

# **Oxford International Intellectual Property Moot 2019**

---

## **Corrections & clarifications**

1. In paragraph f of the Instructions, substitute the words “Industrial Property” for “Intellectual Property” in relation to the Paris Convention.
2. Erewhon is a member of the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks.
3. All relevant provisions of the Erewhonian Trade Marks Act have been provided. This means, inter alia, that there is no equivalent to section 3(6) of the UK Trade Marks Act 1994.
4. English is the official language of Erewhon.
5. There is no evidence before the Court as to the proportion of the Erewhonian population that can read other languages that employ similar ideograms to Shangri-Lese, such as Mandarin Chinese or Japanese.
6. Alinor requested that revocation or narrowing of Marmalade’s registration take place with effect from 1 February 2018, or such other earlier date as the Court thinks fit.
7. Teams are reminded of the limitation in paragraph b of the Instructions in relation to new causes of action. To illustrate, it is not permissible to make arguments under a prohibition against unfair competition.
8. Teams are also reminded that they may not make up facts or adduce new facts that are not included in the moot problem. It is permissible to draw inferences from the facts given, and to make arguments based on facts about which everyone can reasonably be assumed to be aware, eg, that department stores sell a broad range of products.
9. Teams do not have to present issues in the same order as Madam Justice Davies’ judgment in the High Court of Erewhon.
10. The word limit does not include words in the headers and footers (as opposed to headings and footnotes, which do count – see §14 of the Rules and paragraph g of the Instructions). However, those fields should not contain any substantive material.