

# **CARIFORUM Intellectual Property Rights and Innovation**

Rebecca Santana Davies | Alicante | 21.03.2023

## ⊖ € 🕫 🕸 🛟 😔 € 💿 🝣 🔥 🥩 🥩 €



CARIFORUM



This Project is funded by the European Union and implemented by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

caripi-hub.eu

## **Design examination**

**Concepts on Novelty and individual character** 

Alicante, Spain (Webinar)





Funded by the European Union





caripi-hub.com





answers and uestions

4

#### How can a design qualify for registration?



• There has to be a product or part of a product

• Colours, verbal elements and sounds do not qualify as they do not constitute the appearance of a product.

Living organisms and concepts do not qualify either, for the same reason

• Your design should respect public policy and certain morality standards



F	e	e	S
•	$\sim$	$\sim$	$\mathbf{U}$

RESIDEN RECACO				<b>RECACH</b>
1# DESIGN	230EUR	+120ELR	=330ELR	<b>408 R</b> *
	115EUR	60HJR	=17588.R	20H.P.*
<b>DESIGN</b> 11 ANDADDICOAL	50EFR	30HR	<b>=80HJ</b> R	10H.P.*

**FEES** 



	1 <sup>st</sup> renewal	2 <sup>nd</sup> renewal	3 <sup>rd</sup> renewal	4 <sup>th</sup> renewal
Per DESIGN	90 EUR	120 EUR	150 EUR	180 EUR
- Internet aller Part	TON TON DA HOT		Charmen of	Statistics and a second

#### RENEWAL IN ADITIONAL 6 MONTHS GRACE PERIOD: + 25% OF THE BELATED RENEWAL FEE

## **DEFERMENT. Request**



- 30 Months from the date of filing or from the date of priority.
- The request must be submitted together with the application.
- Deferment fee.
- Publication fee may be paid later.

## What is examined?



✓ **Request** for design registration

Information identifying the applicant

Representation of the design suitable for reproduction (Art. 4(1)CDIR):

✓ Good quality / Neutral background / Same design

Compliance with the definition of a design

✓ Public policy & accepted principles of morality.

## What is NOT examined?



Absolute requirements (novelty, individual character, visibility, technical function, designs of interconnections).

✓ Earlier rights

- ✓ conflict with a prior design right
- unauthorised use of an earlier distinctive sign in the design
- unauthorised use of the copyright or improper use of items listed in Art. 6ter of the Paris Convention or other emblems of public interest in a Member State.
- ✓ Whether the applicant is entitled to the design.

# Is your design new? Where to search?



Registered Design:

P eSearch plus

EUIPO's Database access

EUIPO database

DesignView

EUIPO + national registries.

WIPO

**Global Design Database** 

11

# **Representation. Quality of the design**











# **Representation. Quality of the design**









## **Representation. Neutral background**



The background in a view is considered neutral as long as the design shown in this view is **clearly distinguishable from its environment** without interference of any other object, accessory or decoration, whose inclusion in the representation could cast doubt on the protection sought.

(Decision of 25 April 2012, R 2230/2011-3 – Webcams, para. 11-12).

In other words, the requirement of a neutral background neither demands a 'neutral' colour nor an 'empty' background. It is instead decisive that the design stands out so clearly from the background that it remains identifiable. (Decision of 25 January 2012, R 284/2011-3 – Tool chest, para. 13).

Jägermeister

**General** Court

http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=187688&pageIndex=0&d oclang=en&mode=req&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=856363

Court of Justice <u>http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=203609&pageIndex=0&d</u> <u>oclang=EN&mode=reg&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=494293</u>



# **Representation. Neutral background**









# **REPRESENTATION\_Neutral background**





# **REPRESENTATION\_Neutral background**









### If all the views of the design are of bad quality or reproduced on not neutral background:

- The applicant must replace the views with new ones / modify the views (in case of background)
- Filing date = the date when the new/modified views are received

## If some of the views of the design are of bad quality or reproduced on not neutral background:

- The applicant can replace the deficient views with new ones/ modify the views (in case of background)
- Filing date = the date when the new/modified views are received
- o or
- Withdraw the deficient views and maintain the original date of filing but only for the correct views

## If no response to the deficiency letter:

Design is refused (Final Status: "Not to be dealt as a Community Design") Fees are refunded

## No filing date!



**Convergence Project on Graphic representation of designs** 

The first Common Practice on designs was agreed by participating EU IP Offices in November 2015. As a result, a Common Communication has been published on the website of all implementing offices on 15 April 2016.

