

Practical Tips for Trademark Examination in Hong Kong

1. Introduction

The Hong Kong Trade Marks Registry (the Registry), operating under the Intellectual Property Department (IPD) of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) Government, serves as the governing body for trademark registration.¹ This report provides practical guidance for navigating the crucial examination phase of trademark applications under the Hong Kong Trade Marks Ordinance (Cap. 559) (TMO)³ and the accompanying Trade Marks Rules (Cap. 559A) (TMR).⁵ Securing trademark registration in Hong Kong, a significant regional and global intellectual property trading centre⁷, requires a thorough understanding of both the substantive legal requirements and the specific procedural nuances applied by the Registry's examiners.

The Registry itself boasts a long history, having been established in 1874, making it one of the world's oldest.¹ This extensive history suggests a well-established, though continuously evolving, body of practice. Consequently, familiarity with the Registry's specific procedures and interpretations, particularly those documented in its official guidance materials, is paramount for practitioners, rather than relying solely on general international trademark principles. While Hong Kong aligns with international standards, such as adopting the Nice Classification for goods and services⁹ and preparing for accession to the Madrid Protocol⁹, local practice nuances remain critical.

Furthermore, it is essential to distinguish trademark registration from other forms of business registration. Securing a company name with the Companies Registry or a business name with the Business Registration Office of the Inland Revenue Department does not confer trademark rights.¹¹ Trademark protection, granting the exclusive right to use a mark for specific goods or services, requires a separate application and successful registration through the Trade Marks Registry.¹¹ Advising clients on this distinction early is crucial to ensure their brand identity is adequately protected beyond basic corporate formalities.

2. Leveraging Official Resources

Effective navigation of the examination process necessitates familiarity with the resources provided by the IPD. These resources offer invaluable insights into the Registry's practices and expectations.

- **Intellectual Property Department (IPD) Website (www.ipd.gov.hk):** This is the central portal for all IP matters in Hong Kong.¹ Key sections relevant to trademark

examination include dedicated areas for Trade Marks, downloadable Forms and Fees schedules, the official Hong Kong IP Journal, the Trade Marks Registry Work Manual, archives of Trade Mark Hearings decisions, and comprehensive FAQs.¹² The site also hosts vital online services, including the IPD Online Search System for preliminary searches⁷ and the IPD E-Filing System for submitting applications and other documents.⁷

- **Trade Marks Registry Work Manual:** This is arguably the most critical resource for understanding examination practice.¹⁴ It serves as the Registry's internal guide for examining applications and handling other proceedings under the TMO.¹⁴ While explicitly stating it is not legally binding and cannot be quoted as a legal authority, the Manual is intended to reflect the Registry's current practice.¹⁴ It contains detailed chapters covering essential topics such as Absolute Grounds for Refusal, Relative Grounds for Refusal, Examination of Applications, Deficiencies Checking, Classification, Evidence requirements (including for acquired distinctiveness), and procedures for responding to objections.¹⁴ The non-binding status creates a subtle dynamic; practitioners should rely heavily on the Manual to anticipate examiner approaches and formulate initial strategies. However, if an examiner's position based on the Manual appears inconsistent with the TMO, TMR, or established case law, practitioners must be prepared to argue the point based on primary legal sources.
- **Hong Kong Intellectual Property Journal:** This official publication is where accepted applications are published for opposition purposes.¹⁶ Monitoring the Journal is crucial for tracking application progress and identifying potentially conflicting marks published by third parties.
- **Published Decisions:** The IPD website provides access to decisions issued following Registry hearings.²⁰ Reviewing these decisions offers valuable insights into how the Registrar and hearing officers interpret and apply the TMO and TMR to specific factual scenarios, particularly concerning contentious issues like lack of distinctiveness, likelihood of confusion, or bad faith.

Crucially, the Work Manual is subject to periodic updates.¹⁴ Recent updates, for instance, have addressed absolute grounds and classification.¹⁷ This dynamic nature necessitates continuous monitoring by practitioners. Relying on outdated knowledge of Registry practice can lead to unexpected objections based on recent policy shifts. Staying abreast of the latest revisions ensures advice and prosecution strategies remain aligned with current examination standards.

