

Schriften zum geistigen Eigentum  
und zum Wettbewerbsrecht

80

Claire Guillemin

## Law & Odeur

Fragrance Protection in the Fields of Perfumery  
and Cosmetics



**Nomos**



Schriften zum geistigen Eigentum  
und zum Wettbewerbsrecht

Herausgegeben von

Prof. Dr. Christian Berger, Universität Leipzig  
Prof. Dr. Horst-Peter Götting, Techn. Universität Dresden

Band 80

Claire Guillemin

## Law & Odeur

Fragrance Protection in the Fields of Perfumery  
and Cosmetics



**Nomos**

**The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek** lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

a.t.: Hamburg, Bucerius Law School, Diss., 2015

ISBN 978-3-8487-2696-7 (Print)  
978-3-8452-7040-1 (ePDF)

#### **British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-8487-2696-7 (Print)  
978-3-8452-7040-1 (ePDF)

#### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Guillemin, Claire

Law & Odeur

Fragrance Protection in the Fields of Perfumery and Cosmetics

Claire Guillemin

227 p.

Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN 978-3-8487-2696-7 (Print)  
978-3-8452-7040-1 (ePDF)

1. Edition 2016

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany 2016. Printed and bound in Germany.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to "Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort", Munich.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Nomos or the author.

*“Or, jusqu’ici, tous les beaux parfums créés ont été outrageusement et impunément copiés de multiples fois dès leur apparition sur le marché.”*  
(Edmond Roudnitska, Le Parfum, 1985)



## Acknowledgements

This Dissertation was accepted by the Bucerius Law School – Hochschule für Rechtswissenschaft – in Hamburg on 6 November, 2013. The final oral exam took place on 8 January, 2014.

Since the time I completed the original draft of this thesis in 2012 there have been a number of developments in the jurisprudence relevant to intellectual property protection for fragrances. I have updated my original draft to reflect these developments, but caution the reader that, given the current volatility of intellectual property law in this lively area, some of the information presented here may soon benefit from additional updating.

I am very happy and grateful to write these introductory, yet valedictory lines. The encouragement, patience and support from many sides have made this academic challenge possible and I would like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest thanks to:

My advisor and first examiner, Prof. Dr. Karsten Thorn, for accepting me on as a doctoral candidate despite his many other professional and academic commitments and for giving me the freedom to choose and pursue a subject dear to me. My second examiner, Prof. Dr. Dana Beldiman, not only for her native-speaker review of my thesis but also for her invaluable insights regarding intellectual property and innovation law;

My thesis colleagues of the “Sylt-group,” for their tips and encouragement, and to all of my friends who periodically cleared my mind of academic preoccupations;

All of the perfumers, attorneys, chemists and experts of the fragrance industry who welcomed me and helped me broaden my understanding of this fascinating industry;

The International Fragrance Association (IFRA), and its President Pierre Sivac, for providing me the opportunity to apply in a professional capacity the expertise acquired through my doctoral studies;

Many colleagues and amiable librarians who provided me access to obscure articles and jurisprudence relating to fragrance and intellectual property;

My “lectors” Charles Cronin and Dr. Friedrich Rosenfeld for their patience, precious advice and suggestions.



*Acknowledgements*

My family for their love and encouragement. My mother and my father for supporting me in every possible way, my brothers for motivating me (“What? Still not finished yet?”), my children for being a breeze of fresh air in this legal work and especially my husband Teja for pushing me towards excellence and always believing in me through the best and worst moments of this doctoral journey.

I owe you all my deepest gratitude. Thank you, merci, vielen Dank!

Hamburg, September 2015

*Claire Guillemin*

## Table of Contents

Table of Abbreviations	19
§ 1 Introduction	23
I. Fragrance Protection Issue	23
II. Subject Matter Definition	26
III. Outline of the Present Study	28
Part 1: Fragrance Fundamentals	30
§ 2 Perfume Through the Ages	30
I. Perfume in Ancient Times	30
II. Modern Perfumery	32
§ 3 Behind the Scenes of Perfumery	35
I. The Flavour and Fragrance Industry	35
1. A Handful of Powerful Companies	35
2. The Fragrance Industry	36
II. Perfume and Cosmetic Brands	37
III. The Perfumers	38
1. “Métier”	38
2. Creative Process and Commercial Constraints	39
§ 4 The Two Aspects of Perfume	42
I. The Olfactory Source	42
1. Natural Raw Materials	42
a) Origin	42
b) Process	43
2. Synthetic Raw Materials	44
a) Origin	44
(i) Nature Isolates	45
(ii) Synthesised Chemicals	45
(iii) Discoveries	45

