appropriate and distinguishing indication; or (iv) goods have been put on the domestic or foreign market under a registered trade mark by the proprietor or with the proprietor's consent, and the proprietor is not entitled to claim trade mark rights on such goods, unless such claim is to prevent the condition of the goods having been changed or impaired after they have been put on the market, and unless there exist other legitimate reasons (Article 36 of the Trademark Act);
- (2) no damages should be awarded because the suspected infringer lacks the subjective intention or negligence on which an award of damages must be based; or
- (3) the plaintiff's claim for damages was time-barred (see question 10.7).

## 12 Relief

### 12.1 What remedies are available for trade mark infringement?

In criminal aspects, the trade mark owner may file a criminal complaint against an infringer for violation of the Trademark Act and seek a raid action to be initiated by the police and further initiate an incidental civil action during the trial proceedings after the prosecutor's indictment, which will have more impeding effect and also satisfy the cost-saving purpose. Seized counterfeit items will be confiscated and destroyed after the judge confirms and sustains the occurrence of a violation of the Trademark Act. A civil action serves as another remedy, by which a trade mark owner may seek injunction, removal of infringement, compensation, and destruction of the counterfeits.

### 12.2 Are costs recoverable from the losing party and if so, how are they determined and what proportion of the costs can usually be recovered?

In order to initiate a civil action regarding trade mark infringement, the plaintiff should first pay litigation expenses to the

court, and the losing party should bear the litigation expenses upon conclusion of the case. In other words, the winning party may request the losing party to bear litigation expenses. Where the parties each win the case in part, the court may, at its discretion, order the parties to bear the litigation expenses in a certain proportion or order both parties to bear litigation expenses that have been incurred by them respectively.

Mandatory attorney representation is required for specific IP-related civil cases. The court should assess and determine, upon motion or *ex officio*, the amount of remuneration to the attorney as part of litigation expenses in a case (in accordance with Article 15 of the Intellectual Property Case Adjudication Act and the “Standards for Payment of Remunerations to Attorneys-at-Law as Litigation Expenses or Procedural Expenses”).

## 13 Appeal

### 13.1 What is the right of appeal from a first instance judgment and is it only on a point of law?

In the criminal aspect of a trade mark infringement action, the complainant may also seek an appeal, by filing a motion with the prosecutor’s office for the prosecutor to take an appeal if he/she finds the judgment unjustifiable. The second-instance judgment will, however, be the final judgment, with binding effect on the criminal cases of trade mark infringement. That is to say, neither the prosecutor nor the defendant will be allowed to bring the criminal case to a third-instance trial.

In a civil action, either party may appeal the district court judgment to the High Court should they find the judgment unjustifiable. The matter may be brought to the Supreme Court – the court of third instance – if the claim value meets the NT\$1.65 million threshold. An appeal taken to the Supreme Court must be based on a point of law.

### 13.2 In what circumstances can new evidence be added at the appeal stage?

The parties in a trade mark infringement action may present arguments, materials and/or introduce (new) evidence in due course during the preparatory proceedings, or the court may deny those presented by reason of obstruction of proceedings. Furthermore, as the third-instance court is to examine judicial and only judicial issues, neither party is to present a new argument or introduce evidence of any kind during the third-instance proceedings.

## 14 Border Control Measures

### 14.1 Is there a mechanism for seizing or preventing the importation of infringing goods or services and if so, how quickly are such measures resolved?

The trade mark owner or its authorised agent may file the request for recording its registered trade mark(s) with the Customs Authority with the material on the key points to identify a counterfeit to the Customs Authority’s database for use in combating counterfeit goods at the border. The recordation will be valid until expiration of the trade mark term.

The Customs Authority will withhold the shipment of suspected counterfeits declared for export or import in a random inspection based on the relevant recordation data. The trade mark owner or its local agent must respond to the Customs Authority within 24 hours whether it is willing to either conduct an authentication based on the photos of the suspected goods

provided by the Customs officer through the designated Customs online platform or go to the Customs office for authentication upon receiving the Customs’ notice.

Further, the Customs Authority must duly obtain a signed examination report and valuation report issued by the trade mark owner within three business days to be legally authorised to withhold the shipment of suspected counterfeits from release. (Upon request, the Customs Authority may allow an extension of three business days when necessary.) If the trade mark owner fails to do so, the shipment of the suspected goods shall be released unless it violates other customs regulations.