3. Navigating Absolute Grounds for Refusal (Section 11 TMO)

Absolute grounds for refusal, outlined in Section 11 of the TMO³, concern the inherent

registrability of the trademark itself, irrespective of conflicts with other marks.²² An application may be refused if the proposed mark fails to meet these fundamental requirements. Key absolute grounds include:

- **Failure to Meet Definition (S.11(1)(a)):** The sign must be capable of graphical representation and capable of distinguishing the applicant's goods/services from those of others (S.3(1) TMO).²² The threshold for "capability" is low ("not incapable" of distinguishing).²² However, signs fundamentally incapable of distinguishing (e.g., generic terms like "Soap" for soap) fail this test and cannot be registered, even with evidence of acquired distinctiveness.²²
- **Lack of Distinctive Character (S.11(1)(b)):** The mark must be inherently capable of identifying the goods/services as originating from a particular undertaking.¹⁸ It must function as a guarantee of origin.²⁴ Marks that require public education to be perceived as trademarks are considered devoid of distinctive character.²² This is a common ground for refusal.¹⁸ For example, in a Registry decision concerning "BENEFIT ME", the mark was refused as it would likely be perceived merely as an ordinary promotional phrase, lacking the ability to function as a badge of origin for the relevant services.¹⁸ The assessment considers the relevant goods/services and the perception of the average consumer.¹⁸ The IPD is often perceived as applying a strict standard for distinctiveness.²⁵ This practical reality suggests that selecting inherently distinctive marks (e.g., invented words, unique logos) from the outset is a more reliable strategy than relying on borderline marks that may require extensive evidence of acquired distinctiveness later.
- **Exclusively Descriptive Marks (S.11(1)(c)):** Refusal applies if the mark consists *exclusively* of signs designating the kind, quality, quantity, intended purpose, value, geographical origin, time of production, or other characteristics of the goods/services.¹⁸ The term "exclusively" is important; if a mark contains a non-descriptive element (unless insignificant), it may avoid refusal under this specific subsection, though it could still be refused under S.11(1)(b) for lacking overall distinctive character.²² The assessment considers how a reasonably well-informed consumer would perceive the sign – as an origin identifier or an origin-neutral description.²²
- **Generic / Customary Marks (S.11(1)(d)):** Marks consisting *exclusively* of signs that have become customary in the current language or established trade practices are refused.¹⁸ This applies to terms or symbols commonly used within a specific industry (e.g., "Network" for computer software).²²
- **Shape Marks (S.11(3)):** Registration is refused for shapes resulting from the nature of the goods, necessary to obtain a technical result, or giving substantial value to the goods.³

- **Marks Contrary to Morality or Public Order (S.11(4)(a)):** This ground targets marks conflicting with accepted principles of morality.²¹ It is not about mere political correctness but concerns signs that could justifiably cause outrage or undermine core societal values.²² Recent updates to the Work Manual clarify that this includes marks potentially contrary to national security, sovereignty, unity, public order, or personal safety; associated with offensive, indecent, or hateful content; resembling names/symbols of government leadership or agencies without authorization; or offensively commercializing tragedies.²¹ The inclusion of national security and public order concerns introduces a sensitive dimension to examination, requiring practitioners to assess potential political interpretations. Objections on these grounds are typically absolute and unlikely to be overcome by evidence of use.²¹
- **Deceptive Marks (S.11(4)(b)):** Marks likely to deceive the public regarding the nature, quality, or geographical origin of the goods/services are refused.²¹ This includes marks falsely implying official approval or using misleading geographical terms like "exported from" a place not known for the goods.²¹
- **Marks Prohibited by Law (S.11(5)(a)):** Registration is refused if the mark's use is prohibited by any law in Hong Kong.³ An example provided in the Work Manual updates involves potential conflict with the Law of the People's Republic of China on Safeguarding National Security in the HKSAR.²¹
- **Bad Faith Applications (S.11(5)(b)):** Applications made with dishonest intent are refused.²³ While primarily an examination ground, bad faith is also frequently raised in opposition proceedings.²⁷
- **Prohibited Symbols (S.11(6), S.11(7), S.64, S.65):** Marks consisting of or containing the national or regional flags or emblems of the PRC and HKSAR²³, or state emblems, official signs, or emblems of international organizations protected under Article 6ter of the Paris Convention³, are generally refused.
- **Overcoming Lack of Inherent Distinctiveness (S.11(2)):** Objections under S.11(1)(b) (non-distinctive), S.11(1)(c) (descriptive), or S.11(1)(d) (generic) may be overcome if the applicant proves the mark has *acquired* distinctive character through use *before* the date of application.²² Evidence must demonstrate that consumers recognize the mark as indicating goods/services from the applicant's undertaking.²⁸ This typically involves submitting statutory declarations detailing the manner, duration, and extent of use, supported by evidence like labels, packaging, advertisements, invoices, and sales figures relevant to the pre-application period.²⁸