The objective of this project is to define a common practice for the graphic representation of a design which safeguards both the principle of legal certainty and the objective of having a flexible system of design registration available for users. The following four topics will be part of the scope (Disclaimers, Type of Views and a benchmark exercise on Format of Views).

			carIDI
	EXAMINATION	ers	Intellectual Property Rights &
		S S	
Ý	RCD INVALIDITY. General principles	ans	
	Article 25(1)CDR	ls an	
		5	
	Disclosure, exceptions.	Jestic	
		5	
	Tests of novelty and individual carácter. Examples		



# **Declaration of invalidity of Registered Community Designs**

available after the Community design registration substantive check of validity of the right

- ✓ absolute grounds
- ✓ relative grounds
- ✓ entitlement to the RCD

## **Article 25 CDR**



- **1. A Community design may be declared invalid only if:**
- a) it does not correspond to the **definition of design** under Article 3(a);
- b) it does not fulfil the **requirements of Articles 4 to 9**;
- c) by virtue of a court decision, **the right holder is not entitled** to the Community design under Article 14;
- d) it is in **conflict with a prior design** which has been made available to the public after the date of filing of the application;
- e) it is in **conflict with an earlier distinctive sign**;
- f) if it constitutes an unauthorised use of a work protected under the copyright law of a Member State;
- g) if it constitutes an **improper use** of any of the **items listed in Article 6ter** of the "Paris Convention"



# Article 25 CDR in conjunction with Articles 4-9 CDR

- Lack of novelty and individual character (Art. 4(1), 5, 6, 7 CDR);
- Non-visible component parts of complex products (Art. 4(2)(3) CDR);
- Technical function (Art. 8(1) CDR);
- Interconnections ('must fit') (Art. 8(2) CDR);
- Against public policy and morality (Art. 9 CDR).





A Community design may be declared invalid only in the following cases:
 [...]
 b) if it does not fulfil the requirements of Articles 4 to 9

## **Art. 4 CDR - Requirements for protection**

A design shall be protected by a Community design to the extent that it is new and has individual character [...]

# Article 25 CDR in conjunction with Article 5 CDR



**Article 5 CDR – Novelty** 

A design shall be considered to be new if no identical design has been made available to the public:

**a)in the case of an unregistered Community design**, before the date on which the design for which protection is claimed has first been made available to the public;

**b)in the case of a registered Community design**, before the date of filing of the application for registration of the design for which protection is claimed, or, if priority is claimed, the date of priority.

# Article 25 CDR in conjunction with Article 6 CDR



Article 6 CDR - Individual character

A design shall be considered to have individual character if the **overall impression** it produces on the informed user differs from the overall impression produced on such a user by any design which has been made available to the public:

**a)in the case of an unregistered Community design**, before the date on which the design for which protection is claimed has first been made available to the public;

**b)in the case of a registered Community design**, before the date of filing the application for registration or, if a priority is claimed, the date of priority.



- ✓ Invisible features of parts of complex products (Article 4(2) CDR)
- ✓ Features solely dictated by technical function (Article 8(1) CDR)
- ✓ Features of interconnections (Article 8(2) CDR)
- ✓ Features **not discernible** (or clearly discernible) from the registration (Recital 11 DD and decision of 10/03/2008, R 0586/2007-3, Barbecues, § 23 26)
- ✓ Features for which the protection is not sought and they are disclaimed in the RCD representation (judgment of 14/06/2011, T 68/10, 'Watches', § 59 64)

## **General principles**



## DISCLOSURE PRELIMINARY STEP

- ✓ 1° step: the invalidity applicant must prove the **event of disclosure** (Art. 7(1) CDR)
- ✓ 2° step: the **holder** of the contested Community design **can claim an exception** to disclosure (Art. 7(1 second half), (2) and (3)CDR)



## **The Prior Invoked Design**

It is immaterial whether or not an earlier 'design' within the meaning of Article 3(a) CDR enjoys or enjoyed legal protection (as a design, a trade mark, copyright work, patent, utility model or otherwise) (21/05/2015, T-22/13 & T-23/13, UMBRELLAS, EU:T:2015:310, § 24).



## **The Prior Invoked Design**

The invoked earlier design should be identified and reproduced precisely and in its entirety (21/09/2017, C-361/15 P& C-405/15 P, Shower drains, EU:C:2017:720, § 65).





