

IN THIS ISSUE:

**BRAND PROTECTION STRATEGIES IN RUSSIA
AFTER MARKET EXIT**, page_1
**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY NEWS REVIEW
FROM RUSSIA & CIS**, page_6
FIRM NEWS, page_16

GORODISSKY

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TMT

MOSCOW / ST. PETERSBURG / DUBNA / KRASNODAR
EKATERINBURG / N. NOVGOROD / NOVOSIBIRSK / SAROV
TECHNOPARK / SAMARA / KAZAN / PERM / VLADIVOSTOK
UFA / KIEV / ASTANA / DUBAI / BISHKEK

G-NEWS

INFORMATION BULLETIN

#163 (1) 2026

BRAND PROTECTION STRATEGIES IN RUSSIA AFTER MARKET EXIT

Maksim Volkov
Attorney-at-Law
Trademark Attorney
Senior Associate
Legal Department



Since 2022, many foreign companies changed the format of their presence in Russia. Some completely exited, selling their Russian assets, whereas others just suspended operations or continued through local subsidiaries or affiliates while distancing from their core brands. Yet all these scenarios raise the same legal question: does market exit render a widely known trademark free for registration by third parties? The article examines how Rospatent and the courts respond to attempts to capture famous brands, and outlines practical strategies for maintaining brand control even during periods of temporary non-use in Russia.

In practice, foreign companies and related entities that remain active in Russia are often forced to distance themselves from their core international brands. They may

1. rely on already registered brands originally targeted at the Russian market, including those previously bought out or acquired through the acquisition of local companies, or
2. file TM applications for new brands showing continuity with the earlier identity, or
3. register transliterations of English-language brands into Russian.



This article does not address who initiated such rebranding or filings — the original owner, its affiliate, or an unrelated third party acting with or without consent. Russian media, for example, often describe “STARS COFFEE” as a rebranding of “STARBUCKS”, although in fact these two brands belong to different parties and have already become the subject of disputes.

From a legal perspective, however, all these scenarios raise the same question: does the non-use mean that a famous brand becomes available for registration in the name of someone else? The emerging case law suggests that the answer is rather No. A company’s withdrawal from the Russian market does not in itself sever the link between a brand and its original owner. Attempts to capture a widely known designation through a similar trademark filing or through a non-use cancellation action are increasingly being resisted by both Rospatent and the courts. At the same time, recent practice shows that trademark owners, their Russian subsidiaries and affiliated entities still have workable mechanisms to retain brand control even where the mark is not currently used. In practical terms, almost any foreign company that has suspended or ceased operations in Russia but whose brand remains known on the Russian market has an interest in retaining control over that brand. In this context, preserving a brand means both preventing third parties from registering identical or similar designations and maintaining rights in already registered marks, including protection against early cancellation for non-use.

In the circumstances where operations have been suspended, trademark owners are often required to build a brand protection strategy without actual use of the mark.

The purpose of preserving the brand also matters. For some companies, it is a way to keep open the option of re-entering the Russian market later. For others, it is a way to prevent goods from appearing on the market under the same brand, including counterfeit products, thereby supporting the business of a Russian subsidiary. For others, it is a way to reduce risks for their business and reputation in neighboring jurisdictions. In practice, these motives often overlap, but the priority among them influences the legal strategy chosen.

Early cancellation of trademark protection due to non-use

The main reason why a trademark owner must think strategically about brand preservation is the risk of early cancellation for non-use. The grounds and procedure are set out in Article 1486 of the Civil Code. A trademark may be cancelled in whole or in part if the mark has not been continuously used for three years in relation to the goods or services for which it is registered.

Russian law establishes a mandatory pre-trial procedure. A person intending to bring a non-use cancellation action must first send the trademark owner a proposal identifying the relevant marks and the relevant goods

or services. In substance, this proposal is a demand made under the threat of litigation. It may include an offer to assign the exclusive right in the mark, to cancel the mark voluntarily, or to issue a letter of consent for registration of a similar designation. Only if the trademark owner does not agree within two months from the date of the proposal the interested party may file a claim. Non-use cancellation disputes are heard by the IP Court as a court of first instance sitting in a panel of three judges. In such proceedings, the court determines two key merits of the case. First, whether there is evidence of use of the challenged trademark during the three-year period preceding the date of the proposal. Such evidence must show that the relevant goods or services were actually made available

to end consumers. Mere intent to use, preparations for use, or token use aimed solely at preserving the monopoly are not sufficient.

Second, whether the claimant has a legitimate interest in seeking cancellation of the trademark for non-use. Importantly, Russian legislation and case law do not provide foreign trademark owners with either special restrictions or special privileges as compared with Russian companies and individuals. In particular, public statements that a foreign company has suspended operations in Russia have not, in themselves, been treated by the courts as evidence of abuse of rights by the foreign owner, nor have they diminished the evidentiary value of proof of use submitted by that owner.

This article focuses only on cases where there is no evidence of use of the trademark in Russia during the relevant three-year period, whether for the challenged goods and services or for any other goods and services. For that reason, the issue of use itself is not examined here in greater detail.

Mechanisms for preserving control over a brand during temporary non-use

There is no universal solution for long-term brand preservation in Russia once operations are restricted or suspended. It is always a case-by-case decision, depending on the company's goals, brand awareness, product market, and other factors. Below, we shall describe key brand protection mechanisms and current practices for their application.

1. Regular filing of new trademark applications

This approach is based on the three-year grace period following registration, during which trademark protection cannot be cancelled for non-use. To make this mechanism work in practice, the owner should support protection in advance by filing new applications for identical or similar signs. This makes it possible to build a chain of rights in which later registrations continue the protective function as earlier marks become vulnerable to non-use actions. As a result, even if older registrations are cancelled, a third party TM application may still be blocked by the owner's newer marks. Because examination may last for more than a year and may also be suspended,

new applications should be filed well in advance. At the same time, Russian law does not allow the registration of identical marks for the same goods and services, so each new filing should contain at least minimal differences, both in the sign itself and in the specification of goods and services.

Russian media often interpret new trademark filings by companies that have left the market as evidence of an imminent return to Russia. In most cases, however, such filings do not signal a planned resumption of operations. Their main purpose is to preserve control over the brand.

Government Resolution No. 1209 of 2 September 2024 introduced the possibility of hiding information about the applicant from the publicly available register extract maintained by Rospatent. This measure was likely intended for foreign trademark owners wishing to avoid publicity when filing new applications in Russia. In practice, however, the mechanism does not appear to have become widely used. Foreign companies usually focus on preserving their most valuable and best-known brands, so the media often infer who stands behind a filing even without formal disclosure, although in recent years there has also been an increase in similar filings by bad-faith applicants. In addition, any person may obtain the file materials for any application by filing a request with Rospatent and paying the official fee.

It should also be noted that the 2023 review of case law approved by the Presidium of the Supreme Court included the position that new TM application for a designation similar to a mark previously owned by the same person, where the earlier mark had been cancelled for non-use, may in some situations be declared by court as an abuse of rights, because it seeks to circumvent the final court judgment and prevents another person from registering and using the sign. So far, however, this position has not developed further in relation to new filings by foreign brand owners who left the Russian

market. Its application to widely known brands appears unlikely, because in such cases the obstacle to registration is often not only the owner's new application, but also the likelihood of misleading consumers.

Accordingly, periodic filing of new TM applications remains one of the main tools for preserving control over a brand in circumstances of non-use. However, this tool alone may not be sufficient. Furthermore, it does not protect brand owners from the loss of earlier trademarks, which could have been used to combat counterfeiting.

2. Market exit does not make a brand free for registration: blocking a third-party filing citing the threat of misleading the consumer

If the TM holders lack evidence of use of the trademark for three years, they may voluntarily abandon it. Such abandonment will not result in the loss of the brand if there are other trademarks or applications that predate the opponent's. However, if there are no such trademarks or the opponent's application has an earlier priority, the brand owner still has the option to prevent the opponent's registration on another basis, as provided in Paragraph 3 of Article 1483 of the Civil Code: the threat of misleading consumers regarding the product, its manufacturer, or place of production. This means that the mere fact that a foreign company has left the Russian market or suspended operations in Russia does not make its brand available for registration by someone else. Even if the earlier registration has already been cancelled for non-use, Rospatent may still refuse a third-party application if consumers continue to associate the sign with the original owner. This is the logic behind the strategy under which the owner gives up a vulnerable unused registration, simultaneously blocks registration in the name of a competitor or other third party, and files a new application. To do that the owner must prove that the sign remains known in relation to the relevant goods and that consumers continue to associate it with a certain owner. In practice, Rospatent may take into account information from the internet where it supports that perception. The "DR PEPPER" dispute is a good example. Historically, trademark rights for "DR PEPPER" brand in Russia belonged to The Coca-Cola Company group. A Russian seller of soft

drinks filed similar applications and at the same time undertook non-use cancellation actions (NUCA) against a series of “DR PEPPER” marks in cases No. SIP-527/2022 and No. SIP-114/2023. In response, the owner made voluntary renunciation of the TM registrations against which the cancellation lawsuits had been filed, as a result of which the claims were dismissed and the question of actual use was not investigated and determined by the court on the merits. At the same time, the original owner submitted a written submission opposing registration of the applicant’s filings together with a sociological survey and other evidence to Rospatent, arguing that the sign remained known and that registration of such TM application in favor of Russian company would mislead consumers. Those arguments were accepted, registration was refused, and the IP Court later upheld Rospatent’s position in case No. SIP-44/2025 and stated that the Russian applicant’s conduct, aimed at taking over a widely known brand, amounted to an abuse of rights.

A similar approach was applied in case No. SIP-457/2023 concerning the “Latisse” brand. The court likewise upheld refusal of registration on the ground that the sign would mislead consumers and found the applicant’s claim to a designation previously used by another person for goods of the same kind to be unfounded. The fact that the foreign company had left the Russian market or suspended operations in Russia was not treated as having independent legal significance. Meanwhile such voluntary renunciation of the own registration in the hope that Rospatent will then refuse the third party’s application should be regarded as a highly risky step. The examples above show that these tactics may work in some cases, but its success depends on the specific facts and is far from guaranteed. The owner loses marks with earlier priority and creates a period of vulnerability during which, until a new mark is registered, the ability to act against counterfeit goods and other infringements becomes more limited.