4. Addressing Relative Grounds for Refusal (Section 12 TMO)

Relative grounds for refusal, governed by Section 12 of the TMO³, arise when an applied-for mark conflicts with the rights associated with an "earlier trade mark".²⁹ An "earlier trade mark" is defined in Section 5 TMO and includes earlier registered trademarks, earlier applications (once registered), and trademarks well-known in Hong Kong.³ Key relative grounds include:

- **Identical Mark / Identical Goods/Services (S.12(1)):** This constitutes an absolute bar to registration; if the mark applied for is identical to an earlier mark registered for identical goods or services, refusal is mandatory without assessing confusion.²⁹ The Registry interprets "identical" strictly; minor differences, such as the presence or absence of a letter (e.g., 'DIGIT' vs 'digits'), may render marks non-identical, though they would then be assessed for similarity.³⁰
- **Identical Mark / Similar Goods/Services (S.12(2)):** Registration is refused if there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public.³
- **Similar Mark / Identical or Similar Goods/Services (S.12(3)):** Registration is refused if there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public.³
- **Likelihood of Confusion Assessment:** For Sections 12(2) and 12(3), the core test is "likelihood of confusion".²⁹ The Registry employs a "global appreciation" test, considering all relevant factors from the perspective of the average consumer, who is deemed reasonably well-informed and observant.²⁹ This involves assessing the degree of similarity between the marks and the goods/services, recognizing the interdependence between these factors (greater similarity in one can offset lesser similarity in the other).²⁹ The assessment includes the likelihood of association, but only insofar as it leads to confusion about origin (Section 7 TMO).³
- **Similarity of Marks:** Marks are compared visually, aurally, and conceptually.²⁹ The overall impression, considering dominant and distinctive components, is key.²⁹ The doctrine of imperfect recollection acknowledges that consumers may not recall marks perfectly.²⁹
- **Similarity of Goods/Services:** This requires comparing the goods/services listed in the application against those covered by the earlier mark. Factors considered include their nature, intended purpose, users, method of use, trade channels, and whether they are in competition or complementary.²⁹ While the Nice Classification⁶ provides structure, it is not determinative. Goods or services in different classes can still be considered similar if they are complementary, meaning one is important or indispensable for the use of the other, leading consumers to potentially assume a common origin.³² The *Megahong* case illustrates this, where retail services for pharmaceuticals (Class 35) were found complementary to pharmaceutical goods (Class 5).³² This highlights the need for clearance searches

to extend beyond identical or closely related classes and consider potential market overlaps and consumer perceptions of relatedness.

- **Well-Known Marks (S.12(4)):** An application for a mark identical or similar to an earlier well-known mark can be refused even for *dissimilar* goods/services if the use of the applied-for mark would take unfair advantage of, or be detrimental to, the distinctive character or repute of the well-known mark.³ This ground must be raised in opposition by the owner of the well-known mark (S.12(6)).³
- **Conflict with Other Earlier Rights (S.12(5)):** Registration may be refused if the mark's use could be prevented by other laws, notably the common law of passing off (protecting unregistered marks with reputation/goodwill)⁹, or by earlier rights like copyright or registered designs.³ This ground also requires objection by the owner of the earlier right during opposition (S.12(6)).³
- **Overcoming Relative Grounds Objections:**
 - **Consent (S.12(8)):** Obtaining a formal letter of consent from the owner of the earlier trademark or right can overcome the objection.³ The Registry practice has modernized to generally accept scanned copies of consent letters, although the original may still be requested at the examiner's discretion.³⁴ Securing the original remains advisable.
 - **Honest Concurrent Use (S.13 TMO):** An applicant may argue for registration based on honest concurrent use of the mark in Hong Kong alongside the earlier mark.²⁹ This requires demonstrating factors such as the honesty of the adoption and use, the extent and duration of use in Hong Kong, the degree of likely confusion, and the relative inconvenience to the parties if registration is granted or refused.³³ Establishing honest concurrent use typically requires substantial evidence and can be challenging, particularly if the marks and goods/services are highly similar, making it more of a fallback argument when strong evidence exists.³³
 - **Arguing Against Similarity/Confusion:** Applicants can submit detailed arguments disputing the similarity of the marks or the goods/services, applying the established assessment factors to their specific case.²⁹

