

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: D. Botis, acting as Agent)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the First Board of Appeal of OHIM of 29 April 2010 (Case R 1475/2009-1), concerning an application for registration of a sign representing seven squares of different colours as a Community mark.

Operative part of the judgment

The General Court:

1. Dismisses the action;
2. Orders each party to bear its own costs.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 260, 25.9.2010.

Judgment of the General Court of 13 June 2012 — Paul Hartmann AG v OHIM — Mölnlycke Health Care (MESILETTE)

(Case T-342/10) ⁽¹⁾

(Community trade mark — Opposition proceedings — Application for Community word mark MESILETTE — Earlier national and international word marks MEDINETTE — Relative ground for refusal — No likelihood of confusion — Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009)

(2012/C 217/39)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Paul Hartmann AG (Heidenheim an der Brenz, Germany) (represented by: N. Aicher, lawyer)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: A. Folliard-Monguiral, Agent)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM: Mölnlycke Health Care AB (Göteborg, Sweden)

Re:

Action brought against the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of OHIM of 20 May 2010 (Case R 1222/2009-2), concerning opposition proceedings between Paul Hartmann AG and Mölnlycke Health Care AB.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. Annuls the decision of the Second Board of Appeal of the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM), of 20 May 2010 (Case R 1222/2009-2);
2. Orders OHIM to pay the costs.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 288, 23.10.2010.

Judgment of the General Court of 13 June 2012 — Seikoh Giken v OHIM — Seiko Holdings (SG SEIKOH GIKEN)

(Case T-519/10) ⁽¹⁾

(Community trade mark — Opposition proceedings — International registration — Application for territorial extension of the protection — Figurative mark SG SEIKOH GIKEN — Earlier Community word mark SEIKO — Relative ground for refusal — Likelihood of confusion — Article 8(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 207/2009)

(2012/C 217/40)

Language of the case: English

Parties

Applicant: Kabushiki Kaisha Seikoh Giken (Matsudo-shi Chiba, Japan) (represented by: G. Marín Raigal, P. López Ronda and G. Macias Bonilla, lawyers)

Defendant: Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (represented by: J. Crespo Carrillo, Agent)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal of OHIM, intervener before the General Court: Seiko Holdings Kabushiki Kaisha (Tokyo, Japan) (represented by: J. Fish, R. Miller, Solicitors and A. Bryson, Barrister)

Re:

Application for annulment of the decision of the First Board of Appeal of OHIM of 12 August 2010 (Case R 1553/2009-1), relating to opposition proceedings between Seiko Holdings Kabushiki Kaisha and Kabushiki Kaisha Seikoh Giken.

Operative part of the judgment

The Court:

1. Dismisses the action;
2. Orders Kabushiki Kaisha Seikoh Giken to pay the costs.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 13, 15.1.2011.