

CONCISE COLLEGE TEXTS

PATENTS, TRADE MARKS, COPYRIGHT AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS

By

T. A. Blanco White

One of Her Majesty's Counsel

and

Robin Jacob
One of Her Majesty's Counsel

Third Edition

LONDON SWEET & MAXWELL 1986 First Edition 1970 Second Edition 1978 Third Edition 1986

Published by
Sweet & Maxwell Limited of
11 New Fetter Lane, London.
Computerset by Promenade Graphics Limited, Cheltenham.
Printed in Great Britain by
The Garden City Press Ltd.,
Letchworth, Herts.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Blanco White, T. A.
Patents, trade marks, copyright and industrial designs.—3rd ed.

1. Intellectual property—Great Britain
I. Title II. Jacob, Robin
344.1064'5 KD1269

ISBN 0-42**1-**34960-3 ISBN 0-42**1-**349**7**0-0 Pbk

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without the written permission of the copyright holder and the publisher, application for which shall be made to the publisher.

CONCISE COLLEGE TEXTS

PATENTS, TRADE MARKS, COPYRIGHT AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS

OTHER BOOKS IN THIS SERIES:

"A" Level Law, B. Hogan, P. Seago and G. Bennett Banking Law, C. Hamblin Contract, F. R. Davies Criminal Law, P. Seago English Legal System, K. J. Eddey Grant and Levin: Family Law, Jennifer Levin General Principles of Law, C. R. Newton Hotel and Catering Law in Britain, David Field Introduction to Commercial Law, C. Hamblin and F. B. Wright Labour Law, C. D. Drake Land Law, W. Swinfen Green and N. Henderson Law of Arbitration, William H. Gill Law and Procedure of Meetings, Matthew Moore Law for Retailers, Jennifer Brave "O" Level Law, W. J. Brown Press Law, Robin Callender Smith Sale of Goods and Consumer Credit, A. P. Dobson Shipping Law, R. Grime Tort, C. D. Baker

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

The Law Book Company Ltd. Sydney: Melbourne: Perth

CANADA AND U.S.A

The Carswell Company Ltd. Agincourt, Ontario

INDIA

N. M. Tripathi Private Ltd.
Bombay
and
Calcutta and Delhi
M.P.P. House
Bangalore

ISRAEL

Steimatzky's Agency Ltd. Jerusalem: Tel Aviv: Haifa

MALAYSIA: SINGAPORE: BRUNEI

Malayan Law Journal (Pte.) Ltd. Singapore

PAKISTAN

Pakistan Law House Karachi

PREFACE

The demand for a further edition of this little book comes at a very appropriate time. On the one hand, we were able to incorporate, as well as the usual fresh judicial decisions, two new Acts of Parliament: one extending the Trade Marks Act to cover service marks, the other confirming that computer programs are copyright. On the other hand, we have been warned that major legislation in the industrial property field is due in the next year or two. Thus we have been able to provide a short and up-to-date account of the background against which the industrial property "white paper" (presumably out before this book went on sale) and the ensuing bill

and Act need to be judged.

The main impact of the promised legislation seems likely to be directed at the use of copyright in the field of industrial designs. There are here indications that not only the British Government, but also the European Commission and our own House of Lords (whose judgment on the appeal in Leyland v. Armstrong was awaited when this book went to press) consider that our present law, as stated in Chapter 6, will not do. We have hinted in the text at some obviously likely changes. Readers should in addition note that it is currently being considered that the Patent Office be changed into a sort of "quango," but this should result in only relatively minor changes in the administrative procedures described within this book.

We would urge anyone interested to read the white paper: but to read this book first.

The Temple, January 1986 T. A. B. W. R. J.