At the same time, the more important general conclusion from “DR PEPPER” and “Latisse” brands cases is this: market exit and even the cancellation of an earlier registration do not mean that a widely known sign can freely be registered in the name of another person. If the brand continues to have a strong association with the original owner, Rospatent and the courts will con-

sider those and can refuse registration of signs that would mislead consumers. In practical terms, these mechanisms remain available after 2022, but they require regular monitoring of identical and similar applications and timely submission to Rospatent of a comprehensive package of evidence together with a written submission opposing registration. In practice, it is much easier to prevent registration at the examination stage than to attack an already registered mark later.

3. Russian courts are increasingly curbing bad-faith attempts to capture widely-known brands

Challenges to the claimant’s legitimate interest, abuse of rights and unfair competition all reflect the same underlying idea in this category of disputes: claims to a widely known brand should not receive judicial protection where they are not aimed at bona fide market use, but at misappropriating the reputation already built by someone else. This line of reasoning has become increasingly visible in recent non-use cancellation cases. A claimant’s interest is a mandatory element in a non-use cancellation action. Usually, it is framed as the claimant’s intention to use an identical or confusingly similar sign for similar goods or services. The law does not provide a limited list of evidence, and the courts have traditionally taken a relatively flexible approach. As a result, proving interest has often not been particularly difficult, especially for mass-market brands.

This created the central contradiction. On the one hand, the claimant could show a formal interest in the designation. On the other hand, trademark owners argued that even if their mark were cancelled, the claimant would still be unable to register the sign because of the likelihood of misleading consumers. For a long time, however, the courts tended to support position that this issue belonged to the registration process of Rospatent rather than to the NUCA dispute itself. That left uncertainty as to whether such claims could be rejected as abusive or as a form of unfair competition.

The practice developed unevenly. In 2016 there were several decisions in which non-use cancellation claims against widely known marks were treated as abuse of rights and as unfair competition within the meaning of Article 10bis of the Paris Convention. In case No. SIP-530/2014, the courts held that cancellation

of the mark “Dr. Theiss Angi Sept” would facilitate consumer confusion and unfair competition. Similar conclusions were reached in case No. SIP-299/2015 concerning “HENNESSY” and case No. SIP-448/2015 concerning “ЮНИТОН”. Later, decisions with this reasoning largely disappeared. The courts began to state that arguments about free-riding on a widely known brand should be examined either by Rospatent during examination of the application or in a separate dispute on unfair competition or abuse of rights in connection with registration and use of a trademark. Thus, in case No. SIP-334/2024 concerning the “ERICSSON” series of trademarks, the court rejected the argument that the claimant intended to exploit the reputation of a famous brand and explicitly stated that such issues could be raised in an opposition submission against registration under Article 1483, but not within the NUCA itself. The same approach was repeated in cases No. SIP-492/2024 and No. SIP-493/2024 concerning “SPRITE” and “FANTA” trademarks. Although the court refused cancellation on other grounds, it did not accept arguments on the abuse of rights by the claimant.

A further development of this logic emerged once the three-year period after 2022 had elapsed and many foreign companies had already been absent from the Russian market for a substantial time. In case No. SIP-489/2024 concerning the “CANON” trademarks series, the courts rejected the non-use cancellation claim, holding that in light of the wide recognition of the marks, the claimant’s materials did not show a genuine business need to use the sign, but merely an attempt to benefit from the fame of the defendant’s mark. On that basis, the courts held that the claimant’s interest was illusory. The owner’s argument that the claim demands were an abuse of rights was not accepted, however, because the court found no evidence that the action had been filed exclusively to harm the owner. Thus, the “CANON” case developed the idea that even where the claimant can show a formally documented intention to use the sign, the interest may still be defective in substance. The court described this as an “illusory interest”, apparently borrowing terminology from the case law on nominal use of trademarks. This approach was then reinforced at the level

of the Supreme Court, where the assessment of legitimate interest was expressly linked not only to formal intent but also to the claimant's practical ability to use the sign lawfully.



An important step in development of this approach was case No. SIP-1077/2023 on the early termination of legal protection

of a trademark. The Judicial Chamber for Economic Disputes of the Supreme Court set aside the lower decisions and disagreed with the conclusion that the claimant had a real legitimate interest in seeking cancellation. The Supreme Court emphasized that such interest must consist in an intention to register one's own mark and/or use the disputed or similar sign lawfully. Where the claimant had already been found, in another case, to infringe not only trademark rights but also copyright in the work embodied in that trademark, the reality of his intention became doubtful, because such a person would be unable either to register the sign or to use it lawfully in trade. In this way, the Supreme Court effectively confirmed that legitimate interest may be assessed not only formally, but also from the perspective of the lawfulness of subsequent use. The same reasoning was developed further in case No. SIP-803/2024 concerning the "VICTORIA'S SECRET" TM series. The claimant relied on its own application covering a broad list of goods and services, but the court refused cancellation of those goods for which the owner proved that the marks remained known to consumers. The court referred to the absence of proper legitimate interest and to abuse of rights. In substance, the court found that the claimant's formally stated interest was aimed only at taking over the reputation of a globally recognized brand and using it in his own business for similar goods and services. The interest was therefore characterized as malicious. In effect, the court applied the same logic as in "CANON" case, but used what may be a more precise term — "malicious interest" instead of "illusory interest". Similar conclusions were later reached in cases No. SIP-331/2024 and No. SIP-1035/2024 involving the "XIAOMI" brand, in case No. SIP-582/2025 involving the "RAY-BAN" brand, and in case No. SIP-423/2024 involving "ZANUSSI" brand.

The development of this practice may be explained not only by the passage of time, but also by the courts' need to respond to more than twenty non-use cancellation actions filed in 2024 by MULTIGOODS PRODUCTION LIMITED from Hong Kong against famous brands. Besides the cases mentioned above, there were partial or full dismissals based on lack of bona fide legitimate interest in cases concerning "MICHELIN", "Nokia", "Bershka" and "HUGO BOSS" brands. In several other cases the claims were fully granted, but the decisions indicate that the trademark owners did not appear or did not submit a position, for example in matters concerning "MOLEKULE", "AMAZON" and "Nokia Solutions & Networks". This again shows that even where a brand is extremely well known, a clear and well-supported legal position remains essential.

Accordingly, since mid-2025 a more visible line of authority has begun to emerge in which the courts refuse non-use cancellation through the prism of defects in the claimant's legitimate interest. In the first instance, courts increasingly rely on the absence of a genuine and proper interest rather than on abuse of rights or unfair competition as standalone grounds. For foreign brand owners, this sends an important signal: even where use cannot be proven, Russian IP protection does not simply disappear, and questions of good faith are playing an increasingly meaningful role. More broadly, one can see a return to the logic expressed in the 2016 case law: claims seeking cancellation of famous trademarks must be not only formally structured, but substantively justified. For foreign trademark owners, their Russian subsidiaries and affiliated entities, this is significant. If this line of authority continues to consolidate, it will materially simplify defense strategies in cases where evidence of use is unavailable or limited.

Conclusion

Over the four years since 2022, Russian practice has developed a range of workable mechanisms that allow foreign brand owners to preserve control over widely known brands even during periods of temporary non-use in Russia. Several principal conclusions follow. First, a trademark owner's exit from the Russian market does not, by itself,

make the brand free for registration in someone else's name. The fame of the sign, its continued association with the original owner and the risk of misleading consumers all remain legally relevant even where the mark is not currently used. Second, attempts to capture a widely known brand through similar applications or through non-use cancellation actions are increasingly receiving a negative response from both Rospatent and the courts. A formally stated interest in the designation is no longer enough in itself. Russian courts are paying growing attention to questions of good faith and to whether the claimant's conduct is genuinely justified. Third, foreign trademark owners, their Russian subsidiaries and affiliated entities still have real legal tools available to protect their brands. These include periodic filing of new applications, use of written submissions opposing registration of similar signs at the examination stage, and procedural defenses in non-use cancellation litigation. At the same time, such protection does not operate automatically. The courts have repeatedly emphasized that the fame of a trademark must be proven in each individual case and cannot simply be presumed as a matter of common knowledge. The effectiveness of protection therefore depends not only on the strength of the brand itself, but also on the timing, consistency and quality of the owner's legal strategy.

IP NEWS REVIEW: RUSSIA & CIS

(September 2025 – February 2026)

RUSSIA:	
LAWS AND DRAFT LAWS	6
GOVERNMENT ENACTMENTS AND DEPARTMENTAL ENACTMENTS	7
DISPUTES OVER GRANTING AND TERMINATION OF PROTECTION	9
DISPUTES OVER INFRINGEMENT OF THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS	10
OTHER DISPUTES	11
ROSPATENT PRACTICE	11
1. WELL-KNOWN TRADEMARKS	11
2. APPELLATIONS OF ORIGIN OF GOODS (AOG) AND GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS (GI)	13
CIS:	
1. EURASIAN PATENT ORGANIZATION	14
2. GEORGIA	14
3. BELARUS	15
4. KAZAKHSTAN	15
5. UZBEKISTAN	15

LAWS AND DRAFT LAWS

COMPENSATION FOR INFRINGEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS — NEW RULES (FEDERAL LAW 214-FZ DATED JULY 07, 2025)

On January 4, 2026, the Federal Law “On Amendments to Part Four of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation” (No. 214-FZ) came into force. It introduced, in particular, the following changes.

Article 1252 of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation (CCRF) establishes that the infringement of exclusive rights is recognized as the illegal use of one result of intellectual activity or means of individualization in any one way.

New article, Article 1252.1, sets out the general principles for determining compensation in various situations.

In particular, it provides that compensation may be collected for actions that are not formally considered infringements of exclusive rights but contribute to such infringement. This applies

to actions involving the circumvention of technical copyright protection measures (Article 1299 of the CCRF) and the removal of copyright information from a copy of a work (Article 1300 of the CCRF).

