

Intellectual Property Weekly Abstracts Bulletin — Week of June 20

June 22, 2016

Trademark Decisions

Partial Success on a Motion to Strike Pleadings

[LB1 Brands Inc. v. AquaTerra Corporation, 2016 ONSC 3572](#)

In this case, the defendants brought a motion to strike various parts of the Statement of Claim without leave to amend. Counsel settled parts of the motion before hearing. Success was divided. Where paragraphs were struck, the plaintiff was allowed to amend its pleading.

Seven paragraphs dealt with allegations that the defendants made false and misleading representations. The defendants filed evidence to try to show these allegations were frivolous and vexatious. However, the Court held that it must accept the facts alleged in the pleading as proven or true unless they are patently ridiculous or incapable of proof. In this case, although the facts pleaded are in dispute, they are material to the pleadings. Thus, the allegations are not scandalous frivolous or vexatious, and were not ordered struck. Similarly, a further paragraph relating to conspiracy was not struck, as the Court held that the necessary facts were pleaded to establish both types of conspiracy claims.

The next impugned paragraphs dealt with allegations under s. 36 of the Competition Act. The Court held that such a cause of action requires that the plaintiff must have suffered loss as a result of the defendants' conduct contrary to s. 52(1) of the Competition Act. In this case, the causal connection was held not to be plead. Thus **those portions of the claim that advanced claims pursuant to s. 36(1) of the Competition Act were struck.** However, the Court held that the usual practice was to allow leave to amend, and so ordered.

Similarly, the Court held that the intellectual property aspect was missing from a claim pursuant to s. 7(d) of the Trade-marks Act. This was held to be a necessary element. Thus the paragraph was struck with leave to amend. However, further paragraphs were struck without leave to amend, as they were held to relate to origin and quality representations, and not intellectual property.

Industrial Design Decisions

Summary Judgment Invalidates an Industrial Design that Was Dedicated to the Public

[E. Mishan & Sons. v. Supertek Canada Inc., 2016 FC 613](#)

The Federal Court has granted a summary judgment motion and declared an industrial design invalid.

This action is the second part to a bifurcated proceeding. The Federal Court had previously found the plaintiffs' asserted patent to be invalid and dismissed the infringement action ([2014 FC 326](#) and summarized the week of April 14, 2016; affirmed [2015 FCA 163](#) and summarized the week of July 27, 2015).

The industrial design at suit relates to an expandable garden hose comprising an inner flexible stretchable hose encased by an outer fabric hose affixed at both ends with customary garden hose fittings.

Before the hearing the plaintiffs had dedicated the industrial design to the public, discontinued the assertion of the design infringement portion of this action, and provided a letter containing a covenant not to sue to the defendants.

It was argued that the issue of validity was now moot after the dedication, but the Court questioned the effect of the dedication and noted that the dedication was made after the counterclaim as to invalidity was filed. The Court still proceeded to assess its validity, and found that the design is not original and is dictated solely by function.

Also, it was questioned whether the defendants are "persons aggrieved" considering the dedication and discontinuance of the industrial design claim. It was found that these actions, all unilaterally made by the plaintiffs, could not serve to eliminate the defendants' status as persons aggrieved.

The Court further ordered a summary trial with respect to Supertek's claim under section 7(a) of the Trade-marks Act. **The claim pursuant to section 7(a) of the Trade-marks Act was found to require live witnesses, where their credibility will play a part in a proper determination of the matter.** The Court stated that it would like to hear from the relevant witnesses by subpoena, if necessary, to give evidence in person in Court.

By

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

Expertise

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

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

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 or manage your subscription preferences at blg.com/MyPreferences. If you feel you have received this message in error please contact communications@blg.com. BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at blg.com/en/privacy.

© 2025 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.