

## UPDATES FROM IPOS

November and December 2025

Dear readers

Welcome to our latest update on developments relating to IP & tech dispute resolution in Singapore.

### Court decisions

[Ng Say Keong \(trading as S & K Solid Wood Doors\) v Jia Le Aluminium Pte Ltd and another](#)  
[2025] SGHC 243

The claimant, Mr Ng Say Keong (who did business under the name S & K Solid Wood Doors), owned a patent (the “SK Patent”) in respect of an invention relating to a space saving slide-and-swing door better known to the relevant public as the “SK Door”. The defendants sold “SD Doors”, which also had a slide-and-swing feature. The claimant sued for patent infringement and passing off. The High Court found that the SK Patent was valid but it had not been infringed because the SD Door did not have a certain feature claimed in the SK Patent. However, the defendants were found to have engaged in intentional acts of passing off by showing customers an SK Door as a sample (and referring to it as such) but then ultimately supplying an SD Door. An injunction was granted against the defendants. The case was [reported in the Straits Times](#) on 17 December 2025 under the headline “S’pore inventor wins High Court suit against rivals who passed off similar doors as his design”.

[da Silveira, Virgilio Tarrago and Another v Hashstacs Pte Ltd and Another](#)  
[2025] SGCA(I) 3

This dispute arose out of the claimants’ purchase of STACS Tokens, a crypto asset linked to a proposed blockchain project known as the STACS Protocol. The features of the intended project were published online in a Third Whitepaper and Litepaper. The claimants argued, among other things, that these documents contained statements that were fraudulent or negligent misrepresentations which induced them to invest in the project (by purchasing STACS Tokens). At first instance, the Singapore International Commercial Court dismissed all of the claims. The claimants’ appeal to the Court of Appeal was unsuccessful. The court’s case summary is included in the above link.

[The Body Firm Pte Ltd v Siow Soon Sin and Another](#)  
[2025] SGDC 267

The Body Firm Pte Ltd (“TBF”), a beauty treatment centre in Singapore, sued Ms Siow (“Sarah”), a former employee, and Luminashape Pte Ltd (“LPL”), a new beauty treatment centre which Sarah set up. TBF alleged that Sarah retained and misused its confidential information and breached: (a) her contractual obligations of confidentiality; and (b) her equitable duty of confidence.



The District Court found that Sarah had breached contractual confidentiality obligations by retaining access to: (i) TBF's customer and leads database for a short period after termination; and (ii) certain group chat logs, and awarded nominal damages totalling \$3,000 for these breaches. Sarah was also ordered to delete the confidential information in her possession and provide evidence of the same. However, because the breaches were found to be unintentional and there was no evidence of misuse of the confidential information, the court declined to award equitable damages or an injunction.

### **Use of AI-generated material in court proceedings**

There have been a number of recent decisions relating to the use of fictitious authorities in court proceedings generated by Generative AI.

- In [Tajudin bin Gulam Rasul and another v Suriaya bte Haja Mohideen](#) [2025] SGHCR 33 (29 September 2025), an Assistant Registrar ordered that claimant's counsel pay personal costs of \$800 to the defendant. The order was made to compensate the defendant for costs of and incidental to counsel's citation of fictitious authority generated by Gen AI.
- In [Rajib Kumar Dhali v Maybank Singapore Limited](#) [2025] SGMC 62, it was discovered that a self-represented claimant had cited 11 statutory provisions and case precedents generated by Gen AI which were either fictitious or did not stand for the legal propositions cited for. This factor was taken into account in assessing the quantum of costs.
- In [Landscape Engineering Pte Ltd v Dot Safety Solutions Pte Ltd and another](#) [2025] SGHC 214, the court allowed a company's director to represent it in certain court proceedings. In so doing, the court cautioned that the director, who had been found to have relied on Gen AI to generate legal submissions (which included six fictitious cases), should verify the authenticity of the AI's output and that tendering further fictitious authorities may result an adverse award of costs against him personally.

### **IPOS decisions**

[Applications for extensions of time to file counter-statements in three trade mark invalidation applications and two trade mark oppositions by Perfect Supply Chain Co Limited and objection thereto by Amer Sports Canada Inc](#) [2025] SGIPOS 8

This interlocutory hearing involved an out-of-time request for extensions of time to file a counter-statements in respect of 5 related cases. For four of the cases, the period of delay was 60 days and for the remaining one case the period of delay was 51 days. The delay was attributed to a clerical error on the part of its solicitor. Given the long delay and lack of good and sufficient explanation, the hearing officer was not persuaded that the extension should be granted.