TABLE OF CASES

	PAGE
Ackroyds (London) v. Islington Plastics [1962] R.P.C. 97	116
"Advocaat" Trade Mark, Re. See Erven Warnink Besloten Vennootschap v.	
Tana Jalahan (III)	
Townend (J.) & Sons (Hull).	
"Aertex" Trade Mark. See Cellular Clothing Co. v. White.	
American Greetings Corp.'s Application, Re ("Holly Hobbie" Trade Mark)	
[1984] 1 W.L.R. 701; (1983) 127 S.J. 70; [1983] 1 All E.R. 557; (1983) 133	
130-1 1 V.E. 1. (1703) 127 3.J. 70, [1703] 1 M.E. 1. (1703) 133	00
New L.J. 65 Amstrad Consumer Electronics v. British Phonographic Industry (1985) 138	90
Amstrad Consumer Electronics v . British Phonographic Industry (1985) 138	
New L.I. 1186	145
New L.J. 1186 Argyll (Duchess) v. Argyll (Duke) [1967] Ch. 302; [1965] 2 W.L.R. 790; [1965] 1 All E.R. 611 Argyllshire Weavers v. Macauley (Tweeds) Ltd. See "Harris Tweed."	
1 All ED 411	(1/0
TAILE.A. 611	00, 107
Argyllshire Weavers v. Macauley (Tweeds) Ltd. See "Harris Tweed."	
Aristoc v. Rysta Ltd. [1945] A.C. 68; 62 R.P.C. 65	67,73
,	,
"BALI" Trade Mark. See Berlei (U.K.) v. Bali Brassiere Co.	
Bass, Ratcliffe & Gretton Ltd. v. Nicholson & Sons Ltd. ("Triangle" case)	
[1932] A C 130:49 R R C 88	82
[1932] A.C. 130; 49 R.P.C. 88	02
Berlei (U.K.) v. Bali Brassiere Co. [1969] 1 W.L.R. 1306; 113 S.J. /20; [1969] 2	
All E.R. 812	80
Bismag Ltd. v. Amblins (Chemists) Ltd. (1940) 57 R.P.C. 209	67
Blacklock v. Pearson [1915] 2 Ch. 376	138
Didektock v. Fearson [1715] 2 Cit. 576	130
Bollinger v. Costa Brava Wine Co. ("Spanish Champagne") [1960] Ch. 262;	0.0020.00
[1959] 3 W.L.K. 966; [1960] K.P.C. 16; [1959] 3 All E.K. 800	104
— v. — [1961] 1 W.L.R. 277; [1961] R.P.C. 116; [1961] 1 All E.R. 561	63
Boots' Trade Mark (1937) 54 R. D. C. 327	74
Boots' Trade Mark (1937) 54 R.P.C. 327 British Northrop v. Texteam Blackburn [1973] F.S.R. 241; [1974] R.P.C.	7 T
British Northrop v. Texteam Blackburn [1973] F.S.R. 241; [1974] R.P.C.	
57	51, 122
Broad & Co. Ltd. v. Graham Building Supplies Ltd. [1969] R.P.C. 286	61,71
	,
C.B.S. v. Ames Records and Tapes [1981] 2 W.L.R. 973; (1981) 125 S.J. 412;	
[1981] 2 All E.R. 812; [1981] R.P.C. 407	145
Collular Clothing Co. v. White ("A arroy" Trade Mark) (1953) 70 P. D. C. 9	103
Central Clothing Co. v. white Aertex Trade Mark) (1933) / U.F.C. 7	103
Centrafarm BV v. Winthrop BV (No. 16/74) [1976] 1 C.M.L.R. 1; [1976]	
F.S.R. 164	89
Coats (J. & P.) Ltd.'s Application (1936) 53 R.P.C. 355; [1936] 2 All E.R. 975	74
"Coca Cola" Trade Marks, Re [1985] F.S.R. 315; (1985) 82 L.S.Gaz. 950	72
Cota Cota Trade Marks, Re [1705] 1.3.R. 515, (1705) 02 L.3.Gaz. 750	
Coco v. A. N. Clark (Engineers) Ltd. [1969] R.P.C. 41 165, 16	
Columbia Gramophone Co.'s Trade Marks (1932) 49 R.P.C. 239	93
Cow (P. B.) & Co. v. Cannon Rubber Manufacturers [1959] R.P.C. 347	53
Crosfield's Application ("Perfection" Trade Mark) [1910] 1 Ch. 130; 26 R.P.C.	
or a	74
834	74
854	128
"Daiquiri Rum" Trade Mark [1969] F.S.R. 89	(1 01
DAIQUIKI KUM Trade Wark [1707] F.S.A. 87	04,71
Davis v. Sussex Rubber Co. [1927] 2 Ch. 345; 44 R.P.C. 412	84
De Beers Abrasive Products v. International General Electric Co. of New York	
[1975] 1 W.L.R. 972; 119 S.J. 439; [1975] 2 All E.R. 599; [1975] F.S.R.	
1773 1 W.E.R. 772, 117 3.J. 137, [1773] 2 THI E.R. 377, [1773] 1.3.R.	108

