

# Intellectual Property Weekly Abstracts Bulletin — Week of September 12

September 14, 2016

## Trademark Decisions

Appeal allowed in part where opposed services were an extension of Applicant's earlier registration

[Caesarstone Sdot-Yam Ltd v. Ceramiche Caesar S.P.A., 2016 FC 895](#)

This was an appeal of the decision of the Trademarks Opposition Board ("TMOB"), refusing in part the Applicant's registration of the trademark CAESARSTONE & Design.

The central issue raised by the Applicant against the TMOB's Decision was an alleged unreasonable finding of a likelihood of confusion between the Applicant's CAESARSTONE Mark proposed to be used for the Opposed Services relating to flooring and similar applications, and the Opponent's CAESAR Mark.

On the issue of the appropriate standard of review, the Court held that the TMOB's decision was to be reviewed on a standard of reasonableness. While the Applicant had submitted new evidence, the Court did not find that this new evidence would have materially affected the TMOB's findings of fact or its exercise of discretion. The new evidence was found to be supplemental to, and simply more of the same of, that which was before the TMOB when it rendered its decision.

The Court allowed the appeal with respect to the TMOB's consideration of the likelihood of confusion in relation to certain Opposed Services (tiles, slabs and tiles formed of composite stone, and wall cladding and walls), and the matter was referred to a different member of the TMOB for redetermination. The Court found that the TMOB's conclusion that the certain of the Opposed Services were a departure from, rather than an extension of, certain of the goods covered by the Applicant's earlier CAESARSTONE registration, was unreasonable. The Court also noted that this unreasonable conclusion may have affected the TMOB's assessment of the likelihood of confusion.

While this was but one factor, and a surrounding circumstance to be considered in assessing likelihood of confusion, this unreasonable conclusion impacted the outcome and the reasonableness of the TMOB's assessment of other factors, including the weight afforded to the lack of actual confusion in the marketplace where both have

coexisted, at least with respect to the Opposed Services relating to tiles, slabs and tiles formed of composite stone and wall cladding and walls.

The appeal of the TMOB's decision in relation to the remaining Opposed Services was dismissed.

### **Supreme Court Update**

Sandoz Canada Inc., et al. v. Attorney General of Canada, et al., (SCC #36798) – appeal discontinued

Sandoz Canada Inc. has discontinued its application for leave to appeal from the Federal Court of Appeal's decision, where the Court of Appeal reinstated the PMPRB's jurisdiction over generic companies considered to be “patentees” within the meaning of subsection 79(1) of the Patent Act ([2015 FCA 249](#) and summarized the week of November 9, 2015; granting the appeal from two decisions reported at [2014 FC 501](#) & [2014 FC 502](#) and summarized the week of June 2, 2014).

### **Other Industry News**

Health Canada has published a Guidance Document Questions and Answers: Plain Language Labelling Regulations.

Health Canada has published an [External Consultation Report – What we heard Health Products and Food Branch Transparency Initiatives](#).

By

[Chantal Saunders](#), [Beverley Moore](#), [Adrian J. Howard](#), [Jillian Brenner](#)

Expertise

[Intellectual Property](#), [Trademarks](#), [Copyright](#), [Licensing](#), [Patents](#)

## BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 725 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

[blg.com](http://blg.com)

## BLG Offices

### Calgary

Centennial Place, East Tower  
520 3rd Avenue S.W.  
Calgary, AB, Canada  
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500  
F 403.266.1395

### Ottawa

World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street  
Ottawa, ON, Canada  
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160  
F 613.230.8842

### Vancouver

1200 Waterfront Centre  
200 Burrard Street  
Vancouver, BC, Canada  
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744  
F 604.687.1415

### Montréal

1000 De La Gauchetière Street West  
Suite 900  
Montréal, QC, Canada  
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555  
F 514.879.9015

### Toronto

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower  
22 Adelaide Street West  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000  
F 416.367.6749

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing [unsubscribe@blg.com](mailto:unsubscribe@blg.com) or manage your subscription preferences at [blg.com/MyPreferences](http://blg.com/MyPreferences). If you feel you have received this message in error please contact [communications@blg.com](mailto:communications@blg.com). BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at [blg.com/en/privacy](http://blg.com/en/privacy).

© 2026 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.