It stipulates that compensation will not be collected in the event of a method of using a result of intellectual activity (RIA) or means of individualization (MI) that, in itself, has no independent economic significance but is necessary for another method of use. It is also determined that the use of a work without indicating the author, but with an indication of the source of borrowing, is not a infringement of exclusive rights if the author’s name is not included in the source of borrowing.

The new article retains three options for determining the amount of compensation:

- a fixed amount;
- an amount equal to a multiple of the value of the counterfeit goods; or
- an amount equal to a multiple of the value of the right to use the object of rights under comparable circumstances.

The court has the right to award compensation in a fixed amount even if the plaintiff has chosen a different compensation calculation option, but the court finds that the plaintiff’s chosen method

of calculating compensation is inapplicable to the circumstances of the infringement of the exclusive right. The new article also details the procedure for calculating compensation in cases where multiple results of intellectual activity (RIA) or means of individualization are illegally used in a single counterfeit tangible medium, as well as when multiple individuals independently violate exclusive rights using the same counterfeit tangible medium. In the latter case, the court may award compensation jointly and severally to the infringers.

It is established that, where the results of intellectual activity or means of individualization work belongs to several right holders, the compensation collected by any of them for the infringement of the exclusive right to such an object must be distributed among all right holders.

It has also been established that the court may determine the amount of compensation below the limits specified by the Civil Code of the Russian Federation (in particular, within the range of ten thousand to five hundred thousand rubles or within the range of one to two times the cost of counterfeit material media or the right to use an intellectual property object), if the infringer — an individual entrepreneur — did not know and should not have known that he was committing a infringement of an exclusive right. The article establishing the specifics of protecting the rights of a licensee (Article 1254 of the CCRF) additionally stipulates that the claims of the right holder and the exclusive licensee who have filed a claim for compensation in court are joint and several.

The articles defining liability for infringement of exclusive rights to certain intellectual property objects (Articles 1301, 1311, 1406.1, 1515, and 1537 of the CCRF) establish minimum and maximum compensation limits. In particular, the maximum compensation for infringement of exclusive rights to a work, related rights, invention, utility model or industrial design and for the illegal use of a trademark has increased from five to ten million rubles. For patent rights, the minimum compensation has also increased (from ten to fifty thousand rubles). For geographical indications (GIs) and appellations of origin (AOGs), compensation is only possible in a fixed amount. The amendments that have entered into force are aimed at establishing a fairer amount of compensation for the infringement of exclusive rights to intellectual property, taking into account all the circumstances of such infringement. According to paragraph 25 of Resolution No. 10 of the Plenum of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, penalties for infringement of results of intellectual activity and means of individualization are applied based on the legislation in effect at the time of the infringement. This means that the new rules for determining compensation only apply to infringements committed after January 4, 2026.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT MEASURES HAVE BEEN EXTENDED (FEDERAL LAW NO. 463-FZ DATED DECEMBER 15, 2025)

In particular, the Government's right to determine the list of goods for parallel imports has been extended for 2026.

ON PATENTING IT INVENTIONS (DRAFT LAW NO. 922784-8 DATED MAY 21, 2025)

In November 2025, the draft law "On Amendments to Part IV of the CCRF" (draft No. 922784-8 dated May 21, 2025) (on the legal regime of programmable means as objects of patent law) was approved by the State Duma in the first reading.

According to the draft law's authors, the proposed amendments will make it possible to grant patent protection to technical solutions implemented by a programmable device (computer) under the control of a computer program. As stated in the explanatory note to the draft law, the proposed amendments "allow for the possibility of obtaining patent protection for inventions that use machine learning systems, including deep learning, known as 'artificial intelligence.'"

Articles 1350 and 1351 of the CCRF propose specifying that a technical solution implemented in a programmable means, or related to a method implemented using such a means, is also protected as an invention; and a technical solution implemented in a programmable device is also protected as a utility model.

Furthermore, with regard to industrial designs, the draft law provides for an amendment to Article 1352 of the CCRF specifying that the graphical interface of a computer program or its component part, which has independent significance, is also protected as an industrial design.

The draft law also proposes expanding the product categories that inventions may include (in addition to devices, substances, microbial strains, and plant or animal cell cultures) to include "systems" and "complexes," as well as "protein and genetic constructs." As a result, it proposes legislatively codifying Rospatent's established practice of protecting utility models, according to which systems and complexes are not included within the definition of devices and cannot be protected by a utility model patent.

The Government submitted an official response to the draft law to the State Duma, noting that the application of the provisions proposed in this paragraph could lead to the blurring of distinctions in patent protection between inventions and utility models. This could contribute to abuse of rights, including the use of utility model patents by unscrupulous market participants. Therefore, it would be appropriate to exclude paragraph 3 of Article 1 of the draft law.

GOVERNMENT ENACTMENTS AND DEPARTMENTAL ENACTMENTS

THE GOVERNMENT AMENDED THE REGULATION ON PATENT FEES (GOVERNMENT DECREE NO. 1459 DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2025)

A key change is the introduction of an additional fee for depending on the number of goods and services declared within a single class of the Nice Classification. Previously, the fee was determined solely by the number of classes; now, the size of the list within each class is also taken into account. Specifically, the fee for examining a declared designation and for extending trademark protection for another 10-year period is increased by 500 rubles for each product or service in the list of goods and services in a single class, exceeding 10.

In addition, another amendment has been made to the Regulation on Patent Fees, according to which federal government bodies, government bodies of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation, as well as the State Atomic Energy Corporation “Rosatom” and the State Corporation for Space Activities “Roscosmos”, are exempt from paying a number of fees, namely for the registration of an invention, utility model, industrial design, publication of information on the issuance of a patent, the issuance of a patent and maintenance of a patent in force, as well as for the examination of an application for a trademark and for the extension of the term of protection of a trademark, when these state corporations exercise their powers to manage the rights belonging to the Russian Federation to the results of intellectual activity and equivalent means of individualization. The changes came into force on October 4, 2025.

THE POSSIBILITY OF ANONYMOUS PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION IN THE ROSPATENT’S BULLETINS HAS BEEN EXTENDED FOR ANOTHER YEAR (GOVERNMENT DECREE NO. 2202 DATED DECEMBER 29, 2025)

Until December 31, 2026, at the request of the applicant for registration of an invention, utility model, industrial design, trademark, computer program, database, integrated circuit topography or the holder of exclusive rights to the results of intellectual activity and means of individualization, as well as at the request of the parties to an agreement on the disposal of exclusive rights to the results of intellectual activity and means of individualization, Rospatent will not publish information about the such persons in its official bulletins.

THE GOVERNMENT HAS GIVEN PERMISSION TO USE NOVO NORDISK (DENMARK) INVENTIONS IN THE INTERESTS OF PROTECTING THE LIFE AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS (GOVERNMENT ORDERS NO. 3572-P DATED DECEMBER 2, 2025, NO. 3885-P DATED DECEMBER 19, 2025 AND NO. 3931-P DATED DECEMBER 20, 2025)

In accordance with Article 1360 of the CCRF, due to urgent necessity related to the protection of life and health of citizens, in order to provide the population of Russia with medicinal products based on the active substance “sema-glutide”, the Government has permitted LLC GEROPHARM, LLC Promomed Rus and LLC PSK Pharma to use inventions protected by patents No. 2434019, 26435 15, 2657573, 2768283, 2777600, owned by Novo Nordisk A/S (Denmark), without the consent of the patent holder. Permits are valid until the end of 2026.

THE GOVERNMENT HAS GIVEN PERMISSION TO USE DONG-A ST (REPUBLIC OF KOREA) AND MERCK SHARP & DOHME (USA) INVENTIONS IN THE INTERESTS OF PROTECTING THE LIFE AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS (GOVERNMENT ORDER NO. 3997-P DATED DECEMBER 23, 2025)

In accordance with Article 1360 of the CCRF, due to urgent necessity related to the protection of life and health of citizens, in order to provide the population of Russia with medicinal products based on the active substance “tedizolid”, the Government has permitted LLC PSK

Pharma to use inventions protected by patent No. 2414469 of Dong-A ST (Republic of Korea) and patents No. 2556234 and 2555928 of Merck Sharp & Dohme (USA). The permit is valid until the end of 2026.

THE GOVERNMENT IS REDUCING THE TIME LIMITS FOR CONSIDERATION BY AUTHORIZED BODIES OF APPLICATIONS REGARDING REGISTERED AOGs (GOVERNMENT DECREE NO. 165 DATED FEBRUARY 19, 2026)

A petition regarding the disappearance of conditions characteristic of a geographical area and the impossibility of producing a product with special properties specified in the State Register of Geographical Indications and Appellations of Origin may be filed by any person. Such a petition is submitted to the authorized body designated in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 1522.1 of the CCRF. The Decree shortens the time limits for certain procedures performed by authorized bodies when reviewing such applications. Overall, the time limit for an authorized body to review such an application is reduced by approximately two months.

AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE LIST OF GOODS PERMITTED FOR PARALLEL IMPORT (ORDER OF THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND TRADE NO. 4769 DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2025)

An Order of the Ministry of Industry and Trade amended the list of imported goods (groups of goods) to which the provisions of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation on the protection of exclusive rights do not apply, provided that such goods are placed into circulation outside the territory of the Russian Federation by the rights holders or with their consent.

In particular, Ricoh toner/inks and printing equipment, Biorepair oral hygiene products, Braun electric shavers, Trimble receivers, and Spin Master games are excluded from the list, as well as brands Torneo, Oral-B, Amazone, etc. At the same time, medical products under the A&D brand have been added to the list.

The Ministry of Industry and Trade also prepared and submitted for discussion a draft order on a new format for the list of parallel imported goods (ID : 160675). A different structure for the List has been proposed, one that is more convenient for practical use. The List is proposed to include not only the verbal element of a trademark, but also the trademark registration number. This will allow parallel imports to be extended to all types of trademarks, including figurative and combined marks.

AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO DEPARTMENTAL DOCUMENTS REGULATING THE ACTIVITIES OF PATENT ATTORNEYS (ORDER OF THE MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NO. 1 DATED JANUARY 12, 2026)

Due to the fact that Article 48 of Federal Law No. 304-FZ dated July 31, 2025 introduced a number of amendments to the Law “On Patent Attorneys”, it was necessary to bring the provisions of documents regulating the procedure for certification and registration of patent attorneys into line with these amendments. In particular, the Order approved new versions of the following documents:

- Procedure for the activities of the Qualification Commission;
- Procedure for the activities of the Appeal Commission;
- Procedure for maintaining the Register of Patent Attorneys of the Russian Federation (hereinafter referred to as the Register);

The following application forms also have been approved:

- on certification as a patent attorney;
- on making changes to the Register;
- on the correction of typos and (or) errors in the Register;
- on the exclusion of a patent attorney from the Register;
- on the restoration of the registration of a patent attorney in the Register;
- on providing an extract from the Register.

The Order entered into force on March 1, 2026. At the same time, the Order of the Ministry of Economic Development No. 455 dated July 10, 2025, which had approved similar documents and which entered into force on September 1, 2025, was declared invalid.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION APPROVED THE RULES FOR THE PROVISION OF GENETIC MATERIAL OF CREATED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OBJECTS TO THE BIORESOURCE CENTER (GOVERNMENT DECREE NO. 1369 DATED SEPTEMBER 4, 2025)

The Rules define the procedure and conditions for the provision by organizations under the jurisdiction of federal government agencies of genetic material of created objects of intellectual property rights (plant variety, animal breed, microorganism strain (except for pathogenic microorganisms and viruses), plant or animal cell culture) to the biore-source center.

When providing such materials to a biore-source center, information must be provided in accordance with the biological sample certification system provided by the biore-source center, as well as other information stipulated by the agreement on the provision of genetic material. Certain purposes for providing materials to the Biore-source Center are defined, including deposit for purposes of the patent procedure. A procedure for the voluntary transfer of genetic materials to the Center is established. Certain issues of depository storage, deposit and preservation of materials have been settled.

THE LIST OF COLLECTIONS FOR DEPOSITING BIOMATERIALS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE PATENT PROCEDURE HAS BEEN EXPANDED (ORDER OF THE MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NO 94 DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2026)

The Rules for drafting, filing and reviewing applications for inventions and the requirements for application documents for an invention have been supplemented to provide that, for the purposes of the patent procedure, it is possible to deposit biological material in a biore-source center established in accordance with paragraph 16 of Part 1 of Article 2 of the Federal Law No. 428-FZ dated November 30, 2024 and designated by the Government of the Russian Federation in accordance with paragraph 9 of the Rules for the provision of genetic material of created intellectual property objects to the biore-source center, approved by Government Decree No. 1369 dated September 4, 2025 (see above)

DISPUTES OVER GRANTING AND TERMINATION OF PROTECTION

IN A DISPUTE OVER THE EARLY TERMINATION OF LEGAL PROTECTION OF A TRADE-MARK DUE TO NON-USE, THE SUPREME COURT POINTED OUT THE NEED TO PROVE NOT ONLY THE INTENTION TO USE THE TRADEMARK, BUT ALSO THE ACTUAL LEGAL POSSIBILITY OF USING THE DISPUTED DESIGNATION (RESOLUTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION NO. 300-ЭС25-2343 DATED OCTOBER 6, 2025, ON CASE NO. SIP-1077/2023).



Trademark No. 502206

JSC Aeroplan owns trademark No. 502206, protected for goods of classes 20 and 28 and services of class 35 of the International Classification of Goods and Services (hereinafter referred to as the Trademark).

LLC Nika Mebel filed a claim with the Intellectual Property Court (IP Court) against JSC Aeroplan for the early termination of its trademark protection for goods in classes 20 and 28 and services in class 35 of the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of Registration of Marks (hereinafter referred to as the ICGS), for which the trademark is registered, due to non-use. Nika Mebel justified its legal interest by the fact that the rights holder had filed a lawsuit against it for infringement of the right to the Trademark, during the consideration of which the fact of Nika Mebel's use of a designation that was identical or similar to the extent of confusion to the Trademark was confirmed.

The IP Court recognized LLC Nika Mebel's legal interest in various furniture items classified in Class 20 of the Nice Classification and cancelled trademark protection for these items early. The Presidium of the IP Court concurred with this decision.

The rights holder filed a cassation appeal to the Supreme Court, which overturned the IP Court's decisions and remanded the case for a new trial. The Supreme Court's reasoning was as follows.

The trademark contains a graphic image of the character Simka from the animated film "The Fixies". JSC Aeroplan also holds the exclusive right to this character. If the trademark's legal protection is terminated, subsequent use by the plaintiff (or any third party) of the image included in the trademark will infringe the exclusive right to the character as a copyrighted object.

The Supreme Court indicated that the court, in establishing the plaintiff's legal interest in the early termination of legal protection for a trademark, in addition to the circumstances confirming the potential possibility of using the disputed designation, the court should have assessed

the reality of the intention. In particular, the court should have imposed on the plaintiff the obligation to present evidence confirming its ability to lawfully use the disputed designation after the termination of its legal protection, which the court failed to do.

Following the Supreme Court's instructions, the IP Court re-examined the dispute regarding the early termination of trademark protection containing the image of the character Simka from the cartoon "The Fixies".

This time, the IP Court dismissed the claim entirely for lack of legal interest, considering that even if trademark protection were terminated, the plaintiff would be unable to use the relevant designation, as doing so would infringe copyright.

Thus, proving legal interest may be complicated in cases where a trademark contains a copyrighted object.

IN A DISPUTE OVER INVALIDATING THE GRANTING OF PROTECTION TO A TRADEMARK, THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COURT EXPLAINED TO ROSPATENT HOW TO COMPARE DESIGNATIONS AND DETERMINE THE HOMOGENEITY OF GOODS (IP COURT DECISION DATED SEPTEMBER 11, 2025 ON CASE No. SIP-1141/2024)

LLC Bit Trade managed to register trademark (TM) No. 934430, which is practically identical to TM No. 710769 of the Chinese company Bitmain. Technologies Inc. — a manufacturer of cryptocurrency mining equipment.



According to Rospatent, these trademarks are similar, and, taking into account the consent letter submitted by the applicant, Rospatent considered it possible to register the mark of LLC Bit Trade for goods of 9 and services of 38 classes of the International Classification of Goods and Services. Bitmain Technologies Inc. together with Bitmain Technologies Limited filed an objection to the registration of the trademark of LLC Bit Trade, noting, among other things, that the disputed trademark and trademark No. 710769 are substantially identical, and the letters of consent submitted with the application issued to LLC Bit Trade for the registration of the disputed trademark on behalf of Bitmain Technologies Limited and Bitmain companies Technologies Inc., as well as the official dealer certificate, are fake, since the applicants never issued these documents. In its Opinion on the results of its review of the objection, Rospatent stated that the differences in the spelling of the letter combination "ANT" in the word element indicate a lack of identity between these trademarks, and that assessment of the falsification of letters of consent and the dealer certificate is not provided for by the procedure for reviewing objections. Rospatent therefore refused to satisfy the objection.

Disagreeing with the decision of Rospatent, the companies appealed to the court (case No. SIP-1141/2024).

The IP Court independently analyzed the trademarks and concluded that they were legally identical. Therefore, the consents of the owners of earlier marks cannot be taken into account with respect to the claimed mark. Furthermore, the IP Court independently assessed the homogeneity of the goods and services in the disputed and opposing marks and found them to be similar to varying degrees. As

regards the companies' arguments about the falsification of the letters of consent and dealer certificates, the court critically assessed the documents and found them legally invalid due to the fact that they had not been issued by authorized persons in the prescribed manner.

According to the IP Court, Rospatent, in infringement of established requirements, failed at the examination stage to properly verify the authority of the person who signed the letters of consent. The court emphasized that this requirement was not excessive and did not require Rospatent to verify the document for falsification.

The IP Court fully invalidated the disputed trademark and ordered Rospatent to pay court costs in the amount of 100,000 rubles.

DISPUTES OVER INFRINGEMENT OF THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS

ACCORDING TO THE COURT, THE RIGHT TO USE THE COMPANY NAME IS TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER PERSON AS A RESULT OF THE REORGANIZATION (RULING OF THE IP COURT DATED DECEMBER 19, 2025 ON CASE No. A03-11405/2024)



LLC Altayskiye luga (hereinafter referred to as the Company) owns trademark No. 670510 (hereinafter referred to as the Trademark), with a priority date July 11, 2017 and registration date of September 12, 2018.

The Company filed a claim with the Arbitration Court of the Altai Territory against JSC Agricultural Enterprise "Altayskiye Luga" (hereinafter referred to as the Enterprise) demanding that the Enterprise cease using a designation similar to the Trademark in its company name and domain name and pay compensation to the Company for the infringement of the exclusive right to the Trademark. Courts of three instances denied the Company's claims. In doing so, the courts took into account the following. The defendant enterprise was established on September 13, 2019, and on April 2, 2021, the LLC Agricultural Enterprise Alpiyskie Luga, established on March 14, 2018, was merged into it as a result of the reorganization. Based on this, the courts established that "the company name "Altayskiye luga" arose for the defendant Enterprise as a result of the reorganization of the legal entity in the form of the merger with the LLC Agricultural Enterprise "Altayskiye luga", the name of which arose on March 14, 2018." In turn, legal protection for the plaintiff's trademark was granted on September 12, 2018. Thus, the courts established that "the defendant's exclusive right to the company name arose prior to the plaintiff's exclusive right to the business identifier."

Thus, the courts found that the Enterprise had proven the legality of its use of the relevant company name, and therefore no infringement of the exclusive right to the Trademark exists.

OTHER DISPUTES

THE SUPREME COURT CONCLUDED THAT LICENSE FEES ARE PAYABLE FOR THE PERIOD BEFORE THE PATENT IS DECLARED INVALID IF THE LICENSE AGREEMENT WAS PERFORMED BY THE PARTIES IN RELIANCE OF THE VALIDITY OF THE PATENT (RULING OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION No. 310-ЭС25-9110 DATED DECEMBER 3, 2025 ON CASE A09-4451/2022).