The Prior Invoked Design

The invoked earlier design **should be identified and reproduced precisely** and in its entirety (21/09/2017, C-361/15 P& C-405/15 P, Shower drains, EU:C:2017:720, § 65).

10/03/2008, R 586/2007 3, Barbecues

IS IT REPRODUCED PRECISELY ?





## **Article. 7 CDR – Disclosure**

For the purpose of applying Articles 5 and 6, a design shall be deemed to have been made available to the public if it has been:

✓ published following registration;
✓ exhibited;
✓ used in trade;
✓ or otherwise disclosed

**before** the date referred to in **Articles 5**(1)(a) **and 6**(1)(a) or in Articles 5(1)(b) and 6(1)(b), as the case may be, except where these events could not reasonably have become known in the normal course of business to the circles specialised in the sector concerned, operating within the Community.

## ✓ Official Publications

The date of publication can also be identified by the reference to the relevant INID code







## Non necessarily in the EU

Exhibiting a design at a trade fair exhibition anywhere in the world generally constitutes an event of disclosure(14/03/2018, T 651/16, Footwear, EU:T:2018:137, § 67).

**Evidence:** any document able to prove that the design has been exhibited in the fair (a list of participants, a plan that contains stands, pictures of the event...)



Disclosure of a design can be the result of use in trade even where there is no proof that the products in which the earlier design is incorporated have actually been produced or put on the market (21/05/2015, T 22/13 & T 22/13, UMBRELLAS, ECLI:EU:T:2015:310, § 36). It may be sufficient that the products were offered for sale in catalogues (22/10/2007, R 1401/2006 3, ORNAMENTACIÓN, § 25), imported from a country outside the European Union (14/06/2011, T 68/10, Watches, EU:T:2011:269, § 31-32) or were the object of an act of purchase between two European operators (09/03/2012, T 450/08, Phials, EU:T:2012:117, § 30-45).

Evidence: catalogues (also extracts), invoices ...



**<u>CP10 Common Practice – Criteria for assessing disclosure of designs on the internet</u></u>** 





## Websites/Apps/Emails

**Evidence:** printout or screenshot which shows a clear image of the relevant design + date of disclosure + URL address




#### Website archiving services - «WayBack Machine»

Evidence: URL address + screenshot showing the earlier invoked design + relevant date



## Website archiving services - «WayBack Machine»

Evidence: URL address + screenshot showing the earlier invoked design + relevant date



Evidence: printout showing earlier design + URL address visible in the printout + product information (ASIN + date of first availability)



#### Product information

Technical Details			Additional Information	
Package	dimensions	10.6 x 10.6 x 7.3 centimetres	ASIN	B08Z8C3479
Package Weight		0.28 Kilograms	Delivery information:	We cannot deliver certain products outside mainland UK (
Item Wei	ght	80 Grams		Details). We will only be able to
Brand		Lincom		confirm if this product can be delivered to your chosen
Colour		Pink		address when you enter your delivery address at checkout.
Part num	Part number	DC5PK-2	item model number	DCSPK-2
Zoom Ty	Zoom Type Digital Zoom		Batteries	1 Lithium Polymer batteries
Effective	still resolution	30 MP		required. (included)

Date First Available

Customer Reviews

Best Sellers Rank

17 Mar. 2021 179 ratings 3.7 out of 5 stars 21,795 in Electronics & Photo (See Top 100 in Electronics &

Photol

Cameras

124 in All-in-One Digital



#### AMAZON

**Evidence:** printout showing earlier design + URL address visible in the printout + product information (ASIN + date of first availability)







## ARTICLES

Evidence: printout showing earlier design + URL address visible in the printout + date of publication



Good news for online sales fans: Amazon Prime Day is here and there are so many deals to be had. If you don't know what Prime Day is (erm, where have you been?), it's a 48 hour sale where Amazon slashes its prices on various items throughout the day to give its Prime customers a bit of a bargain. This year, it's running until midnight tonight (13 July) so you've still got time to bag a discount.

You need to be signed up to Amazon Prime to take part, and then keep an eye out for Lightning Deals and Spotlight Deals. Lightning Deals start every five minutes and run for a set amount of time, while Spotlight Deals last until an item is sold out. Basically, check in often and shop quickly. Exciting!