Table of Cases

Dorling v. Honnor Marine [1965] Ch. 1; [1964] 2 W.L.R. 195; [1964] R.P.C.	52
160; [1964] 1 All E.R. 241	
157	74
EDGE (William) & Sons Ltd. v. William Niccolls & Sons Ltd. [1911] A.C. 693; 80 L.J.Ch. 744; 105 L.T. 459; 27 T.L.R. 555; 55 S.J. 737; 28 R.P.C. 582	61
Edwards' Application (1946) 63 R.P.C. 19 Electrix v. Electrolux (Electrix Ltd.'s Application) [1960] A.C. 722; [1959] 3	86
W.L.R. 503; [1959] R.P.C. 283; [1959] 3 All E.R. 170	96
Erven Warnink Besloten Vennootschap v. Townend (J.) & Sons (Hull) [1979] A.C. 731; [1979] 3 W.L.R. 68; (1979) 123 S.J. 472; sub nom. Erven Warnink B.V. v. Townend (J.) & Sons (Hull) ("Advocaat" Trade Mark) [1979] 2 All E.R. 927; [1979] F.S.R. 397; [1980] R.P.C. 31	104
Francis Day & Hunter v. Bron [1963] Ch. 587; [1963] 2 W.L.R. 868; [1963]	424
2 All E.R. 16	136 171
Fraser v. Thames Television [1984] Q.B. 44; [1983] 2 W.L.R. 917; (1983) 127 S.J. 379; [1983] 2 All E.R. 101; (1983) 133 New L.J. 281	166
GENERAL ELECTRIC Co. (of U.S.A.) v. General Electric Co. ("G.E." Trade Mark) [1972] 1 W.L.R. 729; 116 S.J. 412; [1972] 2 All E.R. 507; [1973]	
R.P.C. 297 Greers Ltd. v. Pearman & Corder Ltd. (1922) 39 R.P.C. 406	84,87
	108
"HARRIS TWEED" (Argyllshire Weavers) v. A. Macauley (Tweeds) Ltd. [1964] R.P.C. 477	103
Hayward & Co. v. Hayward & Sons (1887) 34 Ch.D. 198 Henriksen v. Tallon [1965] R.P.C. 434	109 22
Hensher (George) v. Restawile Upholstery (Lancs.) [1976] A.C. 64; [1974] 2 W.L.R. 700; 118 S.J. 329; [1974] 2 All E.R. 420; [1974] F.S.R. 173;	1 122
[1975] R.P.C. 31	01,122
tion, <i>Re</i> . "Huggars" Trade Mark [1979] F.S.R. 310	73
00	, ,
Infabrics v. Jaytex [1982] A.C. 1; [1981] 2 W.L.R. 646; (1981) 125 S.J. 257; [1981] 1 All E.R. 1057; [1981] F.S.R. 261	52
Initial Towel Services v. Putterill [1968] 1 Q.B. 396; [1967] 3 W.L.R. 1032; [1967] 3 All E.R. 145	170
Jacques & Sons Ltd. v. Chess (1940) 57 R.P.C. 77 Jellinek's Application ("Panda" Trade Mark) (1946) 63 R.P.C. 59	103 81
Kat v. Diment [1951] 1 K.B. 34; 67 R.P.C. 158; [1950] 1 All E.R. 657 Kean v. McGivan [1982] F.S.R. 119	111 105
Kingston-upon-Thames Royal London Borough v. Woolworth (F. W.) & Co.	
[1968] 1 Q.B. 802; [1968] 2 W.L.R. 223; [1968] 1 All E.R. 401	111
Leyland v. Armstrong [1984] F.S.R. 591	50
McCulloch v. Lewis A. May ("Uncle Mac") (1947) 65 R.P.C. 58; [1947] 2 All E.R. 845	105
All E.R. 845	79