## 15 Other Related Rights

### 15.1 To what extent are unregistered trade mark rights enforceable in your jurisdiction?

Unregistered trade marks that are commonly known to the public are eligible for right protection under the Fair Trade Act in cases where they are used in the same or a similar manner so as to cause confusion with other goods or services (Article 22 of the Fair Trade Act). Advertisements published in Taiwan, and figures with respect to sales volume and market share, etc., for the past two to three years, shall be presented if seeking Fair Trade Act protection.

### 15.2 To what extent does a company name offer protection from use by a third party?

No company may use a company name identical to that of another company. Where two companies’ names contain any word that may specify their different business categories, such company names will not be considered identical. A company name can be used exclusively by its owner once it has been approved by and registered at the competent authority. Anyone may initiate a civil action with the court for protection of his/her company name from use by a third party. Furthermore, he/she may file a complaint with the Taiwan Fair Trade Commission against the use of his/her company name that is commonly known to the public by a third party in the same or a similar manner without his/her prior consent to seek remedy and protection, by asserting the third party’s violation of the Fair Trade Act.

### 15.3 Are there any other rights that confer IP protection, for instance book title and film title rights?

Fair Trade Act protection is conferred on unregistered trade marks, personal names, business or corporate names, or containers, packaging, or appearance of another’s goods, or any other symbol that represents such person’s goods, commonly known to the public, so as to cause confusion with such person’s goods (Article 22 of the Fair Trade Act). In addition, an enterprise may be held in violation of Article 25 of the Fair Trade Act for any deceptive or obviously unfair conduct that is able to affect trading order by taking advantage of any other person’s goodwill, or by the act of plagiarising any other person’s packaging or appearance of goods, book title or film title, etc. that is able to affect trading order.

## 16 Domain Names

### 16.1 Who can own a domain name?

Anyone can own a domain name after completing the due course of registration.

### 16.2 How is a domain name registered?

A registrant may apply to the registrar, such as the Taiwan Network Information Center (TWNIC), to register the domain name he/she selects and to pay the annuity.

### 16.3 What protection does a domain name afford *per se*?

No one may repeat the registration of any registered domain names. According to the “Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy” passed by the TWNIC, in the following three circumstances, a complaint should be sustained and the TWNIC Registry Administrator should cancel or transfer a registered domain name to the complainant after the dispute resolution provider decides in favour of the complainant:

- (1) The domain name in dispute is identical or confusingly similar to the complainant’s trade mark(s).
- (2) The registrant of the domain name in dispute has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name in dispute.
- (3) The registrant has registered or used the domain name in dispute in bad faith.

### 16.4 What types of country code top-level domain names (ccTLDs) are available in your jurisdiction?

The TWNIC deals with disputes in relation to ccTLDs ending with “.tw”.

### 16.5 Are there any dispute resolution procedures for ccTLDs in your jurisdiction and if so, who is responsible for these procedures?

In Taiwan, domain name disputes may be brought to court for resolution by initiating a lawsuit. In addition to a lawsuit, there is another expedited procedure for dispute resolution in which the dispute is handled by a dispute resolution provider that is an organisation or institution approved and recognised by the TWNIC, such as the Science & Technology Law Institute or Taipei Bar Association, which will select qualified panellists to handle domain name disputes according to the “Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy”.

## 17 Current Developments

### 17.1 What have been the significant developments in relation to trade marks in the last year?

The Legislative Yuan of Taiwan passed the third reading of the amendment to the Intellectual Property Case Adjudication Act on January 12, 2023, and the amendment came into effect as of August 30, 2023.

The main points of the amendment to 77 articles (including 36 articles added and 41 articles amended) of the Intellectual Property Case Adjudication Act are summarised as follows:

- (1) Exclusive and concentrated trial of IP-related cases:  
The IPCC should have exclusive jurisdiction over the first-instance civil cases involving IP rights protected by the Patent Act, Trademark Act, Copyright Act, Trade Secrets Act, or Fair Trade Act, etc. Also, the trial plan system is introduced in the amendment.

