© JUL 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 10 Issue 1 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1720210

Cross-Border Approaches to Trademark Protection: A Comparative Legal Study

ARYAN GAUTAM
Amity University

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context and Background

In the contemporary global political economy, the traditional boundaries of commercial enterprise have largely dissolved. Driven by rapid technological advancement, integrated international supply chains, and the ubiquity of borderless digital platforms, commercial entities operate in a marketplace that is inherently global. Within this interconnected ecosystem, trademarks have evolved far beyond their historic function as local identifiers of source or origin. Today, they serve as vital intangible corporate assets, carrying the goodwill, reputation, and brand equity of multinational enterprises across diverse cultural and legal landscapes.

The expansion of cross-border trade, however, exposes a foundational structural friction within intellectual property law: the tension between economic globalization and legal territoriality. Modern trademark law remains fundamentally anchored in national sovereignty. Under the traditional doctrine of territoriality, trademark rights are granted, defined, and enforced by individual sovereign states strictly within their geopolitical borders. Consequently, a trademark registered and protected in one jurisdiction carries no automatic legal effect in another, leaving global brand identities vulnerable to fragmenting into separate domestic legal regimes.

II. FOUNDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK LAW

Key International Treaties and Conventions

Three legal instruments form the core architecture of international trademark law: the Paris Convention, the TRIPS Agreement, and the Madrid System.

1. The Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883)

The Paris Convention represents the earliest multilateral effort to bridge national intellectual property systems. While preserving national territorial sovereignty, it established three indispensable foundational mechanisms:

- National Treatment (Article 2): Requires each contracting state to extend the same trademark protections and legal remedies to foreign nationals of member states as it grants to its own citizens, preventing xenophobic regulatory discrimination.
- Right of Priority (Article 4): Grants an applicant who files a trademark application in one member state a 6-month priority period to file in other member states. Subsequent filings made within this window are backdated to the original filing date, effectively protecting brand owners from intervening third-party filings during international expansion.
- Protection of Well-Known Marks (Article 6bis): Creates a vital exception to strict territoriality by obligating member states to refuse, cancel, or prohibit the unauthorized registration or use of a trademark that is "well-known" in that country, even if the mark has not been registered locally.

2. The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS, 1994)

Concluded under the auspices of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the TRIPS Agreement elevated intellectual property protection into an enforceable pillar of international trade law. TRIPS built upon the Paris Convention in several critical ways:

- Substantive Minimum Standards (Articles 15–21): Defined protectable subject matter

© JUL 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 10 Issue 1 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1720210

broadly (requiring any visually perceptible sign capable of distinguishing goods/services to be eligible for registration) and codified the exclusive rights conferred by a trademark, specifically the right to prevent third parties from using identical or similar signs for similar goods where confusion would result.
- Expanded Protection for Famous Marks (Article 16): Extended Article 6bis of the Paris Convention to service marks and to non-similar goods/services, provided that use on those goods indicates a connection with the owner of the registered mark and damages their interests (codifying dilution protection internationally).
- Enforcement and Dispute Settlement: TRIPS mandated that member states provide robust domestic civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement procedures. Crucially, non-compliance by sovereign states can be challenged through the WTO's binding Dispute Settlement Mechanism.

3. The Madrid System (Madrid Agreement 1891 & Madrid Protocol 1989)
Administered by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the Madrid System addresses the procedural friction of securing territorial rights across multiple nations. Rather than creating a unified "substantive global trademark," the Madrid System functions as a centralized administrative filing gateway.
- Mechanism: A brand owner can file a single "International Application" through their home office of origin, designating multiple member jurisdictions in a single language and paying a single set of fees in Swiss Francs (CHF).
- Bundle of National Rights: Once transmitted to designated country offices, the application is subjected to each nation's domestic substantive law. If no national office refuses the mark within 12 to 18 months, the international registration matures into a bundle of national rights equivalent to local registrations.
- Central Attack Rule: Under the Madrid Protocol, for the first five years, the international registration remains dependent on the basic home application/registration. If the home mark is canceled or invalidated, all designated international protections fall simultaneously ("central attack"), though the Protocol allows conversion into national filings.

III. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: KEY JURISDICTIONAL APPROACHES

3.1. Civil Law vs. Common Law: First-to-File vs. First-to-Use
The most fundamental structural divide in international trademark law lies between jurisdictions that follow the First-to-File doctrine and those that operate under the First-to-Use principle. This philosophical split reflects broader differences between civil law traditions—which prioritize administrative codification and legal certainty—and common law systems, which prioritize equity, commercial reality, and the protection of earned market goodwill.

