Philippines

GROUP SUMMARY REPORT

Developments

1. The Youth Intellectual Property Incentive Program (YIPI), which waives fees for young investors, was continued for the year 2025.
2. An *ex parte* procedure for declaring a trademark as "well-known" was established, and the official Register of Well-Known Marks was created.
3. The definition of "youth filer" in MC No. 2022-019 was amended to "30 years and below" from the former "23 years and below".

Statistics

Year	Number of New Applications	Average timeframe from filing up to registration (months)
2024	44,530	3.99
2025	44,308	3.9986

*) Specific reason for increase/decrease, if any: The slight decrease in trademark applications were offset by an increase in patent, industrial design, and utility model applications.

**) Other comments, if any: The average timeframe from filing up to registration stayed relatively constant between 2024 and 2025.

Cases

Innolab Industries, Inc. v. United Laboratories, Inc

An application to register the trademark "INNOLAB" for pharmaceutical products was opposed by the company with the long-established trademark for "UNILAB." The Court ruled that Unilab failed to prove by substantial evidence that the similarities between the marks were likely to confuse consumers. The opposition therefore was denied and the trademark application for "INNOLAB" was allowed.

ISCO Holding Corp. v. Nikon Corp

An application for the registration of the trademark "NIKON & DESIGN" for use on home and household goods, featuring the word "NIKON" together with an anchor design was opposed by Nikon Corporation, claiming that it was the prior registrant and owner of the well-known NIKON trademark used for its camera products and that ISCO's proposed mark was confusingly similar to its own. The Court affirmed the denial of the application, ruling that Nikon Corporation's mark is well-known and a trademark registered in the Philippines is protected not only against use on identical or similar goods, but also against use on dissimilar goods when such use would create a connection with the trademark owner and likely damage its interests.

Campbridge Waterproofing Systems, Inc. v. Greenseal Products

A company filed a petition to cancel another company's registration of the GREENSEAL trademark for elastomeric sealants, claiming that it was the prior adopter and user of the mark. It asserted that it had registered the GREENSEAL mark in Malaysia in 1993, had been using it internationally since 1986, and had distributed its products in the Philippines since 2004 through its exclusive distributor. In granting the petition the Court ruled that a certificate of registration is only prima facie evidence of ownership and may be cancelled if

	the registration was obtained in bad faith or contrary to the IP Code. The court ruled that the trademark registration was unlawful because it appropriated another company's trade name. ***Subic Bay Yacht Club, Inc. v. Gomeco Metal Corp.*** Gomeco Metal Corporation entered into contracts to supply and install kitchen equipment for a project involving Subic Bay Yacht Club, Inc. (SBYC) and Subic Bay Waterfront Development Corporation (SBWDC). After the project was completed, Gomeco sought payment of the unpaid balance and later argued that both corporations were solidarily liable because they dealt with it as a single entity. While the court ultimately determined solidarity existed between the two corporations and that the claim against SBYC had prescribed, the court noted that violations of trademarks could be an instance where there is solidary liability.