- (2) Mandatory representation by attorneys:  
Mandatory attorney representation is required for specific IP-related civil cases (e.g.: first-instance civil actions that are appealable to the third-instance court for involving the price or value of claims above a certain amount as set out in the Code of Civil Procedure; first-instance civil actions involving patent rights, copyrighted computer programs, or trade secrets; second-instance civil actions; third-instance court cases; and retrial cases). Attorney’s remuneration should be calculated as part of litigation expenses in specific IP-related civil cases.
- (3) Expansion of expert participation:  
The amendment introduces the mechanism of expert verification and expert witness.
- (4) Augmented trade secrets protection:  
The amendment adds measures for enhancing the protection over trade secrets involved in civil actions; for example, use of codes or names for evidentiary documents containing trade secrets for the purpose of de-identification, and expansion of the scope of movants seeking confidentiality preservation orders.
- (5) Enhancement of trial efficiency:  
According to the amendment, the court may disclose all or part of the report prepared by the technical examination officers when necessary for dispute resolution.
- (6) One-time dispute resolution and avoidance of inconsistent judgments:  
The amendment establishes the information exchange system between the court and the administrative authority.

### 17.2 Please list three important judgments in the trade marks and brands sphere that have been issued within the last 18 months.

#### **Case 1: The definition of the well-known trade mark applied to trade mark dilution in administrative case (ruling issued by the Supreme Administrative Court under docket (111) Da-Zi No. 1 on March 17, 2023)**

##### *Brief of the administrative case*

A UK-based company sought registration for its trade mark with the TIPO (defendant in this administrative action), and the TIPO accepted the trade mark for registration (hereinafter the “trade mark in dispute”), against which the plaintiff filed an opposition on the ground of contravention of subparagraph 11 of paragraph 1 of Article 30 of the Trademark Act before initiating the administrative action, and the opposition turned out to be unsuccessful after the TIPO’s review. Refusing to back down, the plaintiff (the UK-based company) initiated the administrative action with the IPCC. The administrative action, however, was dismissed by the IPCC by an administrative judgment, and after that, the plaintiff appealed this administrative case to the Supreme Administrative Court (under docket (110) Shang-Zi No. 138).

The legal opinions adopted by the Supreme Administrative Court on the legal issue involved in this administrative case were discrepant with the opinions made by the Supreme Administrative Court in other precedents; therefore, a request for ruling was submitted accordingly to the Grand Panel of the Supreme Administrative Court (under docket (111) Zheng-Zi No. 2 on October 6, 2022).

##### *Legal issue*

Subparagraph 11 of paragraph 1 of Article 30 of the Trademark Act prohibits the registration of trade marks that are identical or similar to another person’s well-known trade mark, and hence

there exists a likelihood of confusion of the relevant public (first part) or a likelihood of dilution of the distinctiveness or reputation of said well-known trade mark (latter part). Should the ground of dilution set forth in the latter part of this provision be raised for trade mark refusal when and only when the “well-known trade mark” defined thereby has enjoyed recognition to the extent that it has become commonly known not only to relevant consumers but also to the general public at large?

*Reasonings provided in the Grand Panel’s ruling*

Article 31 of the Enforcement Rules of the Trademark Act has clearly defined “well-known trade marks” as those capable of being commonly recognised by relevant enterprises or consumers as substantiated by objective proof. In addition, neither the dilution clauses incorporated in the Trademark Act in 2003 nor the Enforcement Rules thereof require that the dilution ground of trade mark refusal defined in the latter part of subparagraph 11 should attain the level of fame commonly recognised by the general public. Therefore, the interpretation of the term “well-known trade mark” applicable to the latter part of this provision (likelihood of dilution) should be consistent with the interpretation applicable to the first part (likelihood of confusion). That is to say, it refers to a trade mark widely and commonly known to relevant enterprises or consumers as proved by objective evidence without attaining the level of fame among general public awareness.

**Case 2: The reliability and admissibility of an authenticity examination report (a criminal judgment rendered by the Supreme Court under docket (111) Tai-Shang-Zi No. 5677 on February 9, 2023)**

*Fact*

The appellant, Huang, as the actual responsible person of Company A, argued that the earphones and USB cable in dispute he sold carried the complainant’s registered trade mark, and the products in dispute were examined by the expert, Wei, who was entrusted by the complainant, and confirmed not to be the products manufactured by the complainant’s authorised factory. Huang was found not guilty in the first-instance judgment, which was then reversed by the appellate court in the second-instance judgment; the appellate court found the authenticity examination report made and produced by Wei admissible, and therefore decided that Huang was guilty, against which Huang filed an appeal against the second-instance judgment and brought this case to the Supreme Court.