1. First-to-File Regimes (Civil Law Systems: EU, China)
In a pure or modified first-to-file system, trademark ownership is granted strictly to the first party who successfully files an application with the national IP office, regardless of whether that mark has ever been used in commerce locally or internationally.

- Legal Rationale & Benefits: Grounded in civil law jurisprudence, this mechanism emphasizes predictability, public notice, and administrative efficiency. By consulting an official register, market participants can immediately determine whether a sign is available without needing to search for hidden prior commercial uses.
- The Vulnerability—Trademark Squatting: The primary flaw of the first-to-file rule is its vulnerability to opportunistic actors who systematically monitor foreign markets and register well-known international brands locally before the original brand owner enters the market.

© JUL 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 10 Issue 1 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1720210

- China's Evolution: China historically served as the classic example of strict first-to-file application, where bad-faith "trademark squatters" regularly blocked foreign brand entry (exemplified in high-profile battles over marks like iPad and Jordan). In response, amendments to China's Trademark Law (specifically Articles 4, 7, and 15) have introduced explicit bans on bad-faith filings without an intent to use, alongside heightened standards for bad-faith invalidation. However, administrative registration remains the ultimate foundation of protection.

2. First-to-Use Regimes (Common Law Systems: US, UK, India)
In first-to-use jurisdictions, priority and ownership are derived from the actual, continuous commercial use of a mark in connection with goods or services in the marketplace. Registration serves primarily to confirm or enhance existing common law rights rather than create them ex nihilo.

- Legal Rationale & Benefits: Derived from the equitable tort of passing off and unfair competition doctrines, common law systems view trademarks as assets built on consumer recognition and goodwill. Granting ownership to a non-user simply because they reached the registry office first is considered fundamentally unfair and deceptive to consumers.
- United States (The Lanham Act Framework): Under US law, an applicant can file based on "Intent to Use" (ITU) under Section 1(b) of the Lanham Act, but the registration will not issue until the applicant files a Verified Statement of Use demonstrating actual commercial use in interstate commerce. Furthermore, prior unregistered common law use within a specific geographic territory can defeat a subsequent federal registrant's claim of exclusivity in that zone (Barcellona doctrine).
- India's Hybrid Approach: India operates a common law framework codified within the Trade Marks Act, 1999. While registration offers statutory protection and nationwide remedies, Indian law explicitly preserves common law rights under Section 27(2) (the tort of passing off). Indian courts regularly allow prior, unregistered foreign users to invalidate local registrations if the foreign mark has established prior global reputation or trans-border goodwill that spilled into India.

Regional Harmonization Regimes
To mitigate the inefficiencies of piecemeal national trademark filings within integrated economic zones, several regions have created supranational trademark systems. Among these, the European Union (EU) represents the most advanced model of regional harmonization, replacing multi-jurisdictional fragmentation with a unified, pan-regional intellectual property framework.

1. The European Union Trade Mark (EUTM) Framework
Codified under Regulation (EU) 2017/1001, the EUTM creates a single, unitary trademark right administered by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) in Alicante, Spain.

- The Unitary Principle: An EUTM registration extends automatically to all Member States of the European Union. It can only be applied for, transferred, surrendered, or invalidated in respect of the entire EU.
- Dual System Coexistence: The EUTM system does not replace national trademark offices (such as INPI in France or DPMA in Germany). Instead, it operates in parallel. Brand owners can choose between securing national registrations, applying for a unitary EUTM, or maintaining both.
- Unitary Vulnerability: The central trade-off of the unitary character is that a conflict in even a single Member State can compromise the entire EUTM. If a prior conflicting right exists in one small Member State, it can block or invalidate the EUTM across the entire Union (though the applicant may convert the EUTM into individual national applications while preserving the original priority date).

© JUL 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 10 Issue 1 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1720210

2. Substantive Harmonization across EU Member States

Beyond creating the EUTM, the EU harmonized the domestic trademark statutes of its Member States through Directive (EU) 2015/2436. This Directive requires all national trademark registries to align their substantive criteria—such as absolute grounds for refusal (e.g., distinctiveness), relative grounds (conflicting prior rights), and procedural invalidation rules—ensuring that a brand owner encounters consistent legal standards whether operating under national law or the regional EUTM regime.