5. Responding to Examination Objections (Rule 13 TMR)

Once an application undergoes substantive examination¹⁸, the examiner will issue an opinion. If objections are raised, the applicant must respond according to the procedures and timelines set out primarily in Rule 13 of the TMR.¹⁶ Adherence to these procedures is critical, as failure to respond appropriately within the stipulated deadlines can lead to the application being deemed withdrawn or refused.¹⁶

- **Initial Opinion and Response (Rule 13(1)-(3)):** If the examiner finds the

application does not meet registration requirements (due to absolute or relative grounds), a written opinion detailing the objections will be issued under Rule 13(1).¹⁶ The applicant then has **six months** from the date of this notice to either file written representations arguing against the objections or file a request to amend the application to overcome them.¹⁶ A single **three-month extension** of this six-month period can be obtained by filing Form T13 before the initial deadline expires (Rule 13(3)).¹⁶ This first extension is generally granted upon request.

- **Further Opinion and Response (Rule 13(4)-(6)):** If the applicant responds but the examiner maintains the objections, a further opinion will be issued under Rule 13(4).¹⁶ The applicant then has **three months** from the date of this further notice to file further representations, make further amendments, or request a hearing before a hearing officer.¹⁶
- **Further Extensions (Rule 13(6)):** Extensions of the three-month period following a Rule 13(4) opinion are possible, granted in increments of no more than three months each.¹⁶ However, unlike the first extension, these further extensions are *conditional*. The applicant must file Form T13 before the current deadline expires *and* satisfy the Registrar that specific circumstances exist, namely:
 - Needing more time to obtain consent or assignment related to a cited earlier mark.
 - Invalidity or revocation proceedings concerning a cited earlier mark are pending.
 - Needing more time to prepare evidence of use to establish acquired distinctiveness.
 - Other exceptional circumstances justify the extension.¹⁶ The structured nature of this process, with an initial generous timeframe followed by shorter periods with conditional extensions, suggests the Registry expects applicants to address objections substantively early on or provide compelling, specific reasons for subsequent delays. Practitioners should frame extension requests under Rule 13(6) explicitly referencing these permissible grounds.
- **Non-Extendible Deadlines:** It is crucial to note that the primary deadlines set within Rule 13(2) (initial 6 months) and Rule 13(5) (subsequent 3 months) cannot be extended under the general extension provisions of Rule 94. Extensions are only available as specifically provided within Rule 13 itself (i.e., via Rule 13(3) and Rule 13(6)).³⁶
- **Crafting Effective Responses:** Responses should meticulously address each objection raised by the examiner. Arguments should be grounded in the TMO, TMR, relevant sections of the Work Manual, and supporting case law (Registry decisions or court judgments). Where appropriate, evidence should be submitted,

such as evidence of acquired distinctiveness²⁸ or letters of consent.³³

Amendments, such as limiting the specification of goods/services or entering disclaimers, can be proposed strategically. Persuasive and well-supported arguments can lead to swift reversals of objections.³⁷

- **Hearing:** If written submissions fail to overcome the objections, the applicant can request a hearing.¹⁶ Hearings provide an opportunity to present arguments orally before a hearing officer. The IPD allows for hearings to be conducted on paper, via telephone conferencing, or other electronic means where practicable.³⁴

The following table summarizes the key deadlines and extension possibilities under TMR Rule 13:

Stage	Triggering Event	Action Required by Applicant	Initial Deadline	Extension Possibility	Extension Duration	Extension Ground/Rule
Initial Objection	Receipt of Rule 13(1) Notice	File written representations OR Request amendment	6 months	Yes, request before expiry	3 months	Rule 13(3)
Further Objection	Receipt of Rule 13(4) Further Notice	File further representations OR Request further amendment OR Request hearing	3 months	Yes, request before expiry AND satisfy specific grounds	Max 3 months each	Rule 13(6)

6. Practical Strategies and Common Pitfalls

Successfully navigating the Hong Kong trademark examination process involves strategic planning from the outset and careful management throughout.