*Reasonings*

According to the Supreme Court judgment, the appellate court did not err in finding in the second-instance judgment that the authenticity examination report produced by Wei was admissible and in convicting Huang. Hence, the Supreme Court dismissed Huang’s appeal with a finalised judgment. The Supreme Court judgment’s reasoning is summarised as follows:

- (1) The expert witness, Wei, was appointed by the court as agreed upon by and among the prosecutor, the defendant, and the defendant’s attorney (hereinafter the “Parties”), and was further ordered by the judge to sign a written oath to guarantee the authenticity of its examination.
- (2) With respect to the method of authenticity examination, it was agreed upon by the Parties that the complainant should provide the equipment and dispatch personnel for photographing the seized products under the on-site supervision by the court clerk and court attendant assigned by the judge, so as to confirm that the objects to be examined were indeed the seized products.

- (3) The expert witness had to produce an authenticity examination report and written proof of his/her professional competence to conduct the authenticity examination. Moreover, the expert witness appeared at a hearing to explain the standards of examination and determination and to elaborate on the reasons why the seized products were examined as counterfeit. The expert witness was also questioned by the appellant on any issues the appellant found unclear and questionable.
- (4) The Supreme Court determined that the appellant’s right of defence in litigation was not divested because the expert witness, Wei, who met the required qualifications and has professional competence, had made considerably clear explanations about whether the seized products were authentic or counterfeit based on his knowledge and experience and with appropriate methods and tools, and had further been questioned by the appellant. Therefore, the appellate court did not contravene the laws by making a decision on this case based on the authenticity examination report.

**Case 3: Does a trade mark proprietor’s failure to exercise his/her/its rights or failure to file a lawsuit after his/her/its knowledge of the existence of infringement contravene the principle of good faith and further constitute a ground for forfeiture of rights? (A civil judgment under docket (111) Min-Shang-Geng-Yi-Zi No. 5 rendered by the IPCC on August 17, 2023)**

*Fact*

The appellant, Eslite Corporation (hereinafter “Eslite”), alleged that it has successfully registered its Chinese-character mark “誠品” (hereinafter the “Mark”) since 1989 and designated the Mark for use on various goods and services, and that it has expanded the scope of its business to engage also in the business of logistics and transport since 1996. Moreover, the Mark has been recognised as a well-known trade mark that has been widely known among consumers since 1993.

The appellees used their respective company names including the Mark and also used the Mark for marketing purposes on their webpages, fan pages, and advertisements. Eslite asserted that the aforesaid conduct of the appellees was likely to cause confusion to relevant consumers and to dilute the distinctiveness and reputation of the Mark, and hence infringed upon Eslite’s trade mark rights.

The lawsuit has been dragging on for years. The first-instance judgment was rendered in favour of the appellees but was reversed in the second-instance proceedings, and hence the appellees appealed this case to the Supreme Court, which finally vacated the second-instance judgment and remanded this case back to the second-instance court for retrial. The IPCC handed down a judgment in favour of Eslite, demanding that the appellees do not use the Mark and be severally and jointly liable for damages to Eslite.

*Reasonings*

- (1) The appellees had been using the Mark in enlarged and striking font on their trucks, boxes, and company websites, which is very likely to cause consumers to mistakenly believe that the products or services provided by Eslite or the appellees are of the same source or that the users of the Mark are affiliates or in licensor-licensee or franchisor-franchisee or any other similar relationships. As such, the appellees violated subparagraphs 2 and 3 of Article 68 of the Trademark Act.
- (2) With the clear knowledge that the Mark is a well-known trade mark, the appellees used the Mark as part of their company names, and such use was likely to cause confusion

to relevant consumers or to dilute Eslite's business reputation and distinctiveness. By so doing, the appellees violated subparagraphs 1 and 2 of Article 70 of the Trademark Act.

- (3) The appellees defended themselves by arguing that there had been no occurrence of confusion between their companies and Eslite's company throughout their business operation for almost 20 years, and based on that, the appellees invoked laches, that is, Eslite's lengthy failure to assert its rights. However, from the judge's perspective, the appellees had not produced any evidence of any kind to prove Eslite's inaction or any contradictory action seeking no infringement removal and damages payment by the appellees. Moreover, the judge held that the appellees had also failed to substantiate that Eslite agreed to, either expressly or implicitly, the appellees' use of the Mark as part of their company name. In view of the foregoing, the judge determined that the appellees' defensive arguments with respect to Eslite's laches and contravention of the principle of good faith were inadmissible.