## *Table of Contents*

b) Advantages	45
3. Nature Identical Materials	46
a) Headspace	47
b) SPME	47
4. The Mixture of Raw Materials	47
II. The Olfactory Form	48
1. Definition	48
a) An Abstract Notion	48
b) Classification	49
2. Evolutionary Character	50
a) Architecture	50
b) Transformation	51
§ 5 Perception and Identification of the Olfactory Form	52
I. The Smell Sense	52
1. Physiology	52
2. Memorisation	54
II. The Question of Subjectivity	54
1. Chacun ses Goûts	54
2. Poverty of the Olfactory Language	55
3. The Difficulty of Describing Smells	56
§ 6 Olfactory Measurement Methods	58
1. Physical and Chemical Measures	58
a) Gas Chromatography	58
b) Mass Spectrometry	59
c) Nuclear Magnetic Resonance	59
d) Electronic Noses	59
2. A Doubled Edged Sword	60
a) Fine Fragrance Reverse Engineering	60
b) Proving Perfume Copies	61
(i) Limits of Olfactory Measurement	61
(ii) Sensory Analysis	61
§ 7 From Fragrance Imitation to Fragrance Infringement	62
I. Lawful Copying of Fine Fragrance	62
1. Copying as Technical Education	62

2. Copying as Inspiration	63
II. Fine Fragrance Infringement	63
1. Fragrance Knockoff	63
a) Characteristics	63
b) Joint Copies	64
c) Replicas of the Fragrance	65
2. Fragrances with a Completely New Identity	66
§ 8 Conclusion of Part 1	67
Part 2: Fragrances and Patents	69
§ 9 Patent Protection	69
I. Definitions and Legal Bases	69
II. Enforcement	70
1. Patent Application	70
2. Rights under Patents	70
III. Patentability Requirements	71
1. Three of Four Conditions?	71
2. The Concept of Invention in European Law	72
§ 10 The Olfactory Invention	74
I. Inventive Scope	74
1. Exclusion of Aesthetic Creations	74
2. Fragrances as Inventions	75
II. Formula of the Olfactory Source	76
1. Fragrance Formula	76
2. Chemical Formula	77
III. Ingredients of the Olfactory Source	78
1. Natural Raw Materials	78
a) As Such	78
b) As Intermediary Chemical Products	79
2. Synthetic Raw Materials	79
a) Classification	79
b) A Lucrative Business	80
§ 11 Olfactory Source and Patentability Requirements	82
I. Novelty	82

*Table of Contents*

II. Inventive Step	83
1. Non-Obviousness	83
a) The Person “Skilled in the Art”	83
b) Obvious and Non-Obvious Scents	83
2. Perfume and Technical Aspect	84
III. Industrial Applicability	85
§ 12 Practical Relevance of Patent Protection for Perfumes	86
I. Formal Obstacles	86
1. Duration of the Protection	86
a) Perfumes	86
b) Synthetic Materials	87
2. Costs of Protection	87
II. Substantial Obstacles	88
1. Necessary Technical Character	88
2. Disclosure of the Formula	89
§ 13 Conclusion of Part 2	90
Part 3: Fragrances and Trademarks	92
§ 14 Trademark Protection	92
I. Trademark Definition	92
1. Function of a Trademark	92
2. Evolution of Trademarks over the Years	93
II. Legal Bases	94
1. Community Law	94
a) Harmonisation within the Member States	94
b) Registration Requirements	95
(i) Graphical Representation	95
(ii) Distinctiveness	96
2. International Law	96
a) Trademark Law Treaty	96
b) WTO	97
III. Trademark Registration	97
1. Application Process	97
a) Community Application	98
b) International Application	98