- **Pre-Filing Strategies:**
 - **Thorough Clearance:** Conduct comprehensive searches before filing to

identify potential conflicts under both absolute and relative grounds.¹⁸ Utilize the IPD's online search tool ⁷ and consider engaging professional search services. Searches should not be limited to identical marks or classes; assess similarity and consider complementary goods/services, especially in light of cases like *Megahong*.³² Evaluate the inherent distinctiveness of the proposed mark against Section 11 criteria ¹⁸ and consider potential issues under updated morality/public order guidelines.²¹

- **Mark Selection:** Prioritize marks that are inherently distinctive (e.g., invented words, arbitrary terms, unique logos).¹⁸ Avoid marks that are primarily descriptive, laudatory, generic, or potentially offensive.²¹
- **Classification and Specification:** Accurately classify goods and services using the Nice Classification system.⁶ Draft specifications that are clear, concise, and accurately reflect the intended scope of use.⁵ While class headings are permissible ³¹, overly broad specifications may attract objections or prove difficult to support with use evidence later. Hong Kong allows multi-class applications.³⁸
- **Application Filing:**
 - **Accuracy is Key:** Ensure the application form (Form T2 ⁸) is completed accurately and fully to avoid deficiency notices.¹² Common errors include incorrect applicant name/address, unclear mark representation, missing translations or transliterations for non-Roman/Chinese marks, and incorrect fee payment.¹² A clear graphical representation is mandatory.⁵
 - **Statement of Use/Intent:** The application should include a statement of actual use or intention to use the mark.⁴² While Hong Kong permits "intent to use" filings ⁴⁴, the potential need to prove *pre-application* acquired distinctiveness ²² and the requirement for genuine use within three years post-registration to avoid revocation ⁴ mean that actual use or concrete plans for use remain practically significant.
 - **Address for Service:** Provide a valid address for service in Hong Kong.³⁸ Appointing a local agent is recommended for overseas applicants; agents must notify the Registrar of their Hong Kong address.⁴⁶
- **Examination Stage Management:**
 - **Analyze Objections:** Carefully review any examiner's opinion (Rule 13(1) or 13(4)) to fully understand the legal basis and reasoning for each objection.¹⁶ Consult the Work Manual for context on the likely examiner perspective.¹⁴
 - **Respond Strategically and Punctually:** Adhere strictly to the Rule 13 deadlines.¹⁶ Develop targeted responses addressing each objection point-by-point with legal arguments and, where applicable, supporting evidence (e.g., evidence of acquired distinctiveness, consent letters).²⁸

Consider strategic amendments, such as narrowing the list of goods/services or adding disclaimers, if appropriate.

- **Common Pitfalls to Avoid:**

- Inadequate pre-filing searches leading to unforeseen relative grounds objections.
- Selection of inherently weak marks (non-distinctive, descriptive) requiring difficult arguments on acquired distinctiveness.
- Errors or omissions in the application form causing delays due to deficiency checking.¹²
- Missing critical response deadlines under Rule 13, resulting in automatic refusal or withdrawal.¹⁶
- Submitting unpersuasive arguments or insufficient evidence when responding to objections.
- Underestimating the scope of similarity assessment for goods/services (e.g., failing to consider complementarity³²).
- Failing to meet the evidentiary burden for proving acquired distinctiveness.²⁸
- Overlooking recent changes in examination practice, particularly regarding absolute grounds like morality and national security.²¹

The timeline for registration can vary significantly. While a smooth application with no objections might proceed from filing to registration in as little as 6 months¹⁹, applications facing objections, requiring evidence submissions, or proceeding to a hearing can take considerably longer, potentially 12-16 months or more even without opposition.⁴⁷ This variability highlights the practical and commercial value of meticulous preparation and strategic prosecution aimed at minimizing objections and delays.

7. Conclusion

Successfully navigating the examination stage of a Hong Kong trademark application demands more than just knowledge of the Trade Marks Ordinance and Rules. It requires a practical understanding of the Trade Marks Registry's specific practices and expectations, diligent preparation, and strategic management of the procedural requirements.

Key takeaways include the critical importance of leveraging official resources, particularly the regularly updated Trade Marks Registry Work Manual, to anticipate examiner approaches. Thorough pre-filing clearance, encompassing both relative and absolute grounds (including the evolving standards for distinctiveness and morality/public order), is essential for selecting strong marks and avoiding predictable

objections. Accuracy in application filing minimizes procedural delays.