3. Cross-Border Exhaustion of Rights: Regional vs. International

One of the most critical cross-border issues in trademark law is the exhaustion of trademark rights (which governs parallel imports or "grey market" goods). Once a genuine branded item is placed on the market, when does the trademark owner's right to control its further distribution end?

The EU strictly enforces a doctrine of Community (or Regional) Exhaustion, enshrined in Article 15 of the EUTM Regulation:

- Internal Free Movement of Goods: Once genuine goods bearing an EUTM are put on the market anywhere within the European Economic Area (EEA) by the trademark owner or with their consent, the trademark rights in those specific goods are exhausted. The brand owner cannot invoke trademark rights to prevent their resale or movement between EEA Member States.
- Bar against International Exhaustion: Crucially, the CJEU confirmed in seminal rulings (e.g., Silhouette International Schmied v. Hartlauer, C-355/96) that Member States cannot adopt national or international exhaustion rules for goods originating outside the EEA. If genuine goods are first sold outside the EEA (e.g., in the US or Asia) and then imported into the EU without the rights-holder's consent, the trademark owner retains the legal right to block those parallel imports at the EU border.
- Legitimate Reasons Exception: Even within the EEA, exhaustion does not apply if there are "legitimate reasons" for the proprietor to oppose further commercialization—most notably where the condition of the goods has been changed, damaged, or altered after being put on the market.

Enforcement Mechanisms & Remedies

Securing a trademark registration across multiple jurisdictions is meaningless without effective legal enforcement. When infringing conduct spans multiple national borders, rights-holders face severe procedural and substantive hurdles in enforcing their rights, obtaining multi-territorial injunctive relief, and executing border control measures against illicit trade.

1. Cross-Border Injunctions and the Challenge of Foreign Recognition

An injunction is the primary remedy in trademark litigation, aimed at preventing irreparable harm to a brand's goodwill. However, when an infringer operates across multiple countries, securing piecemeal injunctions in every single sovereign court is economically prohibitive and time-sensitive.

- Pan-European Injunctions (The EU Model): The EU provides a clear mechanism for multi-territorial judicial relief. Designated national "EUTM Courts" have the statutory authority under Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 to issue pan-European injunctions that prohibit infringing acts across all EU Member States simultaneously.
- Common Law & Global Limits: Outside regional frameworks like the EU, national courts are far more cautious. While common law courts may issue an in personam injunction against a defendant subject to their personal jurisdiction restraining actions abroad, foreign enforcement depends heavily on international comity and domestic recognition-of-judgment statutes. Foreign courts frequently refuse to enforce extraterritorial IP injunctions, viewing them as impermissible infringements on local sovereign property rights.

.

© JUL 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 10 Issue 1 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1720210

IV. CROSS-BORDER CHALLENGES IN THE DIGITAL AGE

1. Online Trademark Infringement and Commercial Targeting

To prevent total jurisdictional overreach, courts across major jurisdictions have adopted the Targeting Doctrine:

- European Union (L'Oréal v. eBay, C-324/09): The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) held that the mere accessibility of a website within the EU is insufficient to invoke EU trademark law. Instead, courts must assess whether the foreign seller's activity demonstrates an intent to target consumers in that specific territory. Indicators of targeting include offering localized delivery options, accepting local currencies, providing customer support in local languages, or utilizing country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs).
- United States and Common Law Regimes: US courts similarly apply personal jurisdiction and statutory use tests based on intentional targeting (e.g., the Zippo sliding-scale test for website interactivity and specific targeting of US buyers). Unintended, passive accessibility by foreign web users does not establish local trademark infringement.

2. Search Engines, Keywords, and Meta-Tagging

Cross-border digital marketing often involves subtle mechanisms designed to redirect online consumer traffic from famous brands to competitors or counterfeit sellers:

- Ad Keyword Bidding: Competitors frequently bid on registered foreign trademarks as search engine trigger keywords (e.g., buying a competitor's brand name in Google Ads). Jurisdictions handle this differently: while US courts treat keyword bidding as a statutory "use in commerce" but require proof of likelihood of confusion (Network Automation v. Advanced Systems Concepts), CJEU jurisprudence (Google France v. Louis Vuitton, C-236/08) focuses on whether the ad impairs the trademark's essential function of guaranteeing origin.
- Meta-Tagging: Incorporating a competitor's trademark into invisible website metadata or HTML code to manipulate search engine indexing is widely recognized as deceptive commercial practice and actionable infringement across both common law and civil law courts.

