ASIAN PATENT ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION

79th Council Meeting 2025

29 November – 2 December 2026, Hong Kong

Anti-Counterfeiting Standing Committee

SINGAPORE COUNTRY REPORT

Prepared by Gladys Tan, David Llewelyn & Co LLC

20 October 2026

I. Introduction

1. This Country Report examines and reviews anti-counterfeiting developments in Singapore between 2025 and 2026.

II. General trends

2. The Intellectual Property Office of Singapore has published the following data on its website: [1]

Year	Copyright raids	Trade mark raids	Total raids	Total value seized
2025	18	29	47	S$1,383,182.06
2024	8	65	73	S$3,735,902.60
2023	2	41	43	S$1,459,099.77
2022	11	50	61	S$1,351,061.90
2021	2	91	93	S$2,306,419.14
2020	1	61	62	S$1,896,508.30
2019	1	83	84	S$2,412,700.20
2018	0	124	124	S$6,258,034.80
2017	3	109	112	S$13,442,015.35
2016	2	121	123	S$2,561,721.55
2015	3	163	166	S$16,334,863.50

3. Compared to 2023, the number of raids has increased in 2024 with the total value seized more than doubled.

[1] Intellectual Property Office of Singapore, *IPR Statistics by IPRB* (https://www.ipos.gov.sg/global-ip-hub/statistics-and-legislation-developments/statistics/ (accessed on 10 October 2026).

4. International surveys continue to rank Singapore's IP regime as one of the best in the world:[2]

IP Ranking	Global Innovation Index 2026	International Property Rights Index 2024	World Trademark Review IP Office Innovation Ranking 2024	2021 Bloomberg Innovation Index	World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report 2019
1	Switzerland	Finland	European IP Office	South Korea	**Singapore**
2	Sweden	**Singapore**	South Korea	**Singapore**	United States
3	United States of America	Denmark	Australia	Switzerland	Hong Kong SAR
4	Republic of Korea	Netherlands	United Kingdom	Germany	Netherlands
5	**Singapore**	Luxembourg	**Singapore**	Sweden	Switzerland
6	United Kingdom	Sweden	Thailand	Denmark	Japan
7	Netherlands	New Zealand	Poland	Israel	Germany
8	Finland	Australia	France	Finland	Sweden
9	Denmark	Norway	Japan, Mexico	Netherlands	United Kingdom
10	China	Germany	-	Austria	Denmark

III. Media reports

5. Police press releases and news reports from September 2025 to date disclose the following incidents (which are non-exhaustive):

   a. On 5 October 2025, the Police arrested two women for their suspected involvement in the online sale of counterfeit goods. More than 250 pieces of suspected trade mark infringing goods comprising luxury bags, wallets, sunglasses and pouches were seized, with an estimated street value of more than S$42,000.[3]

---

[2] Intellectual Property Office of Singapore, *Singapore's Global Innovation Ranking* <https://www.ipos.gov.sg/global-ip-hub/singapoare-global-innovation-ranking> (accessed on 10 October 2026).

[3] Singapore Police Force, *Police News Releases*, <https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2025/10/20251005_two_women_arrested_for_online_sale_of_counterfeit_goods> (accessed on 10 October 2026).

b. On 5 January 2026, the Asia Video Industry Association's Coalition Against Piracy announced that it had secured a site-blocking order from the Singapore High Court targeting 22 piracy website brands (comprising 53 domains in total) facilitating illegal streaming and downloads of video content in Singapore. The order was obtained by BBC Studios, the Premier League and DFL Deutsche Fußball Liga under s 325 of the Copyright Act 2021, which allows rights holders to apply for website-blocking orders against sites that flagrantly infringe copyright.[4]

c. On 15 January 2026, the Singapore High Court issued a further order under s 325 of the Copyright Act 2021 directing internet service providers including Singtel, StarHub, M1 and ViewQwest, to block access to 47 websites streaming English Premier League football matches without authorization, by 5 February 2026.[5]

d. On 21 May 2026, the Police arrested two women for their suspected involvement in the online sale of counterfeit goods. More than 400 suspected trade mark infringing goods comprising luxury bags, wallets, watches, sunglasses, pouches and accessories with an estimated street value of more than S$14,800 were seized.[6]

e. On 15 June 2026, a Singapore company was fined S$13,000, and its director was sentenced to eight months' imprisonment after being convicted for 14 charges under the Trade Marks Act 1998 for selling counterfeit Sanrio-branded merchandise. The case arose from a 2023 enforcement operation by the Police's Intellectual Property Rights Branch in which a total of 2,034 counterfeit items valued at approximately S$6,604 were seized, with continued infringement detected even after the initial raid.[7]

f. On 25 June 2026, the Police arrested a woman for her suspected involvement in the online sale of counterfeit luxury goods via TikTok. More than 700 suspected trade mark infringing items comprising handbags,