[In a matter of a trade mark application by Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Ltd](#) [2025] SGIPOS 7

This case concerned whether TSMC's slogan "UNLEASH INNOVATION" could be registered as a trade mark for goods and services in classes 9, 40 and 42. The trade mark examiners who examined the



application took the view that the subject application was devoid of any distinctive character and therefore not eligible for registration under s 7(1)(b) of the Trade Marks Act. TSMC was given the opportunity to submit evidence of acquired distinctiveness through use, but did not do so. The matter was heard in an ex parte hearing. The hearing officer found that the average consumers in question (here: professionals and specialists within the semiconductor and information technology industries) would perceive “UNLEASH INNOVATION” as a promotional message and not as a badge of origin and refused registration. The case was covered [by the Straits Times on 7 November 2025](#) under the headline “Chipmaker TSMC fails in bid to trademark ‘Unleash innovation’ slogan in Singapore.

[\*In a matter of an application for extension of time to file counter-statement by Jiang Yazheng and an objection by Wen Zhang Lao Mian Pte Ltd\*](#) [2025] SGIPOS 6

Jiang Yazheng, the proprietor defending a trade mark invalidation action, sought an extension of time to file her counter-statement. Her mark agent at the relevant time, Eagle Mind Pte Ltd (an accounting company), misrepresented to the Registrar that *“Our legal counsel is in the process of handling this matter with the High Court, and we will submit the required documents accordingly”* in order to obtain the extension. In so doing, they acted without instructions. The reason provided was also false. The Registrar granted the extension without knowledge of the falsehood. Subsequently, the applicant which brought the invalidation action requested that the Registrar revoke the extension of time on the basis that the proprietor had provided a false reason and made a false declaration. The hearing officer ultimately decided to revoke the extension of time granted. In so doing, she cautioned that parties involved in contentious proceedings before the Registrar should consider engaging a suitably qualified agent or lawyer.

### **Recent media coverage**

There have been a number of IP or tech-related disputes in the news recently. Some examples include:

- The alleged trade mark infringement suit brought by Louis Vuitton against ValueMax Retail (see The Business Times [report](#) ‘Louis Vuitton sues unit of SGX-listed ValueMax over alleged trademark infringement’, 17 December 2025 and The Straits Times [report](#) ‘ValueMax to defend claims of infringement by LV, says it doesn’t carry LV products currently, 19 December 2025)
- The Straits Times [report](#) on the enforcement action against Amcomics Technology (which was fined \$384,000 for selling illegal streaming devices at Sim Lim Square) and its director Peggy Yu (who was jailed for 22 months). The article, published on 18 Nov 2025, carried the headline ‘22 months’ jail for Sim Lim Square retailer selling illegal streaming devices showing EPL games’.
- The recent reports relating to how former customers of Tokenize Xchange, a now defunct cryptocurrency trading platform, have sought damages against the founder and his wife for fraudulent misrepresentation: see Straits Times report dated 1 Dec 2025 [here](#), and Business Times report dated 28 Nov 2025 [here](#).



## **Mediation case studies under the WIPO-ASEAN Mediation Programme**

[\*Moniba Ather & Singapore New Reading Technology Pte Ltd\*](#) [2025] AMP+ MED 4

This mediation between an author of a novel and a digital publishing company presented cultural dynamics, language barriers and logistical hurdles navigated remotely across three jurisdictions (Singapore, Pakistan and China). This case is a testament of the advantages of having a bilingual Mediator, who, while performing simultaneous interpretation from English to Chinese (and vice versa) took pains to accurately convey the nuance of what was said and ultimately delivered a positive outcome for both parties. Read more [here](#).

[\*The Beauty Nation Pte. Ltd. & Sin Seng Medical & Herbs Pte. Ltd. and The R.Co Pte. Ltd.\*](#) [2025] AMP+ MED 3

Two businesses dealing in health products had an IP dispute. The Mediator's bilingual facilitation stood out as a central element of the session. This demonstrated, in practice, how a Mediator's language sensitivity is integral to party autonomy and procedural fairness. Read more [here](#).

## **Recent published articles**

Readers may be interested in the recent Singapore Academy of Law Journal (Special Issue) [edition](#) on Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property in the Asia-Pacific. The articles contained in this special issue are listed below.