3. Domain Name Disputes and the ICANN UDRP Framework

The intersection of domain names and trademarks represents the classic cross-border IP conflict. Because the Domain Name System (DNS) operates on a global, first-come, first-served basis, bad-faith actors routinely engage in cybersquatting (registering domain names matching famous foreign trademarks to extort payouts or sell counterfeit goods).

Because national courts are slow and geographically limited, the international community relies on administrative alternative dispute resolution (ADR) created by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN):

- The Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP): Introduced in 1999 and administered by bodies like the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center, the UDRP allows brand owners to resolve domain disputes across borders without filing lawsuit in national courts.
- The Three-Pronged UDRP Test: To secure the transfer or cancellation of a domain name, a complainant must prove:

1. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; and

2. The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

3. Comparative Approaches

Despite international guidelines, domestic courts interpret cross-border goodwill with varying degrees

© JUL 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 10 Issue 1 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1720210

of flexibility, reflecting a rift between "hard" and "soft" territorial approaches:

- India: Indian common law courts have emerged as leading proponents of protecting trans-border goodwill. In seminal cases such as N.R. Dongre v. Whirlpool Corp. (1996) and Prius Auto Industries v. Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha (2018), Indian courts recognized that international advertising, global sales, and travel generate a "spillover reputation" in India. In Whirlpool, the Supreme Court allowed a foreign brand owner with no local sales to restrain a domestic squatter from using the "Whirlpool" mark based purely on global reputation that had reached Indian consumers. However, Prius clarified that such trans-border reputation must be convincingly proven to exist in the domestic market prior to the defendant's adoption date.
- United Kingdom and Australia: Conversely, classical UK common law (Starbucks v. British Sky Broadcasting, [2015] UKSC 31) maintains a strict distinction between reputation and goodwill. UK courts hold that to maintain an action in passing off, a foreign claimant must prove actual local commercial goodwill—meaning having actual customers or physical business within the UK. Mere reputation derived from foreign sales or international web accessibility without local customers is insufficient.
- United States: US federal courts are divided. Under Section 43(c) of the Lanham Act, famous marks receive broad federal anti-dilution protection. However, regarding unregistered foreign marks, circuits disagree on whether a pure "famous marks exception" overrides territoriality. While the Ninth Circuit (Grupo Gigante v. Dallo & Co., 2004) accepted that a famous foreign mark (well-known to local Mexican-American consumers) can defeat a local prior user, other circuits require direct domestic commercial use under traditional territorial standards.

2. A Comparative Assessment

A. Focus on Consumer Affordability

Under international exhaustion, once a genuine trademarked product is placed on the market anywhere in the world by the brand owner or with their consent, the trademark rights in those physical goods are exhausted globally. The rights-holder cannot invoke domestic trademark law to block third parties from parallel-importing those items into another country.

- India: Codified under Section 30(3) and Section 30(4) of the Indian Trade Marks Act, 1999, Indian courts (e.g., Kapil Wadhwa v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd., 2012) confirmed that India adheres to international exhaustion. The Delhi High Court held that parallel imports of genuine branded goods are lawful provided the goods have been lawfully acquired abroad and do not suffer from "material differences" that impair quality.
- Economic Rationale: Favored by developing economies to promote competition, reduce consumer prices, and prevent multinational corporations from geographically segmenting global markets to engage in price discrimination.

B. The European Union Model

As detailed in Section 3.2, the European Union strictly enforces regional exhaustion throughout the European Economic Area (EEA), codified under Article 15 of the European Union Trade Mark Regulation (EUTMR).

- The Barrier to Third Countries: While goods move freely once sold within the EEA, brand owners retain absolute legal rights under CJEU jurisprudence (Silhouette v. Hartlauer, C-355/96) to block parallel imports originating from non-EEA countries (such as the US, UK, or Asia).
- Economic Rationale: Balances the internal free movement of goods within the EU single market against a protective trade barrier securing regional brand investments against external price arbitrage.

© JUL 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 10 Issue 1 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1720210

C. The United States Approach

The United States applies a nuanced approach that blends the first sale doctrine with strict consumer protection limitations under Section 42 of the Lanham Act.

- The Material Differences Doctrine: Under established US jurisprudence (K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc., 1988; Lever Bros. Co. v. United States, 1993), parallel imports of genuine goods bearing a US-registered trademark are unlawful if the foreign goods differ materially from the domestic product.
- Threshold for Materiality: US courts interpret "material differences" extraordinarily broadly. A difference is material if consumers would consider it relevant when making a purchasing decision, including variations in formulation, warranty coverage, packaging language, quality control standards, or electrical voltage standards. If material differences exist, the sale of grey-market goods constitutes trademark infringement because it causes consumer confusion and damages local brand goodwill.