Table of Cases

Mentmore v. Fomento (1955) 72 R.P.C. 157	109 145
No-Nail Cases Pty. Ltd. v. No-Nail Boxes Ltd. [1946] A.C. 447; 63 R.P.C. 44	54
"Orlwoola" Trade Marks [1910] Ch. 130; 26 R.P.C. 850" "Ovax" Trade Mark. See Smith, Mayden & Co.'s Application.	83
"PANDA" TRADE MARK. See Jellinek's Application. Parker-Knoll v. Knoll International [1962] R. P.C. 265 Peacey v. De Vries (1921) Mac.C.C. (1917–23) 259 "Perfection" Trade Mark. See Crosfield's Application.	103 138
Phonographic Performance v. Pontin's [1968] Ch. 290; [1967] 3 W.L.R. 1622; [1967] 3 All E.R. 736	148 100 51, 105
REDDAWAY (F.) & Co.'s APPLICATION [1914] 1 Ch. 856 Revlon v. Cripps & Lee [1980] F.S.R. 85 (1979) 124 S.J. 184 Riding v. Smith (1876) L.R. 1 Ex.D. 91 Robb v. Green [1895] 2 Q.B. 315	72 68 169 167
SALTMAN ENGINEERING Co. v. Campbell Engineering Co. (1948) 65 R.P.C. 203;[1963] 3 All E.R. 413n. Seager v. Copydex [1967] 1 W.L.R. 923; [1967] R.P.C. 349; [1967] 2 All E.R. 415	165 55, 168
"Sherry" case. See Vine Products v. MacKenzie. Shredded Wheat Co. v. Kellogg Co. (1940) 57 R.P.C. 137 Sillitoe v. McGraw Hill Book Co. (U.K.) [1983] F.S.R. 545 Sirdar's Agreement [1975] 1 C.M.L.R. D93: [1975] F.S.R. 492. EC Commis-	91 151
sion Decision Smith, Hayden & Co.'s Application ("Ovax" case) (1946) 63 R.P.C. 97 . 79, Smith, Kline & French Laboratories' Application [1974] F.S.R. 106 "Spanish Champagne." See Bollinger v. Costa Brava Wine Co.	72
"Stilton" Trade Mark [1967] R.P.C. 173	98 105
"Striped Toothpaste" case. See Unilever Trade Mark. TAVENER RUTLEDGE v. Trexapalm ("Kojak" case) (1975) 119 S.J. 792; [1975] F.S.R. 479 "Trakgrip" Trade Mark. See Dunlop Rubber Co.'s Application. "Triangle" case. See Bass & Co. v. Nicholson & Sons.	105
"Uncle Mac." See McCulloch v. Lewis A. May. Unilever Trade Mark ("Striped Toothpaste" case) [1980] F.S.R. 280	73
Vane v. Famous Players Film Co. (1928) Mac.C.C. (1923–28) 347 Vine Products v. MacKenzie ("Sherry" case) [1969] R.P.C. 1	142 104
WALKER v. British Picker Co. (1961) R.P.C. 57	121 41
White Hudson & Co. v. Asian Organisation [1964] 1 W.L.R. 1466; [1965] R.P.C. 45; [1965] 1 All E.R. 1040 Wilkinson Sword v. Gillette Industries and Warner Lambert [1974] F.S.R. 433; [1975] R.P.C. 101	102 41

Table of Cases

Wilkinson Sword v. Cripps & Lee [1982] F.S.R. 16 Wombles v. Wombles Skips [1975] F.S.R. 488 Wright's case (Wright, Layman & Umney v. Wright) (1949) 66 R.P.C. 149	68 105 103
YORK TRADE MARK [1981] F.S.R. 111 Yorkshire Copper Work's Application [1954] 1 W.L.R. 554; 71 R.P.C. 150;	74
[1954] 1 All E.R. 570	73

CONTENTS

Preface	Page v
Table of Cases	xi
I. INTRODUCTION	
1. Imitations and Remedies Imitations Remedies Foreign Law Note: Compensation for Infringement 2. Patent, Copyright or Design?	3 3 4 9 9
Patents Copyright and Industrial Designs Periods of Protection "Imitations" and Copying	12 13 14 15
II. IMITATING THE PRODUCT	
3. Patents and How to Get Them Three New Systems of Patent Law Who Applies The Specification and the Claims Securing Priority Patentability Search, Publication, Examination Examination Procedure Grant of the Patent Cost and Period of Protection Grant and Ownership Patent Agents Note: The Grounds upon which a Patent may be Declared Invalid Note: Inventions by Employees Note: Sources of the Law Note: Security Restrictions	19 19 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 26 27 27 27
4. How Much Use are Patents? The Importance of Validity Evading Patents Licensing	32 32 32 34
5. PATENTING IMPORTANT INVENTIONS Introduction Where Others have Tried An Important Invention	36 36 36 37

Contents

The Action for Infringement	42 43
Threats	43
Compulsory Licensing "Improvement" Patents	44
Taxation and Patents	46
Note: Patenting Drugs and Similar Chemical	40
Compounds	46
Note: The Definition of Infringement	48
6. Industrial Designs	49
Introduction	49
Consequences of 1968 Act	49
The Present Law	50
The Copyright Work	50
"Reproduction"	51
Who may be Sued	52
Care of Copyrights	52 53
Designs that are Registered	
7. Crown Rights and Security	54
The Crown's Right to Work Patents	54
Keeping Inventions Secret	55
III. TRADE AND SERVICE MARKS AND UNFAIR COMPETITION	
8. Different Degrees of Protection	59
Passing-off	59
Passing-off and Registration of Trade and	
Service Marks	60
"Part A" and "Part B" Marks	61
Litigation Caused by Uncertainty	62
Protection under the Criminal Law	62
9. What Registered Marks are for	64
Introduction	64
Goods or services for which the Mark is Registered	64
Infringement	65
Exceptions to the General Infringement Rules	68 70
Who should be Sued for Infringement Contested Actions	70
Special Rules for "Part B" Marks	71
Note: Tests for Infringement	71
10. How to Register a Mark	72
Introduction	72
What is a "Mark"?	72
Registrable Marks	72
The Application	75