When objections arise, a structured and timely response under the framework of TMR Rule 13 is crucial. This involves carefully analyzing the examiner's reasoning, crafting persuasive legal arguments, submitting relevant evidence where necessary (such as for acquired distinctiveness or consent), and considering strategic amendments. Mastering the nuances of assessing likelihood of confusion, including the similarity of marks and the potentially broad interpretation of similarity for goods and services (extending to complementarity), is vital for addressing relative grounds objections.

Ultimately, effective Hong Kong trademark prosecution blends legal knowledge with practical mastery of the Registry's administrative landscape. Understanding examiner tendencies gleaned from the Work Manual and published decisions, rigorously adhering to procedural deadlines and requirements, and building compelling, evidence-based arguments tailored to the specific objections raised are hallmarks of successful practice. Careful preparation and strategic handling significantly enhance the prospects of achieving trademark registration efficiently in this key jurisdiction.

引用的著作

1. Intellectual Property Department of the Government of the Hong Kong SAR, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://www.ip-prd.net/en/contact-us/ipd/index.html>
2. Intellectual Property Department - Telephone Directory of the Government of the HKSAR And Related Organisations, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, https://tel.directory.gov.hk/index_IPD_ENG.html
3. Hong Kong, China - WIPO Lex, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/187015>
4. Hong Kong trade mark law - Wikipedia, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hong_Kong_trade_mark_law
5. Chapter: 559A Trade Marks Rules - AWS, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://wipolex-resources-eu-central-1-358922420655.s3.amazonaws.com/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/hk/hk124en.pdf>
6. Trademarks Registration in Mainland China, Hong Kong, Macau - AsiaBC, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://asiabc.co/guide-to-hk/trademarks-in-mainland-china-hong-kong-macau/>
7. Intellectual Property - GovHK, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://www.gov.hk/en/business/registration/intellectual/index.htm>
8. Intellectual Property Protection in Hong Kong: A Simple Guide | Woodburn Accountants & Advisors, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://www.woodburnglobal.com/post/intellectual-property-protection-in-hong-kong-a-simple-guide>
9. Trade Marks - Foundation for Shared Impact, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://www.shared-impact.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Guide-to-Trade-M>

[arks.pdf](#)

10. Latest Developments in Intellectual Property Regime of Hong Kong, China, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
http://mddb.apec.org/Documents/2020/IPEG/IPEG2/20_ipeg2_011.pdf
11. Registration of HK Trade Mark, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.dbhk.com.hk/Register-Trademark/HongKong.html>
12. Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.ipd.gov.hk/>
13. Trade Marks - Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.ipd.gov.hk/en/trade-marks/index.html>
14. Trade Marks Registry Work Manual - Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.ipd.gov.hk/en/trade-marks/trade-marks-registry-work-manual/index.html>
15. Conducting a trade mark search - Hong Kong – Regional IP Trading Centre, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.ip.gov.hk/en/types-of-ip/trade-marks/search/index.html>
16. www.ipd.gov.hk, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.ipd.gov.hk/filemanager/ipd/common/trade-marks/registry-work-manual/current/eng/Examination_of_applications.pdf
17. Hong Kong (HK) - Country Index, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.country-index.com/country_surveys.aspx?ID=163
18. Grounds for Refusal in Trademark Registration Applications - Robertsons, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://robertsonshk.com/news/grounds-for-refusal-in-trademark-registration-applications>
19. A Comprehensive Guide to Trademark Registration in Hong Kong, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.hkcompanyregistration.com/business-guides/trademark-registration-in-hong-kong/>
20. Trade Marks Decisions – Trade Marks Ordinance (Cap. 559) - Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.ipd.gov.hk/en/trade-marks/trade-mark-hearings/cap559/index.html>
21. Hong Kong: Update on Absolute Grounds for Refusal of Trade Marks - Rouse, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://rouse.com/insights/news/2025/hong-kong-update-on-absolute-grounds-for-refusal-of-trade-marks>
22. Absolute grounds for refusal - Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.ipd.gov.hk/filemanager/ipd/common/trade-marks/registry-work-manual/current/eng/Absolute_grounds_for_refusal.pdf
23. Chapter: 559 TRADE MARKS ORDINANCE Gazette Number Version Date Long title L.N. 31 of 2003 04/04/2003 An Ordinance to make new pr, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.bkt.hk/wp-content/themes/new2020-v02/down/EN/CAP_559_e_b5.p

[df](#)