LLC Diprom (hereinafter referred to as the Company) filed a claim with the Arbitration Court of the Bryansk Region against LLC Bryansk Plant of Absorbing Apparatus (hereinafter referred to as the Plant) for the recovery of arrears in the payment of license fees.

On June 2, 2017, the Company (licensor) and the Plant (licensee) entered into a sublicense agreement valid until December 23, 2020. The parties agreed on the terms and conditions for the licensee to pay the licensor a royalty based on the volume of use.

By decision of the Federal Service for Intellectual Property dated October 30, 2021, the patent was declared invalid in its entirety.

In the lawsuit, the Company indicated that the licensee failed to pay royalties for six months (from July to December 2020), while the agreement for the use of the invention was still in effect.

The court of first instance dismissed the claim, finding that invalidating of the patent would terminate all obligations under the license agreement. The appellate and cassation courts upheld the court's findings.

The Supreme Court of Russia reviewed the case materials and overturned the adopted judicial decisions based on the fact that if a patent for an invention is declared invalid, the licensor nonetheless has the right to demand payment for the period during which the license agreement was performed by the parties, relying on the validity of the patent. The Supreme Court overturned the lower courts' rulings and remanded the case for a new trial to the Bryansk Regional Arbitration Court. It also found that the trial court had failed to properly investigate the circumstances of the contract's performance, had failed to meaningfully evaluate the reports submitted by the Plant, had failed to verify the existence and amount of the debt, and that the appellate and cassation courts had failed to correct these infringements.

THE SUPREME COURT CONSIDERED A DISPUTE REGARDING THE REGISTRATION OF THE TRANSFER OF RIGHTS TO TRADEMARKS IN BANKRUPTCY (RULING OF THE ECONOMIC DISPUTES PANEL OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION No. 305-ЭС25-11634, DATED FEBRUARY 2, 2026 ON THE CASE No. A40-180253/2024))

An entrepreneur filed a lawsuit demanding that Rospatent register the transfer of exclusive rights to his trademarks. He substantiated his claim by stating that he had entered into an agreement to assign rights to three trademarks and applied for registration. However, it turned out that the owner of the disputed trademarks had been declared bankrupt, requiring the consent of the debtor's bankruptcy

trustee to register. The entrepreneur failed to provide such consent, and the state agency denied his application. Three courts sided with the entrepreneur. They assumed that the trademark transfer agreement had been concluded before the bankruptcy proceedings began. The transfer of rights also occurred at that time. This meant that the trademarks are not included in the bankruptcy estate. Moreover, the intellectual property transfer agreement has been concluded pursuant to a settlement agreement approved by the court. Rospatent filed a complaint with the Supreme Court of Russia, noting that the exclusive rights had not transferred to the applicant at the time the original owner was declared bankrupt and were included in the bankruptcy estate. Therefore, only the debtor's bankruptcy trustee could dispose of them, and the settlement agreement itself could not provide evidence of the possibility of state registration. The Supreme Court's Economic Disputes Panel upheld Rospatent's arguments, overturned the judgments, and ruled to dismiss the entrepreneur's claims.

ROSPATENT PRACTICE

1. WELL-KNOWN TRADEMARKS

For the period from September 2025 to February 2026, Rospatent, including in accordance with decisions of the Intellectual Property Court, recognized the following trademarks as well-known:

NUMBER IN THE LIST	273
SIGN	
COPYRIGHT HOLDER	JSC AB InBev Efes
PRODUCTS/SERVICES	32 – beer
DATE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	January 1, 2022
NUMBER IN THE LIST	274
SIGN	
COPYRIGHT HOLDER	PJSC Gazprom Neft
PRODUCTS/SERVICES	04 – motor oil
DATE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	August 6, 2024
NUMBER IN THE LIST	275
SIGN	
COPYRIGHT HOLDER	LLC Glavspirtrest
PRODUCTS/SERVICES	33 – vodka
DATE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	January 1, 2019
NUMBER IN THE LIST	276
SIGN	
COPYRIGHT HOLDER	JSC Rust Russia
PRODUCTS/SERVICES	33 – vodka
DATE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	January 1, 2024

NUMBER IN THE LIST	277
--------------------	-----

SIGN	ЧЕРКИЗОВО
------	------------------

COPYRIGHT HOLDER	PJSC Grappa Cherkizovo
------------------	------------------------

PRODUCTS/SERVICES	29 – ham; sausage products; pork; semi-finished pork products
-------------------	---

DATE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	December 1, 2023
--------------------------	------------------

NUMBER IN THE LIST	278
--------------------	-----

SIGN	СТОЛОТО
------	----------------

COPYRIGHT HOLDER	JSC Technologicheskaya Kompaniya Centr
------------------	--

PRODUCTS/SERVICES	28 – lottery tickets 35 – lottery distribution services; lottery ticket retail services
-------------------	--

DATE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	December 31, 2023
--------------------------	-------------------

NUMBER IN THE LIST	279
--------------------	-----

SIGN	
------	---

COPYRIGHT HOLDER	LLC Vologodskoe morozhenoe
------------------	----------------------------

PRODUCTS/SERVICES	30 Ice cream
-------------------	--------------

DATE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	January 1, 2024
--------------------------	-----------------

NUMBER IN THE LIST	280
--------------------	-----

SIGN	РАНХиГС
------	----------------

COPYRIGHT HOLDER	FGBOU VO «RANHiGS»
------------------	--------------------

PRODUCTS/SERVICES	41 – education
-------------------	----------------

DATE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	January 1, 2024
--------------------------	-----------------

In addition, Rospatent, having considered the objection of LLC Apteka Vitaexpress, upheld the legal protection of well-known trademark No. 220 (Rospatent's decision dated November 18, 2025, No. 2025B00023).

During the same period, Rospatent refused to recognize the following designations as well-known marks: "BLEFAROGEL" (Rospatent's decision dated October 17, 2025, No. 2024B01970). Sole proprietor S. Y. Kirsh requested that this designation be recognized as a well-known trademark in relation to goods of class 03 of the International Classification of Goods and Services (ICGS) "gels for the skin around the eyes for cosmetic use" and class 05 of ICGS "medical gels for the treatment of the skin around the eyes". One of the main reasons for this refusal decision was that the claimed designation "Blefarogel" in the minds of Russian consumers cannot be associated exclusively with the applicant, since the economic activity involving the use of this designation, including the production and sale of the claimed goods, is carried out not by the applicant, but by another entity — Geltek-medika LLC.

ПЕТРОВИЧ (Rospatent's decision dated October 17, 2025, No. 2024B02974). LLC Stroitelnyy torgovyy dom "Petrovich" requested that the designa-

tion be recognized as a well-known trademark in relation to services of class 35 of ICGS: "services of stores for retail and wholesale sale of goods for repair, construction work, goods for the home, garden, vegetable garden, and recreation; services of retail and wholesale sale of goods for repair, construction work, goods for the home, garden, vegetable garden, and recreation using Internet sites; supply services for third parties [purchase and provision of entrepreneurs with goods for repair, construction work, goods for the home, garden, vegetable garden, and recreation]". From the documents submitted by the applicant, it was established that the applicant's offline stores are located in 6 constituent entities of the Russian Federation, which does not allow one to conclude that the consumer is aware of the declared designation throughout the territory of Russia. There is no information on advertising activities related to the provision of the requested services in the regions to which goods from Petrovich stores are delivered. The sociological survey submitted by the applicant also failed to convince Rospatent that the claimed designation possesses the properties of a well-known trademark. "KOTOFEY" (Rospatent's decision dated October 30, 2025, No. 2024B04225). JSC Yegoryevsk-Obuv requested that the trademark under certificate No. 684767 be recognized as a well-known trademark in relation to goods of class 25 of ICGS — "footwear".

The reasons for this refusal decision include the following:

- the applicant's goods, namely footwear for children and teenagers, do not cover other types of the generic group of goods of class 25 of ICGS "footwear" (men's, women's, sports, etc.);
- the offer for sale and sale of the applicant's goods is carried out through the KOTOFEY chain of stores and on popular Internet sites using a trademark other than the one declared, namely a combined designation that includes a pictorial element.

The applicant requested clarification of the list of goods in class 25 of ICGS, "children's and teenagers' footwear" but was denied because this wording was not included in certificate No. 684767.

"TOCHKA" (Rospatent's decision dated October 30, 2025, No. 2024B04207). JSC Tochka requested recognition of its trademark as a well-known trademark for services falling under class 36 of ICGS, "Banking Services." The materials submitted by the applicant were largely rejected as evidence of the actual provision of banking services to consumers, preventing a conclusion regarding the extent of use of the claimed trademark. The results of the sociological survey submitted by the applicant did not allow for determining the geographic scope of the audience participating in the study, and the insufficient number of respondents made it impossible to obtain objective data on the level of awareness of the claimed trademark.

"DOMKLIK" (Rospatent's decision dated October 30, 2025, No. 2024B04027). LLC Domklik requested that the designation be recognized as a well-known trademark in relation to services of class 36 of ICGS "intermediary services in real estate transactions", but was unable to prove that, as of the requested date (December 1, 2024), the designation "DOMKLIK" had become widely known specifically in relation to the applicant, since most of the services provided by the applicant are marked using the well-known trademark

No. 260, which belongs to another legal entity — PJSC Sberbank. This did not allow an unambiguous conclusion to be drawn about the wide rec-

АПТЕКА ВИТА

of well-known trademark No. 220 (Rospatent's decision dated November 18,



No. 260, which belongs to another legal entity — PJSC Sberbank. This did not allow

ognition of the claimed designation “DOMKLIK” in relation to the declared services and in relation to the applicant. “K&B” (Rospatent’s decision dated October 30, 2025, No. 2024B03648). LLC Alfa-M requested recognition of the designation as a well-known trademark in relation to services under Class 35 of ICGS, “services of stores for the retail sale of goods.” The main reason for the refusal was that the documents submitted indicate the applicant’s intensive use of other combined designations, rather than the claimed “K&B”.