Contents

More about Oppositions Registration in Cases where Confusion is Likely More about Confusion Removal from the Register Defensive Registration of Trade Marks Part B Marks	79 82 83 83 84 84
11. PITFALLS IN TRADE MARK LAW Introduction The Old Rule—The Mark must not Mislead Changing the Way the Mark is Used Change in Ownership Split Ownership Parallel Imports Licensing of Trade and Service Marks Marks that are the Name of the Article Non-Use The Need for Vigilance Foreign Marks The "Electrix" Story	86 86 87 87 88 89 91 92 94 95
12. CERTIFICATION TRADE MARKS The Nature of Certification Trade Marks Application Infringement Other Features of the System	97 97 97 98 98
13. THE LAW OF PASSING-OFF A General Rule Varieties of Passing-off "Badges" and Reputations Odd and Unusual Instances Suing for Passing-off	100 100 100 100 104 106
14. SLANDER OF GOODS The General Rule Examples Conclusion	108 108 108 109
15. THE CRIMINAL LAW Introduction The Trade Descriptions Acts 1968–72 Conclusion	111 111 111 114
IV. COPYRIGHT	
16. Introduction то Соругіднт Introduction The Nature of Copyright	117 117 117

Contents

Copyright, Reputations and Competition Types of Copyright Dispute Copyright in Practice Copyright and Confidence Old Copyrights "Reproduction"	118 118 119 119 119 120
17. Works the Subject of Copyright "Works" Copyright can Exist only in "Works" Illegal and Immoral Works Overlapping Copyrights The Period of Copyright	121 121 126 126 127 128
18. THE OWNERSHIP OF COPYRIGHT Introduction The Basic Rule—Copyright Belongs to the Author Crown Copyright Where Authorship is not Certain	130 130 130 133 134
19. What is Infringement? Introduction Infringement by Reproduction Other forms of Infringement Note: "Works"	135 135 135 141 146
20. What is not Infringement The Owner of the Copyright cannot Control Legitimate Copies Specific Exceptions to the Rules for Infringement The Right to Reproduce, subject to Royalties	150 150 150 153
21. DEALINGS IN COPYRIGHT Introduction Formal Problems Contracts relating to Copyrights Taxation and Authors	154 154 154 157 162
22. CONFIDENCE AND COPYRIGHT Introduction The Action for Breach of Confidence Sales of "Know-How" The Need for Agreements Difficult Cases	164 164 164 171 172 172
Index	174

Part I INTRODUCTION



CHAPTER ONE

IMITATIONS AND REMEDIES

IMITATIONS

THE subject of this book is the law of commercial and industrial imitation: imitation by one manufacturer of another's products, imitation by one trader of the names and badges by which another's goods or business are known.

Overlap of the types of imitation

In law, these two varieties of imitation are best treated as distinct; in practice, they overlap. For one thing, the imitation of a rival manufacturer's goods often depends for its profitability on being able to tell customers that this is an imitation of something they will have heard of; people are usually willing to pay more for products they have heard of. For another, where imitation of goods is close enough for the imitation to look like the original, the similarity of appearance is usually itself enough to suggest to customers knowing the one product that the other is really the same thing. Again, in these days of advertising, it is often more important that a product should be convincingly advertised than that it should work well; and it may be that the main reason for wanting a product to be different from its rivals is to make it easier to advertise that product as being different.

The commercial use of legal rights

One result of this sort of overlap is that the various legal rights with which this book is concerned are by no means always used for the purposes that the law supposes them to serve. In legal theory, a patent—and much of this book is concerned with patents—should normally be reckoned as valueless unless it enables its owner to secure an order from the courts forbidding a competitor to make or sell something that competitor would otherwise want to put on the market. To some businesses, that is indeed the purpose of patents. To others, however, the mere possession of a patent, however rubbishy to the lawyer's mind, may be of real value for advertising purposes. Others again treat patents merely as cards in complicated games of business politics that no lawyer understands. Industrial designs, on the other hand, are given protection, in theory, to protect