- [Foreword](#) by Justice Debbie Ong (2025) 37 SAcLJ vii
- [Introduction](#) by Jason Grant Allen, Saw Cheng Lim & Huijuan Peng (2025) 37 SAcLJ 639
- [Destination Unknown](#): AI and IP in the Digital Economy by Jason Grant Allen (2025) 37 SAcLJ 64
- [Building Sandcastles at High Tide](#): Contracts in the IP Regulation of AI Training Data by Wenting Cheng & Georg Zoeller (2025) 37 SAcLJ 673
- [“Does This Unit Have a Soul?”](#) AI-Generated Works, Creativity Research, and Copyright Policy by Joshua Yuvaraj (2025) 37 SAcLJ 710
- [Copyright in the Generative AI Era](#): Reimagining Creativity and Fairness by Huijuan Peng & David Tan (2025) 37 SAcLJ 749
- [Copyright Ownership and Duration of AI-Authored Works](#) by Saw Cheng Lim (2025) 37 SAcLJ 790
- [Assessing the Originality of Works Created with the Assistance of Generative AI](#): An Indonesian Legal Perspective by Ari Juliano Gema (2025) 37 SAcLJ 810
- [Comparative Analysis of Text and Data-Mining Exception Clauses](#) in South Korea, Singapore, and Japan by WooJung Jon (2025) 37 SAcLJ 832



- [Copyright Alignment for Generative AI](#): Designing a Dual-Phase Duty-of-Care Regime in China by Jianfeng Cao & Jiahui Chen (2025) 37 SAcLJ 860
- [Bridging Statutory Exclusion and Administrative Exception](#): AI Patent Workarounds and Policy Reform in Thailand by Poomsiri Dumrongvute & Sukhprem Sachadecha (2025) 37 SAcLJ 894

Readers may also be interested in the following:

- [Unpacking copyright infringement issues in the GenAI development lifecycle and a peek into the future](#), by Cheng Lim Saw and Bryan Zhi Yang Tan (Computer Law & Security Review, Volume 58, 2025)
- Certification Marks in Practice, [Part 1](#) [2025] SAL Prac 29 and [Part 2](#) [2025] SAL Prac 30, by Bram Van Wiele.

### **Featured events**

- IPOS, Penn State Dickinson Law and the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center jointly present the following complimentary half-day seminars in a hybrid format. Hear from global IP leaders and legal experts from the US and Singapore, including Jane Ginsburg, Morton L. Janklow Professor of Literary and Artistic Property Law, Columbia University School of Law. [Register your interest](#) now to be notified when full registration opens (registrants will be able to access **video recordings** of the seminars once they are available).

### **International Tech & IP Disputes Exchange (I-TIDE) 2026 — AI and Cross-Border Tech Disputes** (3 and 5 March 2026)

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into our daily lives is happening at an unprecedented pace, often without us even realizing it. This swift adoption brings significant legal challenges in areas like copyright infringement, patent eligibility, and trade secret protection.

As legal professionals, courts, and lawmakers around the world tackle these cutting-edge issues, this event invites us to consider international perspectives. What lessons can we learn from other jurisdictions and those leading the way in resolving these cases through various modes of dispute resolution?

- Justice Dedar Singh Gill is speaking at the following WIPO Webinar for Judges on 29 January 2026, which will touch on the *East Coast Podiatry Centre Pte Ltd v Family Podiatry Centre Pte Ltd* [2025] SGCA 28 decision.

### **Navigating the Threshold of Trademark Use in Online Advertising** (29 January 2026)

The rise of online advertising has reshaped the way businesses promote their products and services and, in turn, how courts assess trademark use and infringement. Search engines,



sponsored links, and targeted keywords have become powerful commercial tools, allowing companies to reach consumers instantly based on their online searches. This transformation, however, also presents new legal challenges. When a trademark is used as a keyword or within an online advertisement, questions arise as to whether such use constitutes “trademark use,” whether confusion may result, and how courts should approach evidence in these contexts.

-----

If you know of anyone who would like to be added to this mailing list (which deals primarily with IP/IT dispute resolution in Singapore), please drop us a note at [ipos\\_hmd@ipos.gov.sg](mailto:ipos_hmd@ipos.gov.sg). IPOS also separately maintains another mailing list for circulars, legislative amendments and other related matters which you can join by contacting [news@ipos.gov.sg](mailto:news@ipos.gov.sg). For any comments or feedback (or to draw our attention to any interesting news we might have missed), please email [see\\_tho\\_sok\\_yee@ipos.gov.sg](mailto:see_tho_sok_yee@ipos.gov.sg). Archived copies of our previous updates are available at the following [link](#).