”FARADEY” (Rospatent’s decision dated December 18, 2025, No. 2024B04180). JSC Companiya “FARADEY” requested recognition of the designation as a well-known trademark in relation to goods of class 25 of ICGS “footwear for military personnel, namely boots, shoes.” The applicant failed to prove the well-known nature of the designation claimed by him for a number of reasons, in particular:

- the sale of goods is carried out using a combined designation;
- the results of the sociological survey of consumers do not prove the real association of the declared designation with the declared goods.



CAMOKAT (Rospatent’s decision dated December 30, 2025 No. 2024B04231).

LLC Umnyy Retail requested recognition of the designation as a well-known trademark in relation to services of class 35 of ICGS, “services for the retail sale of food products via a mobile application”, and services of class 39 of ICGS, “delivery of food products”. The applicant’s presence is not in all constituent entities of the Russian Federation and the applicant advertises its services only in its locations did not allow Rospatent to conclude that the claimed designation has been widely known to a large number of people throughout Russia for a long time. The results of the consumer survey submitted by the applicant were critically assessed by Rospatent and did not convince it that the claimed designation has become widely known to consumers.



(Rospatent’s decision dated December 30, 2025, No. 2024B04096). LLC LEVEL GROUP requested recognition of the designation as a well-known trademark in relation to services of class 35 of ICGS “sale of real estate”, services of class 36 of the International

Classification of Goods and Services, “housing management, real estate management” and services of class 37 of ICGS, “construction”. With regard to the materials provided by the applicant, the Rospatent’s decision notes that they cover short periods of time and contain information on the provision of certain declared services primarily in Moscow and the Moscow region using a designation different from the declared one. This did not allow Rospatent to establish the fact of widespread use of the claimed designation for identification of the declared services in the territory of the Russian Federation over a long period of time.

2. APPELLATIONS OF ORIGIN OF GOODS (AOG) AND GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS (GI)

For the period from September 2025 to February 2026, Rospatent registered 22 geographical indications (GI) and one appellations of origin of goods (AOG):

NUMBER IN THE REGISTER	GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS/ APPELLATIONS OF ORIGIN	GOODS	REGION
385 (GI)	TASHLINSKY QUARTZ SAND	quartz sand	Tashlinskoye quartz sand deposit, Sengileevsky district, Ulyanovsk region
386 (AOG)	BELYOVSKAYA MERINGUE	meringue	Belyovsky District of the Tula Region
387 (GI)	SARATOVSKOE SUNFLOWER OIL	sunflower oil	Saratov Region
388 (GI)	MORDOVIAN VODKA	vodka	Republic of Mordovia
389 (GI)	VASILIEVSKY MOSS PEAT SOILS	peat soils	Vasilievsky Mokh settlement, Kalininsky District, Tver Region
390 (GI)	YAKUT HIGH GRAIN FOOTWEAR	undy (fur footwear)	Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)
391 (GI)	TAMBOV POTATOES	potato	Tambov Region
392 (GI)	LUGANSK ICE CREAM	ice cream	Luhansk People’s Republic
393 (GI)	KARACHAY AVRAN	ayran	Karachay-Cherkess Republic
394 (GI)	SHCHUCHANSKY CHEESE	semi-hard cheese	the village of Shchuchye, Liski municipal district, Voronezh region
395 (GI)	KARELIAN PASTILA	marshmallows	Republic of Karelia
396 (GI)	PSKOV SNAIL	baked snail (culinary dish)	Pskov Region
397 (GI)	CHUMIKANSKAYA CAVIAR	granular salted salmon caviar	Tuguro-Chumikansky District of Khabarovsk Krai
398 (GI)	TULA CERAMICS	household and everyday objects made on a potter’s wheel or by hand-molding; relief glazed tiles and souvenir items based on them; plain painted tiles and souvenir items based on them; clay toys and small clay items	Tula Region
399 (GI)	YEISK BALM	non-alcoholic beverages made from plant-based ingredients (non-alcoholic herbal balms)	Yeisk district of Krasnodar Krai
400 (GI)	YAKUT “DYABAKA” HEADDRESS	headdress	Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)

401 (GI)	SASOVSKY CHIBRIK	pies	Sasovo, Ryazan Region
402 (GI)	SAPOZHKOVSAYA (ALEXANDRO-PRASKOVINSKAYA) CLAY TOY	clay toy	Sapozhkovsky district of the Ryazan region
403 (GI)	TALITSKOYE MILK	pasteurized drinking milk	Talitsky urban district of the Sverdlovsk region
404 (GI)	PAVLOVSKY LEMON	indoor lemon tree seedlings	the town of Pavlovo, Pavlovsky District, Nizhny Novgorod Region
405 (GI)	GINGERBREAD SMOLENSKY	printed gingerbread cookies	Smolensk region
406 (GI)	GLUSHKOVSKAYA CERAMICS	pottery and ceramic products for artistic, decorative, and utilitarian purposes	Glushkovsky district of Kursk region
407 (GI)	SAMORYADOVSKOYE PATTERNED WEAVING	woven products for artistic, decorative and utilitarian purposes	Samoryadovo village Bolshesoldatsky district of Kursk region

VOLOGDA LACE IS DENIED PROTECTION IN EUROPE (BULLETIN OF THE LISBON SYSTEM, WIPO 2025, No. 54.4)

As with the AOG Gzhel (No. 2 in the Russian Register of Appellations of Origin and Geographical Indications; No. AO-1397), an attempt to obtain protection for the Russian AOG Vologda lace (No. 3 in the Russian Register of Appellations of Origin and Geographical Indications) through the Lisbon System for International Registration at WIPO (No. AO-1422 in the Lisbon Registry) resulted in refusals by EU countries. Refusal notices were sent to WIPO in November 2025 and published in the WIPO Bulletin.

The notifications stated two reasons for the refusal. First, protection of GIs and AOGs for such goods (crafts) had not yet entered into force in the EU at the time the refusal decision was made (it is effective from December 1, 2025). Second, in accordance with the 14th package of European sanctions against Russia, applications from Russian applicants for the protection of GIs and AOGs in EU countries are not accepted, including through the Lisbon System.

EAPO & CIS

1. EURASIAN PATENT ORGANIZATION

CHANGES IN THE AMOUNTS OF SOME EAPO FEES

Effective **February 1, 2026**, new fees of the Eurasian Patent Organization have been established for actions related to applications for Eurasian patents for inventions and industrial designs and Eurasian patents for inventions and industrial designs. Many fees have been significantly increased, and some fees have been increased by multiples.

AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE PATENT REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE EXAMINATION OF INVENTIONS AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS

The changes affect issues of obtaining protection for inventions and industrial designs. In particular:

- the provisions on the novelty exemption (Rule 3(2) of the Regulations) do not apply to disclosure in a “publication of patent documents”;
- among the subject matter excluded from protection in Rule 3(4) of the Regulations are methods of cloning a human being and his clone, methods of modifying the genetic integrity of human germline cells and the use of human embryos for industrial and commercial purposes;
- Rule 16 lists the conditions for extending the validity period of a Eurasian patent for certain inventions beyond 20 years;
- Rule 24 sets the upper limit for extending procedural deadlines at 24 months;
- Rule 42 states that the office may request the applicant information on patent searches carried out by international search authorities or national offices in relation to applications belonging to the same patent family as the Eurasian application;
- Rule 49 clarifies the conditions for the applicant to amend the claims of an invention at the stage of substantive examination of the application: the amendments must relate to the invention (group of inventions) in relation to which a patent search was conducted and a fee was paid for the substantive examination of the Eurasian application, in compliance with the requirement of unity of invention.

Other changes concern supplementing of the Patent Regulations with an indication that certain details are to be established by the President of the Eurasian Patent Organization. The main changes in terms of industrial designs are as follows:

- the range of solutions that are not granted legal protection as industrial designs due to their identity or similarity to the point of confusion with trademarks has been clarified (Rule 78(6)(d));
- the validity of a Eurasian patent for an industrial design may be extended both in relation to all industrial designs specified in the Eurasian patent and in relation to individual industrial designs specified therein (Rule 88(3));
- the validity of a Eurasian patent for an industrial design may be challenged administratively during the entire term of the patent (Rule 116(2));
- The Implementing Regulations (Rule 77 and new Chapter IX1) have been supplemented with provisions necessary for the possible participation of the EAPO in the Geneva Act of the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs, the decision on the accession of the EAPO to which was taken at the meeting of the Administrative Council in Ashgabat (Turkmenistan) in mid-October 2025.

2. GEORGIA

GEORGIA JOINED THE LISBON SYSTEM OF REGISTRATION OF GIs AND AOGs

On October 14, 2025, the Geneva Act of the Lisbon Agreement on Appellations of Origin and Geographical Indications (hereinafter referred to as the Geneva Act) entered into force for Georgia. From this date, Georgia can be included in international applications for registration of GIs and AOGs under the Lisbon system.

3. BELARUS

ON THE DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION ON IP PROTECTION

On February 11, 2026, at a plenary session of the House of Representatives of the National Assembly of the Republic of Belarus (RB), the draft Law “On Amending Laws on the Legal Protection of Intellectual Property Objects” (draft law), submitted by the Belarusian government, was considered and adopted in the first reading.

The draft Law was developed with the aim of comprehensively adjusting the laws of the Republic of Belarus in the field of intellectual property.

The draft law, in particular, provides for:

- optimization of administrative procedures carried out by the patent authority (National Center for Intellectual Property) within the framework of activities to provide legal protection to intellectual property objects;
- establishing the procedure for registering with the patent authority agreements on the pledge of exclusive rights in relation to inventions, utility models, industrial designs, plant varieties, and topographies of integrated circuits;
- clarification of the procedure for paying remuneration to authors for the use of scientific works, inventions, utility models, industrial designs, plant varieties, integrated circuit topologies, and production secrets (know-how);
- establishing the possibility of use under statutory licensing of musical works without the consent of the authors or other right holders (with payment of remuneration to them) in the creation and (or) distribution by the editorial staff of television media of individual television programs from the composition of television programs included in the mandatory publicly available package of television programs.

In addition, in order to bring laws into line with the Civil Code of the Republic of Belarus and the Code of Civil Procedure of the Republic of Belarus, certain terms and the term of validity of the exclusive right to works of science, literature and art (during the life of the author and 70 years after his death) have been clarified.