24. Absolute grounds for refusal - Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.ipd.gov.hk/filemanager/ipd/common/trade-marks/registry-work-manual/previous/eng/Absolute_grounds_for_refusal_20150320.pdf
25. Registration of Trademarks in Hong Kong - Lorenz & Partners, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.lorenz-partners.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/NL200E-Registration-of-Trademarks-in-Hong-Kong-Nov15.pdf>
26. Hong Kong Trademark Law & Difference from Mainland Chinese Practice - China Briefing, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.china-briefing.com/news/trademark-registration-in-hong-kong-a-primer/>
27. What grounds are available for Hong Kong Trade Mark opposition proceedings? - Rouse, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://rouse.com/insights/news/2022/what-grounds-are-available-for-hong-kong-trade-mark-opposition-proceedings>
28. What is evidence of distinctiveness in HK? - Chang Tsi, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.changtsi.com/news/insight/1910.html>
29. www.ipd.gov.hk, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.ipd.gov.hk/filemanager/ipd/common/trade-marks/registry-work-manual/current/eng/Relative_grounds_for_refusal.pdf
30. Relative grounds for refusal, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.ipd.gov.hk/filemanager/ipd/common/trade-marks/registry-work-manual/previous/eng/Relative_grounds_for_refusal.pdf
31. Trademark Registration in Hong Kong: How It Works - iPNOTE, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://ipnote.pro/en/blog/trademark-registration-in-hong-kong-how-it-works/>
32. Can the owner of a trade mark in one class oppose another person's registration for a similar mark in a different class? - ONC Lawyers, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.onc.hk/en_US/publication/can-the-owner-of-a-trade-mark-in-one-class-oppose-another-person-s-registration-for-a-similar-mark-in-a-different-class?page=1
33. Consent, honest concurrent use and other special circumstances - Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.ipd.gov.hk/filemanager/ipd/common/trade-marks/registry-work-manual/previous/eng/WM_Honest_Concurrent_Use.pdf
34. Hong Kong: Trademark practice - Small changes, big differences - Deacons, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.deacons.com/2020/05/08/hong-kong-trademark-practice-small-changes-big-differences/>
35. Application process - Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.ipd.gov.hk/en/trade-marks/apply-for-a-trade-mark/application-process/index.html>

36. wipolex-res.wipo.int, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://wipolex-res.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/hk/hk124en.html>
37. Hong Kong Team: Unprecedented Swift Reversal of Objection on Absolute Grounds, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.changtsi.com/news/insight/2267.html>
38. Trademarks in Hong Kong - SSRANA, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://ssrana.in/global-ip/international-trademark-filing-registration/trademarks-in-hong-kong/>
39. How to Successfully Register a Trademark in Hong Kong: A Detailed Guide - ASL LAW, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://aslgate.com/how-to-successfully-register-a-trademark-in-hong-kong-a-detailed-guide/>
40. Trademark Registration in Hong Kong - Explained Procedure, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://lawfirmhongkong.com/register-a-trademark-in-hong-kong/>
41. A Guide to Trademark Registration in Hong Kong - Reg Easy Intellectual Property, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.regeasy.hk/post/a-guide-to-trademark-registration-in-hong-kong>
42. Trade Marks Ordinance (Cap.559) - Hong Kong Intellectual Property Department, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.ipd.gov.hk/en/trade-marks/faqs/trade-marks-ordinance/index.html>
43. Trade Marks Ordinance (Chapter 559) - cloudfront.net, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://dusyzh85wmzqh.cloudfront.net/uploads/4-Hong-Kong-Trademark-T1-english-and-sample-1542954719.pdf>
44. Trade mark registration steps - Hong Kong - Regional IP Trading Centre, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://www.ip.gov.hk/en/types-of-ip/trade-marks/registration-steps/index.html>
45. The Paradox of TVB's Ownership of the "HKTV Trade Marks" - ONC Lawyers, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
https://www.onc.hk/en_US/publication/the-paradox-of-tvb-s-ownership-of-the-hktv-trade-marks?page=133
46. Trade Marks (Amendment) Rules 2004, Hong Kong, China, WIPO Lex, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025, <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/2132>
47. Trademark in Hong Kong: A Comprehensive Guide to Hong Kong Trademark Registration - ASL LAW, 访问时间为 五月 1, 2025,
<https://aslgate.com/trademark-in-hong-kong-a-comprehensive-guide-to-hong-kong-trademark-registration/>