

Case law Case Details

National ID: Decision no. 1207/2016 Member State: Romania Common Name:link Decision type: Court decision in appeal Decision date: 29/02/2016 Court: Bucharest Tribunal Subject: Plaintiff: Unknown Defendant: National Agency for Fiscal Administration Keywords: advertisement, comparative advertising Directive Articles Misleading and Comparative Advertising Directive. Ar

Misleading and Comparative Advertising Directive, Article 4 Misleading and Comparative Advertising Directive, Article 4, (a) Misleading and Comparative Advertising Directive, Article 4, (d) Misleading and Comparative Advertising Directive, Article 4, (f)

Headnote

An advertising containing a direct reference to another advertising already used by a competitor constitutes comparative advertising.

Facts

The plaintiff conducted a promotion using the following advertising "Some boast the price revolution, we boast the fair price resolution". At the same time, a well-known competitor already promoted its products by using the advertising phrase "Price revolution", which was also registered as a trademark.

The competent body (the defendant) stated that the deed represents an infringement of letters a, d and f of article 6 of Law no. 158/2008 and, therefore, sanctioned the plaintiff for the commitment of three misdemeanours.

The plaintiff submitted a court action against the defendant requesting the annulment of the minutes ascertaining the misdemeanours.

Legal issue

The court stated that the advertising is comparative in accordance with the relevant legal provision. However, a deed infringing several letters provided by art. 6 of Law no. 158/2008 triggers the application of only one sanction.

Decision

Does an advertisement containing a direct reference to another advertising already used by a competitor constitute comparative advertising?

Full text: Full text
Related Cases
No results available
Legal Literature
No results available
Result
The court admitted the action in part.

EN