Limitations of WIPO and WTO

The international governance of trademark law relies primarily on two multilateral organizations: the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). While these institutions have established foundational international treaties—such as the Paris Convention, the Madrid System, and the TRIPS Agreement—their structural frameworks exhibit fundamental limitations when confronting the realities of modern cross-border commercial trade.

1. Structural Limitations of WIPO: Consensus Paralysis and the Turn to "Soft Law"

As a specialized agency of the United Nations, WIPO administers core international agreements governing intellectual property. However, its institutional design limits its ability to enact binding substantive reform:

- The Consensus Requirement and Geopolitical Gridlock: Negotiating new binding multilateral treaties within WIPO requires broad consensus among over 190 member states. Because developed exporting nations (favoring strong, expansive IP protections) and developing importing nations (favoring national sovereignty and broader public domain flexibility) hold opposing trade priorities, negotiating new substantive trademark treaties has reached institutional paralysis.
- Administrative Focus Over Substantive Harmonization: WIPO has excelled at streamlining administrative processes—most notably through the Madrid System and the Trademark Law Treaty (TLT). However, administrative efficiency does not equal substantive harmonization. WIPO agreements expressly avoid resolving core substantive legal divides, such as mandating a single rule on first-to-file versus first-to-use or standardizing the definition of bad-faith filings.
- Reliance on Non-Binding "Soft Law": To bypass treaty deadlock, WIPO transitioned toward issuing non-binding Joint Recommendations—such as the 1999 Joint Recommendation Concerning Provisions on the Protection of Well-Known Marks. While these guidelines provide valuable authoritative criteria for national registries, they carry no binding legal weight. Sovereign courts and domestic legislatures remain free to adopt, modify, or completely ignore them without international legal consequence.

V. CONCLUSION

1. Core Findings

Territoriality Persists: Intellectual property rights remain bound to individual sovereign states, creating a fundamental friction with borderless international commerce and digital trade.

- The Systemic Divide: The clash between first-to-file (civil law) and first-to-use (common law) systems continues to drive cross-border vulnerabilities like bad-faith trademark squatting.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1720210

- Incomplete Harmonization: International treaties (Paris, TRIPS, Madrid) have achieved administrative efficiency, but substantive legal rules—such as the exhaustion of rights and judicial extraterritoriality—remain fragmented.
- Digital Impasse: Online platforms and global e-commerce struggle with inconsistent jurisdictional rules (targeting tests) and high enforcement costs for brand owners.

2. Policy & Institutional Reforms

- Mandatory Bad-Faith Rules: Elevate non-binding WIPO soft law into binding treaty obligations under Paris/TRIPS to require ex officio bad-faith rejection of pre-emptive filings.
- Harmonized Internet Jurisdiction: Establish a uniform "commercial targeting" standard so courts only exercise jurisdiction over foreign websites genuinely aiming at local markets.
- Madrid Protocol Updates: Shorten the 5-year "Central Attack" window to 2 years to reduce international dependency risks.
- Platform Safe-Harbor Standards: Standardize notice-and-takedown timelines and enforce "know-your-business-customer" (KYBC) rules across global e-commerce platforms.

3. Brand Owner Strategies

Proactive & Defensive Filings: File early in prospective markets, including local-language character transliterations (e.g., Chinese/Arabic scripts) and defensive classes.

- Supply Chain Safeguards: Execute strict contracts with foreign Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) and record trademarks directly with local customs authorities for port export seizures.
- Hybrid Registration Strategy: Combine Madrid Protocol filings for stable markets with direct national filings in high-risk first-to-file countries.
- Digital Automation: Enroll in platform brand registries (e.g., Amazon, Alibaba) and automated registry watch services.

4. Future Research Directions

- AI & Consumer Confusion: How AI purchasing agents alter the traditional "likelihood of confusion" test and who bears liability for algorithmic infringement.
- Virtual Goods & Web3: Extending real-world trademark protection into metaverses and enforcing rights on decentralized, non-ICANN blockchain domains (.eth, .sol).
- Regional Realignment: Evaluating whether regional IP harmonization models (like EUIPO or ARIPO) offer better solutions than struggling multilateral WTO/WIPO frameworks.