### 17.3 Are there any significant developments expected in the next year?

The Legislative Yuan of Taiwan greenlighted the amendment to partial provisions of the Trademark Act, with the amendment promulgated by presidential order on May 9, 2023. The amendment will take effect on a date determined and announced by the Executive Yuan.

Highlights of the amendment are summarised as follows:

- (1) Introduction of accelerated examination:  
Trade mark applicants who require timely registration may request with the trade mark registrar for accelerated examination by stating the facts and reasons for their immediate need for registration and pay double official fees.
- (2) Establishment of a trade mark agent management system:  
To act as trade mark agents and engage in trade mark agency services, individuals must possess trade mark-related professional competence and complete trade mark agent registration.
- (3) Simplification of the authentication procedure by trade mark owners after receiving a notice from customs:  
To keep in line with the simplified border control measures implemented by the Customs Administration of the Ministry of Finance, trade mark owners may conduct authentication on suspected goods or articles detained by customs through an online platform by accessing the digital photos of these suspected goods or articles and may conduct on-site authentication when necessary.
- (4) Expanded scope of eligible trade mark applicants:  
To answer to business entities' practical needs for operation on the market, the amendment provides that partnership organisations (such as law and architectural firms), non-corporate groups (such as temples, associations, and production and marketing groups), and duly registered sole proprietorships or partnerships are now included as eligible applicants for trade mark registration and may act as a party in litigation.
- (5) Specification of fair use:  
The amendment incorporates and defines "nominative fair use" that is not subject to the effect of another person's trade mark rights and does not constitute trade mark infringement. For example, mobile phone repairing service providers may use the trade marks of various branded mobile phones in their advertisements to indicate the specific branded mobile phones for which they provide repairing services.

### 17.4 Are there any general practice or enforcement trends that have become apparent in your jurisdiction over the last year or so?

#### General practice for trade mark infringement

In general circumstances of trade mark infringement occurrences, trade mark owners may act upon the Trademark Act to assert trade mark rights for civil or criminal aspects involved. The trade mark owner in practice files a criminal complaint seeking a raid action to be initiated by the police and further initiates an incidental civil action during the trial proceedings after the prosecutor's indictment, which will have a greater impeding effect and also satisfy the cost-saving purpose. Under the Intellectual Property Case Adjudication Act, the judge shall hear and decide on the criminal action and the incidental civil action at the same time.

#### Use of another's registered trade mark online

For such promotional activities as displaying online a product bearing another's registered trade mark or otherwise advertising or issuing catalogues indicating said trade mark carried on the product, such use of the registered trade mark in the foregoing activities will be considered "nominative fair use" as defined by subparagraph 1 paragraph 1 of Article 36 of the Trademark Act when and only when such use aims to provide correct and truthful product information to consumers and is necessary and in line with good faith commercial practices without any likelihood of causing confusion to consumers with respect to the source of goods or services. That is to say, in the foregoing activities, it is legally acceptable to assert that such activities are not subject to the effect of another's registered trade mark. However, if the manner or type of use of the trade mark in the foregoing activities is likely to cause consumers confusion, such use will still be considered likely to cause trade mark infringement. Therefore, "nominative fair use" should be assessed and determined on a case-by-case basis.

#### Trade mark registration for responding to the rise of the Metaverse

As branded products have been launched on the Metaverse, it has become necessary to complete trade mark registration for designated use on Metaverse-related goods or services (as elucidated in the following paragraphs) if goods/service providers intend to engage in business activities on the Metaverse, so as to extend trade mark protection of their trade marks to the Metaverse.

The "Comprehensive Guide to Domestic and Foreign Trademark Applications" compiled by the TIPO in October 2022, which provides the applicable classifications for virtual goods or services in the Metaverse, establishes classes 9, 35, 41, and 42 as the main Nice Classification classes for virtual goods or services.

Class 9 is the classification for downloadable virtual product images or software that can be used online and in the online virtual world, namely virtual product images featuring the category name of the physical product; for example, clothing, etc.

Class 35 is the classification for the online retail service of virtual goods, that is, the online retail service for the category name of physical goods that are used in a virtual environment/world.

Class 41 is the classification for entertainment services, that is, online game services or virtual reality game halls that use the virtual images of the category name of physical goods.

Class 42 is the classification for non-downloadable virtual product image files or software that can be used in the online virtual world and feature the category name of the physical product.