## SOCIAL MEDIA

**Evidence**: printout or a screenshot showing a clear image of the relevant design + URL address + date of publication + any other relevant information (the 'popularity' indicators, views, likes...)





♥ 68.4k likes ● 3,511 comments

Mythical magic makers, we're sharing a sneak peek of NEW, never before seen brushes. These beauties were inspired by fantasy and will bring your makeup dreams to life! Flying into your beauty collection in 2017. #sneakpeek #fantasy #areyouready



## YouTube

**Evidence:** printout or a screenshot showing a clear image of the relevant design + URL address + date of publication of the video + any other relevant information (the 'popularity' indicators, views, likes...)



#### Google cache search



## NOT CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE MAY SUPPORT OTHER EVIDENCE



Judgment of 22/06/2010, T-153/08, Communications equipment

Even if **some items of evidence are not conclusive in themselves**, **they may contribute** to establishing the event of disclosure when examined **in combination with other items**. (09/03/2012, T-450/08, Phials, EU:T:2012:117, § 25, 30-45; 27/02/2018, T-166/15, Sacs pour ordinateurs portables, EU:T:2018:100, § 24; 14/03/2018, T-651/16, Footwear, EU:T:2018:137, § 52; 17/05/2018, T-760/16, Fahrradkörbe, EU:T:2018:277, § 42, 45 and 50; 13/06/2019, T-74/18, Informationstafeln für Fahrzeuge, EU:T:2019:417, § 22).



# **Article 25 CDR in conjunction with Article 7 CDR**

**EXCEPTIONS** 



## **DISCLOSURE** = PRELIMINARY STEP

1° step: the invalidity applicant must prove the event of disclosure (Art. 7(1) CDR)

**2° step**: the holder of the contested Community design can claim an exception to disclosure (Art. 7(1 - second half), (2) and (3)CDR)

#### **EXCEPTIONS**

## Safeguard clause:

**1.** [...] except where these events could not reasonably have become known in the normal course of business to the circles specialised in the sector concerned, operating within the Community;



#### **EXCEPTIONS**

## Grace Period - Art. 7(2) CDR

Disclosure of the Community design within 12 months preceding the date of filing or the priority date of the contested Community design will not be taken into consideration if it was made by:

- the designer, or
- its successor in title

#### The holder must establish that it is either :

- the creator of the design upon which the application is based, or
- its successor in title

## **Article 25 CDR**



# Novelty and Individual character tests

# **Article 25 CDR: Different tests**



#### NOVELTY

**Objective test** Matter of fact

Does there exist, in the relevant prior art an identical design?

The later design:

 exactly reproduced, or
different only in immaterial
details (insignificant details which may pass unnoticed)

Decision of 28/07/2009, R 921/2008-3, 'Nail files' (left: contested RCD, right: examples from the state of the art



#### **INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER**

#### Perception of the informed user:

Does there exist, in the relevant prior art, a design which does not differ in the overall impression?

**Factors** affecting perception of the informed user:

- designer's freedom & technical features due to the purpose, function and nature of some types of products

- design corpus & saturation of the market

- visibility of some features during the normal use

- banal and common features to all the designs of the type of a product

#### Comparison of designs is not an imperfect recollection test

When the nature of the product in which the compared designs are incorporated makes it possible, the overall impression left by these designs will be assessed on the assumption that the informed user can make a direct comparison between them

(judgment of 18/10/2012, joint cases C 101/11 P and C 102/11 P, Ornamentation, § 54-55).



Decision of 25/05/12, R 970/2011-3 – 'Armchairs' left: contested RCD, right: prior design Different overall impression

+

Article 5 CDR – Lack of Novelty

## What do you think?



Article 5 CDR – Lack of Novelty

## What do you think?



#### Article. 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character

1. A design shall be considered to have individual character if the overall impression it produces on the informed user differs from the overall impression produced on such a user by any design which has been made available to the public: [...]

b) in the case of a <u>registered Community design</u>, **before the date of filing** the application for registration or, if a priority is claimed, **the date of priority**.

**2**. In assessing individual character, the **degree of freedom of the designer** in developing the design will be taken into consideration.

Article 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character

Four-stage examination to establish:

- 1. the sector concerned
- 2. the informed user
- 3. the designer's degree of freedom
- 4. the overall impression

#### Article. 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character

#### 1. The sector concerned

To determine the sector to which the product of the contested design belongs (and hence the informed user and the degree of freedom of the designer in developing the design), it is appropriate to **look at the design itself** to specify the nature, intended **purpose or function of the product**. Taking the design itself into account may make it possible to better determine the product concerned within the wider category of products indicated in the registration (18/03/2010, T-9/07, Metal rappers, EU:T:2010:96, § 56).