The draft law also provides for a reduction in the time limits for certain actions related to the legal protection of industrial property rights.

The draft law also eliminates provisions from intellectual property laws requiring the submission of a power of attorney to the patent authority when filing an application. The conditions and requirements for submitting a power of attorney to the patent authority will be determined by the Government (for example, when withdrawing an application or amending the applicant’s name).

The draft law is scheduled to be considered in its second reading in the first half of 2026.

4. KAZAKHSTAN

CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE TO A NUMBER OF LAWS IN THE FIELD OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

On January 25, 2026, the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated November 24, 2025 No. 233-VIII ZPK “On Amendments and Additions to Certain Legislative Acts on Intellectual Property Issues” came into force. The adoption of the Law was an important step in the modernization of the national system of intellectual property protection of the Republic of Kazakhstan (RK).

The law introduced amendments, in particular, to the following laws:

- the Civil Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan;
- the Law “On Copyright and Related Rights” (CRRL);
- the Law “On the Protection of Selection Achievements” (LPSA);
- the Patent Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan (PLRK);
- the Law “On Trademarks, Service Marks, Geographical Indications and Appellations of Origin of Goods” (LTSGIAOG);
- the Law “On the Legal Protection of Topographies of Integrated Circuits” (LPTIC); and others.

Among the amendments, particular note should be made of the unification of provisions of the LPSA, PLRK, LTSGIAOG and LPTIC regulating the activities of patent attorneys.

One of the amendments of the PLRK stipulates that, for applications for inventions, verification of whether the claimed proposal falls within the range of solutions not recognized as inventions will be carried out at the formal examination stage.

The amendments are aimed at strengthening the protection of the rights of authors and right holders, clarifying key regulations in the area of trademarks and patenting, and introducing new regulatory mechanisms aimed at increasing the transparency and effectiveness of collective rights management.

The law provides for the introduction of accelerated trademark registration — within three months — as well as an extended period for filing objections to trademark registration, which will allow businesses to plan their activities more confidently and predictably.

The Law on Copyright and Related Rights introduces provisions aimed at digitalizing collective rights management. At the same time, oversight of the activities of collective rights management organizations is being strengthened.

5. UZBEKISTAN

AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO SOME LAWS IN ORDER TO IMPROVE THE PROTECTION AND DEFENCE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Law No. ZRU-1080 dated August 8, 2025 introduced amendments, in particular, to the following laws of the Republic of Uzbekistan:

- “On inventions, utility models and industrial designs”;
- “On trademarks, service marks and appellations of origin of goods”;
- “On Geographical Indications”;
- “On the legal protection of topologies of integrated circuits”;
- “On the legal protection of programs for electronic computers and databases”;
- “On breeding achievements”
- Civil Code;
- Criminal Code;
- Code of Administrative Responsibility;
- “On state fee”.

The amendments to the laws are aimed at streamlining procedures related to intellectual property registration, including digitalizing the process of granting protection, as well as strengthening criminal and administrative penalties for intellectual property infringement. Patent fee payment procedures are also being streamlined.

NEWS

4 DECEMBER 2025

BEST RUSSIAN LAWYERS RANKING BY "ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA"

RGRU

BEST RUSSIAN LAWYERS RANKING

"Rossiyskaya Gazeta" published a rating of the best Russian lawyers. In the nomination "Intellectual Property" are noted:

- Valery Medvedev, Managing partner, Russian & Eurasian Patent Attorney ("Gorodissky and Partners", Moscow)
- Yuri Kuznetsov, Senior Partner, Russian & Eurasian Patent Attorney, Head of Patent Practice ("Gorodissky and Partners", Moscow)
- Evgeny Alexandrov, Ph.D., Senior Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney, Head of Legal, Trademark & Design Practice ("Gorodissky and Partners", Moscow)
- Sergey Medvedev, Ph.D., LL.M., Senior Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney, (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow, Dubai)
- Alexey Kratiuk, Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney, Head of Trademark Department (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow)
- Elena Nazina, Partner, Russian & Eurasian Patent Attorney, Head of Chemical & Life Sciences Department (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow)
- Natalia Nikolaeva, Partner, Trademark Attorney, Regional Director (Gorodissky & Partners, Novosibirsk)
- Sergey Vasiliev, Ph.D., Partner, Trademark Attorney (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow)
- Valery Narezhny, Ph.D., Counsel (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow)
- Ilya Goryachev, Counsel (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow)

4 DECEMBER 2025

SEMINAR: "INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: SOME ASPECTS OF PROTECTION FOR SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT", ASTANA, KAZAKHSTAN

Yuri Kuznetsov, Senior Partner, Russian Patent Attorney, Eurasian Patent & Design Attorney, Head of Patent Practice, Vladimir Bashkirov, Partner, Russian Patent Attorney, Eurasian Design

Attorney, Head of Patent Search Department, Alexander Vladimirov, Ph.D., Russian and Eurasian Patent Attorney, Deputy Head of Electronics & Physics Department, Alexander Budkin, Patent Search Expert, Denis Ashikhin, Russian and Eurasian Patent Attorney, Andrey Rogov, Head of Computer Systems Department, Elizaveta Seliverstova, Patent & Trademark Attorney, Head of IP Renewals & Recordals Department (all — Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow), Cholpon Dootalieva, Kyrgyz Patent Attorney, Regional Director, (Gorodissky & Partners, Bishkek) and Arman Sauganbayev, Kazakh Patent Attorney, Eurasian Patent & Design Attorney, Regional Director, Saule Kasenova, Assistant (both — Gorodissky & Partners, Kazakhstan) held the seminar 'Intellectual Property: Some Aspects of Protection for Successful Business Development', which took place in Astana.

The seminar was attended by representatives of the Eurasian Patent Office. The seminar included a round table: "What Entrepreneurs Need To Know About Trademarks".



The firm's specialists presented an analysis of patent information and the current state and trends in the development of artificial intelligence as a combination of several technological areas, a comparative analysis of the patent systems in Kazakhstan, Russia, Kyrgyzstan and the Eurasian Patent System, and also Legal Tech solutions in the field of intellectual property.

4 DECEMBER 2025

LES RUSSIA CONFERENCE "ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: FROM LEGAL FOUNDATIONS TO PRACTICAL APPLICATION", MOSCOW

Evgeny Alexandrov, President of LES Russia, Ph.D., Senior Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney, Head of Legal, Trademark & Design Practice and Nikita Maltsev, Ph.D., Lawyer (both — Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow) took part in the Conference "Artificial Intel-



ligence and Intellectual Property: From Legal Foundations to Practical Application", organized by LES Russia.

Evgeny Alexandrov gave the welcome address.

Nikita Maltsev presented a report 'Legal Issues of Artificial Intelligence Training in the Context of Copyright: Analysis and Solutions'.

5 DECEMBER 2025

PRAVO-300 RANKING

ПРАВО 300 LAW FIRMS ANNUAL RANKING

Gorodissky & Partners improved its leading positions in the federal

ranking of law firms "Pravo-300" in the following categories:

Group I

- "Intellectual Property (Litigation)",
- "Intellectual Property (Consulting)",
- "Intellectual Property (Registration)",
- "Personal Data" Group II
- "TMT (telecommunications, media, technology)"
- "Pharmaceuticals and Healthcare (Pharmaceuticals)"

11-12 DECEMBER 2025

ANNUAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE "ACTUAL ISSUES OF PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS", MOSCOW

Evgeny Alexandrov, President of LES Russia, Ph.D., Senior Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney, Head of Legal, Trademark & Design Practice, Sergey Vasiliev, Ph.D., Partner, Trademark Attorney, Alexey Kratiuk, Partner, Russian Trademark & Design Attorney, Eurasian Design Attorney (all — Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow) and Viktor Stankovsky, Partner, Russian Patent Attorney, Eurasian Patent & Design Attorney, Regional Director (Gorodissky & Partners, St.Petersburg) took part in the Annual scientific and practical conference "Actual Issues of Protection and Enforcement of Intellec-

tual Property Rights” organized by the Chamber of Patent Attorneys. Evgeny Alexandrov moderated a roundtable discussion “IP Disputes in 2025: Analysis of Key Cases and Their Impact on Practice”, organised by the LES Russia. Sergey Vasiliev participated in the discussion with a presentation “Important court decisions in the field of IP protection”.

Alexey Kratyuk chaired a roundtable discussion on trademarks and gave a presentation on “The use of geographical names/toponyms as a means of identifying goods”.

Viktor Stankovsky took part in a business game “Court hearing on the termination of infringement of utility model rights”.

16 DECEMBER 2025

ANNUAL PATENT CONGRESS — 2025, MOSCOW

Vladimir Biriulin, Member of the AIPPI Russian National Group Bureau, Partner, Sergey Vasiliev, Ph.D., Partner (both -Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow) and Yaroslava Gorbunova, Partner, Senior lawyer (Gorodissky & Partners, St.Petersburg) took part in the Annual Patent Congress, organized by the AIPPI Russian National Group.

Vladimir Biriulin chaired the LES Russia section. In this section Yaroslava Gorbunova spoke on ‘Features of licensing patent rights and know-how in contract manufacturing’ and Sergey Vasiliev presented a report ‘Important court decisions in the field of IP protection’.

12 JANUARY 2026

NO TRADEMARK PIRATE CAN AVOID CANON FIRE // THE GLOBAL IP MAGAZINE

The Global IP magazine published an article “No Trademark Pirate Can Avoid Canon Fire” by Vladimir Biriulin, Partner, Russian Patent Attorney (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow). This article addresses third-party attempts to cancel Canon’s trademarks in Russia. The Russian courts dismissed these initiatives due to inadequate demonstration of bona fide commercial intentions and underscored Canon’s sustained reputation among Russian consumers.

20 JANUARY 2026

IPLA IP LAW CONFERENCE, DUBAI Kirill Kukshev, LL.M., Regional Director (Gorodissky & Partners, Dubai) spoke on “Online Brand Protection” in the round table “Digital and online

brand protection” at the IPLA IP Law Conference in Dubai (UAE).