J. K. Lin, Attorney-at-Law and Patent Attorney, Director of TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law.

J. K. Lin became the Director of TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law in 1997, the same year TIPLo's founder, M. S. Lin, passed away. During the 27-year tenure to date, J. K. has set out to further streamline the hierarchy of the staff and adopted effective formulae leading to improved synergy in all aspects of TIPLo's patent, trade mark and legal services to proactively accommodate clients' intensifying needs for IP right enforcement. J. K. also devotes his time to many public speaking events targeted at global corporations and international society, addressing issues of IP-related concerns and unfair competition among other subjects, while following the footsteps of his late father in his dedication to *pro bono* activities organised by various NGOs, such as the Judicial Reform Foundation, the Taiwan International Law Society and the Taiwan Human Rights Committee, among many others. He was the Co-Chairperson of the Organizing Committee at the 2019 Asian Patent Attorneys Association ("APAA") 70<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting in Taipei. J. K. is currently a council member of the APAA, and Vice-President of the APAA Taiwan Group. He is a member of the Japan Intellectual Property Association, Japan Trademark Association, INTA, IPBA, AIPLA, Taipei Bar Association and Taiwan Patent Attorneys Association.

**TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law**

7<sup>th</sup> Floor, We Sheng Building  
No. 125, Nanking East Road, Sec. 2  
Taipei City 10409  
Taiwan

Tel: +886 2 2507 2811

Email: [tiplo@tiplo.com.tw](mailto:tiplo@tiplo.com.tw)

URL: <https://www.tiplo.com.tw/en/team/1345/10>



**H. G. Chen**, Attorney-at-Law and Patent Attorney, Chief Counsel of TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law.

H. G. Chen is the Chief Counsel of the Legal Department of TIPLo. He has been practising law in Taiwan for more than 30 years. H. G. has extensive experience in the fields of intellectual property, litigation, unfair competition, dispute resolution and general corporate matters. In the late 1980s, he demonstrated pre-eminent litigious flair by successfully representing a client in a leading trade dress case in Taiwan before the enactment of the Taiwan Fair Trade Act. He has represented various global corporate clients from Japan, the United States and Europe in patent and trade mark litigation, licensing and negotiation in Taiwan, and this illustrious record has won him a reputation as one of the most successful lawyers in the country. He served as the President of the Taipei Bar Association for the term of May 2005 to November 2006. He was the Director of the Intellectual Property Committee of the Taipei Bar Association (1990–1993) and the Taiwan Bar Association (1993–1995). He is currently a Council Member of the Asian Patent Attorneys Association (APAA) and an Executive Member of the Board of Directors of the APAA Taiwan Group.

**TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law**

7<sup>th</sup> Floor, We Sheng Building  
No. 125, Nanking East Road, Sec. 2  
Taipei City 10409  
Taiwan

Tel: +886 2 2507 2811

Email: [chg013@tiplo.com.tw](mailto:chg013@tiplo.com.tw)

URL: <https://www.tiplo.com.tw/en/team/1345/11>

TIPLo Attorneys-at-Law (also known as Taiwan International Patent & Law Office) was founded in 1965 by M. S. Lin and a group of professional legal and technical associates specialising in IP rights. Being a leading firm in patent and trade mark prosecution and enforcement, TIPLo is one of the largest and most reliable full-range IP service law firms in Taiwan. TIPLo is currently staffed by 282 full-time members, many of whom are multilingual professionals fluent in English, Chinese, Japanese, Taiwanese and other languages. TIPLo mainly consists of three departments: Patent; Trademark; and Legal. Over 100 patent engineers and attorneys at TIPLo have a continuous career length of more than 15 years in average, with expertise and experience covering a wide range of technical fields, including electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, applied chemistry, biochemical engineering, biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, semiconductors, computer technology and other emerging areas. TIPLo is a leading firm in patent and trade mark prosecution, invalidation and

opposition proceedings, infringement assessment and validity appraisal. The proficiency of our Legal Department in IP enforcement – in particular, litigating infringement cases and coordinating law enforcement efforts – is highly recognised by local enforcement authorities of all levels and industries alike, reinforcing TIPLo as one of the most effective law firms representing the interests of its clients.

[www.tiplo.com.tw](http://www.tiplo.com.tw)

**TIPLo**  
Attorneys-at-Law

台灣國際專利法律事務所