

COURT OF APPEAL DISMISSES APPEAL BY PARALLEL IMPORTER WHO INFRINGED PHARMACEUTICAL TRADE MARK

- Tension between trade mark infringement and the free movement of goods within the EEA
- ▶ Public campaigns about product properties and trade mark significance
- Is a trade mark enforceable against an importer of an identical product produced by the same manufacturer?

What's it about?

The respondent, Flynn Pharma Limited (**Flynn**), was a pharmaceutical company using the name FLYNN, a UK and EU registered trade mark, in respect of its products. On 24 September 2012, Flynn launched the anti-epileptic drug Phenytoin Sodium Flynn (**PSF**), which had been previously sold in the UK, by Pfizer, under the brand name Epanutin.

Pfizer and subsequently Flynn went to great lengths to inform both patients and healthcare professionals that PSF and Epanutin were chemically the same product.

The appellants, DrugsRUs Limited and Tenolol Limited, were parallel importers of Epanutin, purchased from Spain and imported for sale on the UK market. However, MHRA guidelines require pharmacists to supply the specific branded product prescribed.

PSF was the preferred product given its prominence and stable supply. The appellants therefore wished to re-label their product PSF but include a disclaimer as to its true origins. Flynn claimed trade mark infringement against the defendants/appellants in relation to this use of the FLYNN mark.

The defendants argued that Flynn's actions were equivalent to a disguised restriction of trade between member states contrary to Article 36 of the TFEU. Furthermore, the defendants asserted that Flynn's use of the mark was only as a description of the goods, without which they could not be readily prescribed.

At first instance, the High Court ruled that the imported goods infringed Flynn's trade mark, a decision that was subsequently appealed by the defendants.

Why does it matter?

The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. In relation to the trade mark use, the court disagreed with the appellants' suggestion that Flynn's information campaign had resulted in the trade mark losing its significance. The use of the mark FLYNN did not signify a characteristic of PSF.

In relation to the disguised restriction, the court's decision was two-fold. Firstly, that Flynn had no control over the Epanutin that had been produced by Pfizer that the appellants sought to import. The products had been placed on the market for sale by Pfizer, not Flynn. Secondly, nor was Flynn's use of the trade mark or the specification of PSF under Pfizer's control.

Consequently, Flynn had a legitimate interest in the enforcement of its mark against a product that it had not placed on the market but was sold under its mark and over which it would have no control. The appellants would be able to trade off Flynn's reputation; a reputation that could be damaged by a defective batch of Epanutin. This applied even though the imported Epanutin was chemically identical to PSF and produced by the same manufacturer.

Now what?

This judgment will be welcome news for trade mark proprietors who are seeking to protect their legitimate interests against parallel importers.

It also highlights that the key issue will be that of "control" and specifically, whether it is the trade mark proprietor itself that has placed the products on the market for sale in the EEA.

Current indications suggest leave to appeal this judgment to the Supreme Court has been sought.

Flynn Pharma Ltd v Drugsrus Ltd and another [2017] EWCA Civ 226, 6 April 2017

For further information on this or any other IP related matter please contact Andrew Bayley on 0161 934 6436

10-18423495-1

addleshawgoddard.com

Aberdeen, Doha, Dubai, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Hong Kong, Leeds, London, Manchester, Muscat, Singapore and Tokyo*

*a formal alliance with Hashidate Law Office

© 2017 Addleshaw Goddard LLP. All rights reserved. Extracts may be copied with prior permission and provided their source is acknowledged. This document is for general information only. It is not legal advice and should not be acted or relied on as being so, accordingly Addleshaw Goddard disclaims any responsibility. It does not create a solicitor-client relationship between Addleshaw Goddard and any other person. Legal advice should be taken before applying any information in this document to any facts and circumstances. Addleshaw Goddard is an international legal practice carried on by Addleshaw Goddard LLP (a limited liability partnership registered in England & Wales and authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and the Law Society of Scotland) and its affiliated undertakings. Addleshaw Goddard operates in the Dubai International Financial Centre through Addleshaw Goddard (GCC) LLP (licensed by the QFCA), in Oman through Addleshaw Goddard (Middle East) LLP in association with Nasser Al Habsi & Saif Al Mamari Law Firm (licensed by the Oman Ministry of Justice) and in Hong Kong through Addleshaw Goddard (Hong Kong) LLP, a Hong Kong limited liability partnership pursuant to the Legal Practitioners Ordinance and regulated by the Law Society of Hong Kong. In Tokyo, legal services are offered through Addleshaw Goddard's formal alliance with Hashidate Law Office. A list of members/principals for each firm will be provided upon request. The term partner refers to any individual who is a member of any Addleshaw Goddard entity or association or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. If you prefer not to receive promotional material from us, please email us at unsubscribe@addleshawgoddard.com. For further information please consult our website www.addleshawgoddard.com or www.aglaw.com.