Kirill described the stages of online brand protection using automated platforms based on AI, demonstrated their effectiveness through examples of usage, and provided recommendations for selecting online platforms.

24 JANUARY 2026

THE 2025 OUTSTANDING INTERNATIONAL IP SERVICE TEAMS RANKING



Law firm Gorodissky & Partners has been honored with the award for The 2025 Outstanding

International IP Service Teams for the second consecutive year.

Twelve specialists from Gorodissky & Partners:

- Valery Medvedev, Chairman of Partnership;
- Sergey Medvedev, Ph.D., LL.M., Managing Partner;
- Evgeny Aleksandrov, Ph.D., Senior Partner, Head of Legal, Trademark & Design Practice;
- Yury Kuznetsov, Senior Partner, Head of Patent Practice;
- Vladimir Biriulin, Partner, Head of Special Projects;
- Sergey Dorofeev, Partner, Head of Mechanics Department;
- Elena Nazina, Partner, Head of Chemical & Life Sciences Department;
- Sergey Vasiliev, Ph.D., Partner, Head of Legal Department;
- Vyacheslav Rybchak, Partner, Head of Design Department;
- Aleksey Kratyuk, Partner, Head of Trademark Department;
- Valery Narezchny, Ph.D., Partner, Legal Department;
- Andrey Bazhenov, Partner, Head of Electronics & Physics Department

have been included in the list of recommended leading specialists in intellectual property.

Evaluation of international IP firms took into account the number of clients from China and the number of completed projects.

24–25 JANUARY 2026

2026 ENTERPRISE IP STRATEGY FORUM, BEIJING, CHINA

Delegation of the law firm Gorodissky & Partners participated in the “2026 Enterprise IP Strategy Forum of In-house IP Managers” held in Beijing. Vladimir Biriulin, Partner, Russian Patent Attorney (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow) made a speech “Opening



Horizons of Cooperation in Intellectual Property” at the session “Judicial Protection of Enterprise IP Rights”.

Nikita Maltsev, Ph.D., Senior Lawyer and Alexei Lifanov, Patent agent (both — Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow) consulted representatives of Chinese companies regarding intellectual property protection in Russia and Eurasian Patent Convention member countries at the company’s exhibition stand. The forum was attended by over 500 participants.

27 JANUARY 2026

BUSINESS BREAKFAST “UPDATED PROVISIONS OF THE CIVIL CODE ON COMPENSATION: HOW JUDICIAL APPROACHES WILL CHANGE IN DISPUTES OVER TRADEMARK AND PATENT INFRINGEMENTS”, MOSCOW Gorodissky & Partners hosted a business breakfast “Updated Provisions of the Civil Code on Compensation: How Judicial Approaches Will Change in Disputes over Trademark and Patent Infringements”, which was attended by more than 50 IP specialists.

During the event, professionals from Gorodissky & Partners — Sergey Vasiliev, Partner and Head of Legal Department, Maksim Volkov, Senior Lawyer, Attorney at Law, and Denis Kudryavtsev, Lawyer (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow)—shared their experience and practical recommendations on the following topics:



Overview of court practice regarding claims for compensation for infringement of exclusive rights to trademarks and patents in 2024 and 2025
Review of changes to provisions of the Civil Code concerning compensation for violation of exclusive rights
Prospects for applying new provisions of the Civil Code on compensation taking into account previous judicial approaches

NEWS

The business breakfast was highly appreciated by the audience for its hot topics and high-level information provided.

3 MARCH 2026

PRAVO-300 / INDIVIDUAL RANKINGS



The results of the annual ranking of the best lawyers according to Pravo.

ru portal have been published. Our colleagues were among the nominees:

Intellectual Property:

- Sergey Medvedev, Ph.D., LL.M., Managing Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney,
- Valery Medvedev, Chairman of the Partnership, Patent & Trademark Attorney,
- Yuri Kuznetsov, Senior Partner, Russian Patent Attorney, Eurasian Patent & Design Attorney, Head of Patent Practice,
- Evgeny Alexandrov, Ph.D., Senior Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney, Head of Legal, Trademark & Design Practice,
- Alexey Kratiuk, Partner, Russian Trademark & Design Attorney, Eurasian Design Attorney, Head of Trademark Department,
- Elena Nazina, Partner, Russian Patent Attorney, Eurasian Patent Attorney, Head of Chemical & Life Science Department,
- Sergey Vasiliev, Ph.D., Partner, Trademark Attorney, Head of the Legal Department,

- Vyacheslav Rybchak, Partner, Russian Trademark & Design Attorney, Eurasian Design Attorney, Head of Design Department
 - Ilya Gogyachev, Counsel,
 - Nikita Maltsev, Ph.D., Trademark Attorney, Senior Lawyer
- TMT:

- Sergey Medvedev, Ph.D., LL.M., Managing Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney,
- Sergey Vasiliev, Ph.D., Partner, Trademark Attorney, Head of the Legal Department,
- Stanislav Rumyantsev, Ph.D., CIP-P/E, Senior Lawyer,
- Ilya Gogyachev, Counsel, Personal Data Protection:
- Sergey Medvedev, Ph.D., LL.M., Managing Partner, Trademark & Design Attorney,
- Valery Narezchny, Ph.D., Partner,
- Stanislav Rumyantsev, Ph.D., CIP-P/E, Senior Lawyer, Pharmaceuticals and Healthcare
- Elena Nazina, Partner, Russian Patent Attorney, Eurasian Patent Attorney, Head of Chemical & Life Science Department

24 MARCH 2026

PROTECTION OF IP RIGHTS ON RUSSIAN MARKETPLACES: CURRENT PRACTICE AND FUTURE OUTLOOK // CHINA IP

China IP magazine published an article “Protection of IP Rights on Russian Marketplaces: Current Practice and Future Outlook” by Tatiana Karetina, Lawyer (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow).

The article discusses the importance of proactive IP protection for Chinese businesses entering the Russian mar-

ket, highlighting the necessity of early trademark registration and effective enforcement strategies through case studies, ultimately emphasizing that a solid IP strategy is crucial for sustainable success in Russia.

7 APRIL 2026

MEDIA LAW INTERNATIONAL

MLI Gorodissky & Partners was included into Tier 1 of the best Media Law firms in Russia. Ilya Goryachev, Counsel (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow) was recognized among the leading lawyers.

16-17 APRIL 2026

CHINA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND INNOVATION SUMMIT CIPIS 2026, SHANGHAI, CHINA

Gorodissky & Partners hosted the session “Hotspots and Challenges of Trademark Non-Use Cancellation in Russia and China”, where Natalia Nikolaeva, Partner, Regional Director (Gorodissky & Partners, Novosibirsk) served as moderator, while Nikita Maltsev, Ph.D., Senior Lawyer (Gorodissky & Partners, Moscow) delivered his insights into Russian enforcement practice during the China Intellectual Property and Innovation Summit (CIPIS) 2026.



129090, **MOSCOW**, RUSSIA
B. Spasskaya str., 25, bldg. 3
Phone: +7(495) 937-61-16
e-mail: pat@gorodissky.com
www.gorodissky.com

197046, **ST. PETERSBURG**, RUSSIA
Kamennooostrovsky prosp., 1/3, of. 30
Phone: +7(812) 327-50-56
e-mail: spb@gorodissky.com

420015, **KAZAN**, RUSSIA
Zhukovskogo str., 26
Phone: +7(843) 236-32-32
e-mail: kazan@gorodissky.com

603000, **N. NOVGOROD**, RUSSIA
Kostina str., 4, office 403
Phone: +7(831) 430-73-39
e-mail: nnovgorod@gorodissky.com

607328, **SAROVTECHNOPARK**, RUSSIA
N. Novgorod region, Diveevo, Satis
Parkovaya str., 1, bldg. 3, office 7
Phone: +7(83134) 452-75
e-mail: sarov@gorodissky.com

141980, **DUBNA**, RUSSIA
Flerova str., 11, office 33, Moscow region,
Phone: +7(496) 219-92-99 / 92-29
e-mail: dubna@gorodissky.com

620026, **EKATERINBURG**, RUSSIA
Rosa Luxemburg str., 49,
Onegin Plaza Business Centre
Phone: +7(343) 351-13-83
e-mail: ekaterinburg@gorodissky.com

350000, **KRASNODAR**, RUSSIA
Krasnoarmeiskaya str., 91
Phone: +7(861) 210-08-66
e-mail: krasnodar@gorodissky.com

443096, **SAMARA**, RUSSIA
Ossipenko str., 11, Business center Portal
Phone: +7(846) 270-26-12
e-mail: samara@gorodissky.com

614015, **PERM**, RUSSIA
Topolevyy per., 5,
Astra apartment house, office 4.8
Phone: +7(342) 259-54-38
e-mail: perm@gorodissky.com

630099, **NOVOSIBIRSK**, RUSSIA
Deputatskaya str., 46, of. 1204
Business center Citicenter
Phone: +7(383) 209-30-45
e-mail: novosibirsk@gorodissky.com

450077, **UFA**, RUSSIA
Verkhetorgovaya pl., 6,
Business center Nesterov, office 2.1.1
Phone: +7(347) 286-58-61
e-mail: ufa@gorodissky.com

690091, **VLADIVOSTOK**, RUSSIA
Oceansky prospect, 17, office 1003
Phone: +7(423) 246-91-00
e-mail: vladivostok@gorodissky.com

720001, **BISHKEK**, KYRGYZSTAN
Isanova str., 79, Business center 79, office 1001
e-mail: pat@gorodissky.kg

010000, **ASTANA**, REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN
Almaty district, Tauelsyzdyk avenue, 41, Silk Way
Business Center, office 507
Phone: +7 (7172) 270-901
e-mail: astana@gorodissky.com

01135, **KYIV**, UKRAINE
V. Chornovola str., 25 lit. A, office 219
Phone: +380 (44) 501-18-71
e-mail: office.gorodissky@gmail.com
www.gorodissky.ua

The Maze Tower, Office 1502
Sheikh Zayed Road, **DUBAI**, UAE
Phone: +971 43 55 4882
e-mail: info@gorodissky.ae

All News,
Events and
Publications:



Subscription:

