

# Contents

## Part I The Average Consumer: A Consumer Fiction in European Trademark Law

<b>1</b>	<b>Background</b> . . . . .	3
1.1	Introduction . . . . .	3
1.2	Who/What Is the Average Consumer? . . . . .	5
1.3	Purpose of Trademarks and European Trademark Law . . . . .	8
1.3.1	The Legal Functions of Trademarks . . . . .	8
1.3.2	Economic Functions of Trademarks . . . . .	13
1.3.3	Functions of European Trademark System . . . . .	15
1.4	Contextualisation . . . . .	19
1.5	Delimitation . . . . .	21
1.5.1	Why Likelihood of Confusion? . . . . .	22
1.5.2	Temporal Delimitation . . . . .	27
1.5.3	Geographical Delimitation . . . . .	28
1.5.4	National Procedural Rules and Evidence . . . . .	29
1.5.5	Adjacent Areas of Law . . . . .	31
1.6	Purpose and Outline of the Analysis . . . . .	34
1.7	Structure . . . . .	37
<b>2</b>	<b>Methodology</b> . . . . .	39
2.1	Methodological Challenges . . . . .	39
2.2	European Legal Method: A Scandinavian Kaleidoscope . . . . .	41
2.2.1	Scandinavian Legal Realism . . . . .	44
2.2.2	Critical Legal Positivism . . . . .	47
2.2.3	Coherence and Consistency . . . . .	48
2.2.4	Summarising Discussion . . . . .	52

2.3	Aspects of Comparative Law . . . . .	55
2.3.1	The Vertical Analysis . . . . .	56
2.3.1.1	The Chosen Jurisdictions . . . . .	58
2.3.1.2	Method . . . . .	60
2.3.2	The Horizontal Analysis . . . . .	62
2.4	Conclusion . . . . .	63
<b>3</b>	<b>Legal Sources . . . . .</b>	<b>65</b>
3.1	Multi-Level Legal Sources . . . . .	65
3.2	EU Law . . . . .	65
3.2.1	Primary EU Law . . . . .	66
3.2.2	Secondary EU Legislation . . . . .	69
3.2.2.1	Trademark Legislation . . . . .	69
3.2.2.2	The UCPD . . . . .	72
3.3	National Trademark Law and Its Institutions . . . . .	72
3.3.1	England and Wales . . . . .	73
3.3.2	Nordic Trademark Law: Similarities and Differences . . . . .	75
3.3.2.1	Sweden . . . . .	77
3.3.2.2	Denmark . . . . .	78
3.3.2.3	Norway: The EEA Connection . . . . .	80
3.4	National Trademark Courts . . . . .	83
3.5	International Treaties . . . . .	86
3.5.1	The Paris Convention and the TRIPS Agreement . . . . .	86
3.5.2	The Nice Agreement . . . . .	87
3.6	Soft Law: The Important Role of Registration Offices . . . . .	89
3.7	Conclusion . . . . .	92
<b>4</b>	<b>The Dynamics of the European Trademark Law . . . . .</b>	<b>93</b>
4.1	The EU as a Lawmaker . . . . .	93
4.2	Harmonisation Through Legislation . . . . .	94
4.2.1	EU Trademark Legislation . . . . .	94
4.2.2	The UCPD . . . . .	99
4.3	The CJEU as a Lawmaker . . . . .	100
4.3.1	Preliminary Rulings: A Dynamic Dialogue with National Courts . . . . .	103
4.3.2	The Court of Justice and Its Appellate Function . . . . .	108
4.3.3	Legal Precedent: Looking Backwards and Ahead . . . . .	110
4.3.4	Interpretation and the Use of Legal Sources . . . . .	113
4.3.5	Opinions of Advocates Generals . . . . .	119
4.4	Conclusion . . . . .	122

**Part II Horizontal Analysis: One Among Other Fictions  
and the UCPD Consumer Models**

<b>5</b>	<b>The Average Consumer as a Legal Fiction and Beyond . . . . .</b>	<b>127</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	127
5.2	Rules and Standards . . . . .	132
5.3	Legal Fictions . . . . .	136
5.3.1	Defining “Legal Fiction” . . . . .	138
5.3.2	Why Use Fictions? . . . . .	140
5.3.3	Evaluation . . . . .	141
5.4	Legal Constructs . . . . .	144
5.5	Legal Concepts . . . . .	145
5.6	Conclusion . . . . .	147
<b>6</b>	<b>The Average Consumer and Its More or Less Distant Cousins . . . . .</b>	<b>149</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	149
6.2	EU Design Law: The “Informed User” . . . . .	152
6.2.1	Background . . . . .	152
6.2.2	Pepsi v. Grupo Promer: Changing the Script? . . . . .	155
6.3	European Patent Law: The “Person Skilled in the Art” . . . . .	161
6.3.1	Background . . . . .	161
6.3.2	Is the Skilled Person in Practice a Nerdy Android? . . . . .	168
6.4	Informed or Skilled: Why Does It Matter to Trademark Law? . . . . .	175
6.5	The Reasonable Person in Tort Law . . . . .	178
6.5.1	Background . . . . .	178
6.5.2	The Objectified Reasonable Person . . . . .	181
6.6	Rational Actor Model . . . . .	186
6.6.1	Background . . . . .	186
6.6.2	The Average Consumer and the Rational Actor: Distant Cousins? . . . . .	189
6.6.3	The Critique from Behavioural Economics . . . . .	194
6.6.4	Summarising Discussion . . . . .	196
6.7	Conclusion . . . . .	198
<b>7</b>	<b>The UCPD and Trademark Average Consumers: Two of a Kind? . . . . .</b>	<b>201</b>
7.1	Introduction . . . . .	201
7.2	Purpose of the UCPD . . . . .	203
7.3	Transaction Timing and Likelihood of Harm . . . . .	205
7.4	The Average Consumer . . . . .	207
7.5	Other Consumer Models . . . . .	212
7.5.1	The Models at a Glance . . . . .	212
7.5.2	Vulnerable Consumers Represented by Children . . . . .	215
7.6	Conclusion . . . . .	220

### Part III Vertical Analysis: The Judicial Background and European Trademark Law

<b>8</b>	<b>The Early Beginnings of the Average Consumer Pre <i>Sabel</i></b> . . . . .	225
8.1	What Is the Origin? . . . . .	225
8.2	The Free Movement of Goods Framework . . . . .	227
8.3	Cassis de Dijon: The “Beacon” . . . . .	229
8.4	Drei Glocken: The Hard Balance . . . . .	232
8.5	Medical Products and the “Public Health” . . . . .	236
8.6	Consumer Protection and Unfair Competition . . . . .	239
8.7	Leaving a Legacy . . . . .	247
<b>9</b>	<b>Likelihood of Confusion: Legislative Harmonisation?</b> . . . . .	253
9.1	Introduction . . . . .	253
9.2	The Likelihood of Confusion: An International Standard? . . . . .	254
9.2.1	The Paris Convention . . . . .	255
9.2.2	The TRIPS Agreement . . . . .	258
9.3	The European Likelihood of Confusion Standard . . . . .	260
9.3.1	The EU Standard . . . . .	261
9.3.1.1	Introducing the Legislative Requirements . . . . .	261
9.3.1.2	Part of the Public . . . . .	266
9.3.2	National Differences? . . . . .	269
9.3.2.1	England and Wales . . . . .	269
9.3.2.2	Nordic Countries . . . . .	272
9.3.2.2.1	Sweden . . . . .	274
9.3.2.2.2	Denmark . . . . .	275
9.3.2.2.3	Norway . . . . .	276
9.4	Conclusion . . . . .	277
<b>10</b>	<b>The Average Consumer in a “Global” Perspective</b> . . . . .	281
10.1	Introduction . . . . .	281
10.2	The Trinity Decisions: <i>Sabel</i> , <i>Gut Springenheide</i> and <i>Lloyd</i> . . . . .	282
10.2.1	Frame of the Decisions . . . . .	282
10.2.2	Interpretation of the Decisions . . . . .	284
10.2.3	How They Are Relevant Today . . . . .	288
10.2.4	The General Court . . . . .	292
10.3	The Global Appreciation Test in a National Context . . . . .	296
10.3.1	England and Wales . . . . .	299
10.3.2	The Nordic Countries . . . . .	302
10.3.2.1	Sweden . . . . .	302
10.3.2.2	Denmark . . . . .	305
10.3.2.3	Norway . . . . .	308
10.4	Conclusion . . . . .	310

<b>11</b>	<b>Contextualisation of the Average Consumer</b> . . . . .	315
11.1	Introduction . . . . .	315
11.2	Discounting . . . . .	323
	11.2.1 Discounting the Homer Simpsons and Mr. Spocks? . . . . .	323
	11.2.2 Average as $\bar{x}$ or “Ordinary”? . . . . .	326
11.3	Similarity of the Products . . . . .	331
11.4	Different Product Markets . . . . .	334
	11.4.1 General Court Practice . . . . .	335
	11.4.1.1 Everyday Consumer Goods . . . . .	335
	11.4.1.2 Specialised Goods . . . . .	342
	11.4.2 National Examples . . . . .	347
	11.4.2.1 UK . . . . .	347
	11.4.2.2 Nordic Jurisdictions . . . . .	352
11.5	Different Market Places . . . . .	358
11.6	Trademark Contextualisation . . . . .	361
11.7	Conclusion . . . . .	363
<b>Part IV Wrapping Up</b>		
<b>12</b>	<b>Putting the Average Consumer into Perspective</b> . . . . .	369
12.1	Lessons Learned . . . . .	369
12.2	The Distant Cousins and the False Friends in European Law . . . . .	370
12.3	European Trademark Law: A Patchwork . . . . .	371
12.4	A Need for Concern? . . . . .	376
12.5	Bringing in Trademark Policy . . . . .	378
12.6	Law and Economics: A Search Cost Analysis . . . . .	382
12.7	Future Research . . . . .	384
	<b>Table of Legislation, Preparatory Works Etc.</b> . . . . .	389
	<b>Table of Cases</b> . . . . .	399
	<b>Bibliography</b> . . . . .	417