Art. 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character

## 1. The sector concerned



#### **Article 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character**

#### 2. The informed user

The informed user is a legal fiction and the interpretation of that concept must be that the status of 'user' **implies that the person concerned uses the product in which the design is incorporated, according to the purpose for which that product is intended**. The qualifier 'informed' suggests that, without being a designer or a technical expert, the user is familiar with the various designs that exist in the sector concerned, possesses a certain degree of knowledge about the features which those designs normally include and, as a result of their interest in the products concerned, pays a relatively high degree of attention when they use them (18/10/2018, T-368/17, Electrically operated lifting column, in particular for tables, EU:T:2018:695, § 26 and the case-law cited therein).

**Article 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character** 

#### 2. The informed user



#### 3. The designer's degree of freedom

The greater the designer's freedom in developing the contested design, the less likely it is that minor differences between the conflicting designs will be sufficient to produce a different overall impression, and vice versa (09/09/2011, T 10/08, Internal combustion engine, EU:T:2011:446, § 33).

The designer's freedom is limited in particular as regards those features imposed by the technical function of the product or an element thereof, or by statutory requirements, resulting in a standardisation of certain features (18/03/2010, T 9/07, Metal rappers, EU:T:2010:96, § 67), which thus apply to all designs intended for use in the products concerned.

However, the fact that the intended purpose of a product requires the presence of certain features does not automatically imply a limitation of the designer's freedom (14/06/2011, T 68/10, Watches, EU:T:2011:269, § 69).

Article 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character

## 3. The designer's degree of freedom



#### Art. 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character

#### **4**. The overall assessment

- Direct and synthetic comparison
- Contested design must be compared individually with each prior design invoked
- Saturation of the prior art
- Relative weight is given to:
  - Less visible features when the product is in use
  - Banal, arbitrary and different from the norm features
  - Features in relation to which designer's freedom was limited or broad

Art. 6 CDR – Lack of Individual Character

### 4. The overall assessment



## **Article 25 CDR**



# **Examples**

Decisions taken

#### The same overall impression



Decisions taken

#### The same overall impression



## **Article 25 CDR**

#### The same overall impression



Decision of 15/01/2014, R 2232/2011-3, 'Shoes' left: contested RCD, right: prior design

## **Article 25 CDR**

#### **Different overall impression**



Decision of 04/01/2016, R 2298/2014-3, 'Boots' left: contested RCD, right: prior design



The RCD is declared invalid with the effects "ex tunc" for the whole EU territory

The design may be maintained in the Register in an amended form

Revision

## **Appeals**

Appeal has a suspensive effect

**3**<sup>rd</sup> Board of Appeal at EUIPO

**•**General Court (EU): the Court of first instance

**Court of Justice of EU: the Court of second instance** 

## **Legal Acts**

**DIRECTIVE 98/71/EC** of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 1998 on the legal protection of designs

COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 6/2002 of 12 December 2001 on Community designs (CDR)

<u>COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 2245/2002\*\*</u> of 21 October 2002 implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 6/2002 on Community designs (CDIR) <u>COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 2246/2002</u> of 16 December 2002 on the fees payable to the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) in respect of the registration of Community designs (CDFR)

Council Regulation No 1891/2006 of 18 December 2006 amending Regulations (EC) No 6/2002 and (EC) No 40/94 to give effect to the accession of the European Community to the Geneva Act of the Hague Agreement concerning the international registration of industrial designs Commission Regulation (EC) No 876/2007 on 24 July 2007 amending Regulation (EC) No 2245/2002 implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 6/2002 on Community designs following the accession of the European Community to the Geneva Act of the Hague Agreement concerning the international registration of industrial designs Commission Regulation (EC) No 877/2007 of 24 July 2007 amending Regulation (EC) No 2246/2002 concerning the fees payable to the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) following the accession of the European Community to the Geneva Act of the Hague Agreement concerning the international registration of industrial designs

# Thank you \* Gracias \* Merci \* Bedankt

## **Email Address**

caripi@euipo.europa.eu

## Website

caripi-hub.com

**@EUIPcooperation** 











CARIFORUM



This Project is funded by the European Union and implemented by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

caripi-hub.eu