---

[4] Asia Video Industry Association, <https://avia.org/avias-coalition-against-piracy-secures-new-singapore-court-order-blocking-53-illegal-streaming-domains/> (accessed 10 October 2026).
[5] The Straits Times, *Access to 47 illegal Premier League streaming sites given the boot in Singapore* (4 February 2026), <https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/access-to-47-illegal-premier-league-streaming-sites-given-the-boot-in-spore> (accessed 10 October 2026).
[6] Singapore Police Force, *Police News Releases*, <https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2026/05/20260521_two_women_arrested_for_online_sale_of_counterfeit_goods> (accessed 10 October 2026).
[7] Mothership, *Selling counterfeit Sanrio products: S'pore company fined S$13,000, its director, 51, given 8 months' jail* (16 June 2026), <https://mothership.sg/2026/06/fake-sanrio-products-jailed/> (accessed 10 October 2026).

wallets, watches, sunglasses, clothing, footwear and accessories were sized. The estimated street value of the seized items exceeds S$34,000.[8]

g. On 16 September 2026, the Police arrested two women for their suspected involvement in the sale of counterfeit luxury goods. Simultaneous raids were conducted at retail shops in a shopping mall along Scotts Raid and more than 900 suspected trade mark infringing goods comprising luxury bags, watches, apparel, footwear and accessories were seized. The estimated street value of the seized items exceeds S$180,000.[9]

h. In other Sanrio-related enforcement news, on 3 October 2026, eleven bakery and cake-related businesses in Singapore published a public apology in local newspapers acknowledging that they had sold, offered for sale, displayed for sale and possessed counterfeit Sanrio products for the purposes of trade. The apology notice involved characters including Hello Kitty, Cinnamoroll, Pompompurin, Kuromi, Gudetama, Pochacco, My Melody and LittleTwinStars.[10]

IV. Notable Court decisions

Louis Vuitton Malletier v Ng Hoe Seng (formerly trading as EMCASE SG) **[2026] SGCA 22**[11]

9. The decision of the General Division of the High Court of Singapore was highlighted in last year's report. In this decision, the Singapore Court of Appeal clarified the approach to statutory damages for trade mark infringement involving counterfeit marks. The Court of Appeal also provided guidance on the factors to be considered in determining the quantum of statutory damages.

10. The relevant section on statutory damages is set out in Section 31(5) of the Trade Marks Act 1998 ("**TMA**"):

> "*In any action for infringement of a registered trade mark where the infringement involves the use of a counterfeit trade mark in relation to goods or services, the claimant is entitled, at the claimant's election, to —*

---

[8] Singapore Police Force, *Police News Releases*, <https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2026/06/20260626_woman_arrested_for_online_sale_of_counterfeit_goods> (accessed 10 October 2026).
[9] Singapore Police Force, *Police News Releases*, <https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2026/09/20260918_two_women_arrested_for_sale_of_counterfeit_goods> (accessed 10 October 2026)
[10] The Straits Times (3 October 2026) at p A13.
[11] This decision may be accessed via this link: https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2026_SGCA_22

(a) damages and an account of any profits attributable to the infringement that have not been taken into account in computing the damages;

(b) an account of profits; or

(c) statutory damages —

(i) not exceeding $100,000 for each type of goods or service in relation to which the counterfeit trade mark has been used; and

(ii) not exceeding in the aggregate $1 million, unless the claimant proves that the claimant's actual loss from such infringement exceeds $1 million."

11. To briefly summarise the facts, Louis Vuitton ("**LV**") owns 13 registered trade marks in Singapore. The respondent sold nine types of goods bearing signs identical to those marks through an Instagram store, with some goods bearing multiple counterfeit marks. Some listings claimed that the goods used authentic vintage LV materials verified by a third-party authenticator, but trap purchases showed that at least two did not. After receiving a cease-and-desist letter, the respondent moved to another Instagram account. He did not participate in the High Court proceedings, where LV obtained default judgment and an injunction, but continued infringing and made his account private.

12. The High Court found at least 121 instances of infringement involving counterfeit marks. LV argued that both statutory limits applied per mark, resulting in a S$2.9 million limit and an aggregate limit of S$13 million. The Judge rejected that interpretation, holding that the maximum was S$900,000 (S$100,000 for each of the nine types of goods, subject to the S$1 million aggregate limit per action). He awarded S$200,000 without explaining the calculation.

