

Kluwer Trademark Blog

REVOCATION ON GROUNDS OF NON-USE AND PROPER REASONS

João Paulo Mioludo (CMS Rui Pena & Arnaut) · Tuesday, May 10th, 2016

In a recent decision, the Portuguese Court of Intellectual Property confirmed a surprising interpretation of the exception for the revocation of a trademark on grounds of non-use – namely proper reasons for non-use. The Industrial Property Office had rejected a revocation request against the protection in the Portuguese territory of an international trademark assuming that there were proper reasons for non-use.

The international trademark in question designated Portugal in 2004. The request for revocation was filed in November 2014. The relevant period of time in which the use of the trademark should be determined was November 2009 – November 2014.

In reply to the revocation request, the owner of the challenged trademark filed the following evidence: *i)* regarding the period between November 2009 and December 2010, copy of a licensing agreement and copy of reports of royalties paid in that period under the licensing agreement; *ii)* regarding the period between December 2010 and November 2014, evidence of a judicial action pending before a French court concerning the same international trademark.

The Industrial Property Office found the evidence admissible, despite the fact that *i)* the licensing agreement had not been registered before the Industrial Property Office and hence could not be enforced against third parties under Portuguese law and practice; and *ii)* the judicial action was pending in a foreign jurisdiction and there was no evidence that the outcome could have any impact on the use of the international trademark in Portugal.

In result, the revocation request was dismissed and the protection of the international trademark in Portugal was not revoked. The Court of Intellectual Property confirmed the interpretation of the Industrial Property Office entirely and an appeal against the judicial decision is currently pending before the Lisbon Court of Appeal.

In light of very few previous court decisions regarding the interpretation of what can be considered proper reasons for non-use of a registered trademark, it should be interesting to see what the Court of Appeal will decide in this case. In particular, it will be very important to know if the mere pendency of a judicial action regarding the trademark in question can constitute a proper reason for the non-use, or if only a definitive judicial decision prohibiting the use of the trademark is suitable to justify the lack of use.

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Trademark Blog, please [subscribe here](#).

Kluwer IP Law


The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future?

Learn how **Kluwer IP Law** can support you.

79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

Drive change with Kluwer IP Law.

The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.




2022 SURVEY REPORT
The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer
Leading change

Experience how the renewed **Manual IP** enables you to work more efficiently



[Learn more →](#)



This entry was posted on Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 3:36 am and is filed under [Portugal](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. You can leave a response, or [trackback](#) from your own site.

