Taiwan:

GROUP SUMMARY REPORT

<table>
<tr><td>Developments</td><td>1. TIPO Revises Examination Guidelines for Non-Traditional Trademarks - Effective August 1, 2025.

2. Where a trademark application misses the statutory deadline for submitting priority documents due to causes not attributable to the applicant, the applicant may apply for reinstatement by submitting relevant supporting proof, and TIPO will determine on a case-by-case basis whether to grant it.

3. For gifts provided by the trademark owner free of charge and bearing restrictive or reserved statements, since no consideration for the goods has been obtained through a first sale, the trademark rights should not readily be deemed exhausted; any further marketing or resale still requires the trademark owner's consent in order to avoid infringing the trademark rights. Where goods are not marked with statements such as “Gift – Not for Resale” or “Not for Sale”, whether the trademark owner may assert its rights shall be determined case by case depending on the nature of the accompanying goods; if the goods deteriorate or are damaged after entering the market, or other legitimate reasons exist, the trademark owner may still assert its rights in accordance with the law. In addition, the trademark exhaustion principle naturally does not apply to counterfeit goods.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statistics</td><td><table>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>Number of New Applications</th><th>Average timeframe from filing up to registration (months)</th></tr>
<tr><td>2024</td><td>90,341</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>2025</td><td>97,411</td><td>8</td></tr>
</table>
*) Specific reason for increase/decrease, if any: N/A
**) Other comments, if any: N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cases</td><td>1. Intellectual Property & Commercial Court Civil Judgment (112 Min-Shang-Shang-Zi No. 8):
♦ According to general social perception and market transaction practices, relevant consumers regard domain names and account names on shopping platforms and social media platforms as identifiers of business entities, rather than as marks distinguishing the source of goods or services; therefore, such use does not constitute trademark use.
♦ During the litigation proceedings, upon the agreement of both parties, the court requested a third-party institution to conduct a market survey. The survey targeted adults aged 18 and over and was conducted through on-site random sampling in different regions of northern, central and southern Taiwan, supplemented by an online questionnaire. The survey results are sufficient to represent the degree to which relevant domestic consumers recognize or are familiar with the two marks, and may be adopted as evidence for determining whether there is a likelihood of confusion among relevant consumers.
2. Intellectual Property & Commercial Court Administrative Judgment (114 Xing-Shang-Su-Zi No. 9):
♦ The plaintiff had long been aware that the cited mark was a famous mark, yet still applied to register the identical Chinese characters “萬家香” (Wan Jia Xiang); moreover, its designated goods are associated with the consumer impression established by the cited mark, which could not be a mere coincidence. This sufficiently shows the plaintiff's bad faith in imitating the famous reputation of the cited mark.
♦ Taking into account factors including the high degree of fame of the cited</td></tr>
</table>

	mark, the extremely high degree of similarity between the two marks, and the strong distinctiveness of the cited mark and its greater familiarity to consumers, the barbecue utensils, lighting apparatus and other goods designated by the disputed mark and the soy sauce seasoning for which the cited mark is famous are used together in barbecue activities and are closely related, which is sufficient to cause a likelihood of confusion among relevant consumers. ♦ As for the remaining goods designated by the disputed mark, although they differ in nature from the soy sauce products for which the cited mark is famous and the markets are distinct, the cited mark has a high degree of fame and strong distinctiveness and has not been commonly used on other goods/services; if the disputed mark were registered and commonly used, it could weaken the unique impression of the cited mark in the minds of the general public, and there is thus a likelihood of dilution of its distinctiveness.