13. On appeal, LV submitted that the Judge had erred in (a) not accepting the "per mark" interpretation; and (b) quantifying the statutory damages at S$200,000 as that is wholly adequate. LV maintained that the prescribed statutory limits operate on a per mark basis. It argued that the applicable limit on statutory damages ought to be S$2.9 million (based on the 29 counterfeit marks applied on the respondent's goods) and that S$1.45 million should be awarded (which amounts to an award of S$50,000 per counterfeit mark per type of goods). At the hearing, LV submitted that in the event the court rejects the per mark interpretation (and

thus the statutory limit of S$900,000), LV should be awarded S$675,000 in statutory damages.

14. The Court of Appeal upheld the Judge's interpretation, holding that the wording of section 31(5)(c) supported applying the limits per type of goods and per action. The Court also held that the legislative purpose of the statutory damages regime in Singapore is to compensate the claimant and deter the defendant and other potential infringers, but not to punish the wrongdoer. This dual purpose must be achieved within boundaries that bear a reasonable relationship to the harm caused to the claimant or benefit derived by the defendant. Applying LV's per mark interpretation could produce damages substantially exceeding both measures and therefore have a punitive effect.

15. The factors to be considered by a Court in awarding statutory damages is set out in section 31(6) TMA:

> "*In awarding statutory damages under subsection (5)(c), the Court is to have regard to —*
> *(a) the flagrancy of the infringement of the registered trade mark;*
> *(b) any loss that the claimant has suffered or is likely to suffer by reason of the infringement;*
> *(c) any benefit shown to have accrued to the defendant by reason of the infringement;*
> *(d) the need to deter other similar instances of infringement; and*
> *(e) all other relevant matters.*"

16. The Court of Appeal also provided guidance on the scope and application of the different factors in section 31(6) TMA.

Factor (a): Flagrancy of the infringement of the registered mark

17. The Court of Appeal held that the flagrancy of infringement may be assessed by reference to the number of counterfeit marks used, the number of types of goods as well as the scope of the defendant's operations (for example, whether the defendant was a retailer, manufacturer, importer or distributor), and the manner of advertising. Aggravating conduct includes using the claimant's name to promote counterfeit goods, representing them as authentic and disseminating false claims online.

Factor (b): any loss that the claimant has suffered or is likely to suffer by reason of the infringement

18. The assessment of loss suffered by the claimant under section 31(6)(b) should consider whether the field of business activities of the parties give rise to direct competition, ie, whether the products sold by the defendant are substitutes of the claimant's products within the same market. The Court of Appeal also noted that lost sales are unlikely to be significant where there is a substantial price disparity as buyers likely know that the goods are counterfeit. Beyond such direct commercial loss, there is also damage to exclusivity, reputation and goodwill.

Factor (c): any benefit shown to have accrued to the defendant by reason of the infringement

19. Under this factor, the defendant's benefit may be measured by estimating the profit margins, for example, by comparing the prices of the defendant's counterfeit goods with alternatives which have no counterfeit marks associated with the claimant's brand. The advantage of free-riding off the quality associated with the registered marks is also a relevant factor.

Factor (d): need to deter other similar instances of infringement

20. There are two aspects to the deterrence factor. General deterrence may account for the prevalence of counterfeit luxury goods and the ease with which online platforms facilitate infringement, requiring awards the meaningfully discourage similar conduct by other potential infringers. Online marketing and sales generally give the infringer a wider reach at a lower cost. Specific deterrence requires consideration of the defendant's conduct, including recalcitrant behaviour, attempts at evasion, non-cooperation with legal proceedings and persistence in infringing activities in disregard of court orders.

Amount awarded

21. Given that the statutory limit is S$100,000 for each type of goods or service in relation to which the counterfeit trade mark has been used, the Court of Appeal held that the more appropriate approach is to assess damages based on the factors in section 31(6) in respect of each of the nine types of goods in the case.

22. On the facts, the Court of Appeal found the infringement highly flagrant and considered both general and specific deterrence necessary. The respondent was evasive, uncooperative and recalcitrant, and continued infringing in blatant disregard of the injunction. All the factors under section 31(6) TMA in this case were aggravating and the only factor militating against a higher award of damages is the fact that the respondent's operations appear to be limited. Bearing that in mind, the Court of Appeal held that damages should provisionally

land on the higher side of the mid-point of S$50,000 per type of goods, subject to adjustments for category-specific factors.

23. The Court then grouped the nine types of goods into four categories conceptualized based on several factors including the quantum of the respondent's sales and/or advertising, price disparity and whether LV deals in the same type of goods. Awards ranged from S$30,000 for cigarette cases (where there was one documented infringement and no evidence that LV sells such goods) to S$70,000 for phone cases, key cases and pouches/purses (which LV sold and for which there was extensive use of counterfeit marks, numerous documented infringements and high profit margins). The total award was S$510,000.