2. Advantages of Trademark Protection	98
§ 15 The Olfactory Sign	99
I. Different Kinds of Olfactory Signs	99
1. Fragrant Products	99
a) Naturally and Usually Scented Products	99
b) “Unscented” Products	101
(i) Fragrant Valorisation of Neutral Smelling Products	101
(ii) Hiding a Natural Unpleasant Smell	101
2. Perfumed Places	102
a) Corporate Smells	102
b) Atmosphere Smells	103
II. From the Olfactory Sign to the Olfactory Mark	104
1. Why an Olfactory Mark?	104
2. The Perception Problem	107
a) Access to the Smell	107
b) Evolution and Recognition	108
§ 16 The Registration of Olfactory Signs in Practice	109
I. Pioneering Applications in Common Law	109
1. The First Historical Registration in the US	109
2. Three Olfactory Mark Applications in the UK	111
a) The Chanel Failure	112
b) Perfumed Tyres and Darts Successes	112
3. Olfactory Trademark Practice in Australia and New Zealand	113
II. Regressive Evolution of the Jurisprudence in the EU	114
1. Controversial Acceptance of Olfactory Marks by the OHIM	115
a) “The Smell of Fresh Cut Grass”	115
(i) Acceptance of the First Olfactory Community Mark	115
(ii) The Controversy	116
b) “The Scent of Raspberries”	119
(i) Confirmation of the Registrability	119
(ii) Lack of Distinctive Character	119
2. Clear Opposition by the European Court of Justice	120
a) The “Sieckmann” Case	120

*Table of Contents*

b) Community Jurisprudence in the Light of the “Sieckmann” Case	124
(i) Only Few and Unsuccessful Applications	124
1) “Coloured Matrix” (CTM-Application No. 521 914)	124
2) “Virginia Tobacco” (CTM-Application No. 566 596)	125
3) The “Smell of Ripe Strawberries” (CTM-Application No. 1 122 118)	126
4) “The Smell of Vanilla” (CTM-Application No. 1 807 353)	127
5) The Smell of Lemon (CTM-Application No. 1 254 861)	127
6) The Taste of Oranges (CTM-Application No. 3 132 404)	128
(ii) A Negative Impact on National Jurisprudence	128
§ 17 The Inherent Difficulties of Olfactory Signs	130
I. The Graphical Representation Ambiguity	130
1. Discrepancy Between Legal Texts and Reality	130
a) Direct Representation v. Indirect Representation	130
b) Criticism as to Potential Constitutional Conflicts	131
c) Graphical Representation Conditioned by Flexible Interpretation of Legal Texts	133
2. Review of the Graphical Representation Means	134
a) The Verbal Description	134
(i) Simple Smells	135
1) Colour and Music Analogy	135
2) Scope of Protection and Common-Sense	136
(ii) Complex Scents	139
1) Limits of Verbal Description.	139
2) Accurate Description of a Fragrance by its Name	140
b) Picture of the Fragrant Product	141
c) The Chemical Formula	141
d) Samples	143
(i) Invalid Means of Graphic Representation	143
(ii) Practical Issues	144

e) Modern Smell Recording Methods	145
II. Distinctiveness Issue for Fragrances	146
1. The Smell, Substance or Signature?	146
2. Generic Fragrances	148
§ 18 Conclusion of Part 3	149
Part 4: Fragrances and Copyright	150
§ 19 Copyright Protection	150
I. Definition	150
1. Origin and Purpose	150
2. Copyright /Authors' Rights	151
II. Application	151
1. Legal Basis	151
2. Copyright Conditions	152
a) Non-Exhaustive Legal Framing	152
b) Existence of a Perceptible Form	153
c) Originality	154
3. A Generous Protection	155
§ 20 Chronology of Fragrances and Copyright Case Law	156
I. Short Overview	156
II. 1974- 1999: First Hesitant Decisions	157
1. 3 July 1975: Rochas v. de Laire	157
2. 6 June 1997: Kenzo and Tamaris v. Parfums Via Paris	159
3. 28 June 2000: Clarins v. Batignolles and Pierre Cattier	160
4. 24 Sept. 1999: Mugler v. Molinard	161
III. 2003-2006: A Succession of Favourable Decisions in France	163
1. 26 May 2004: L'Oréal v. Bellure	163
2. 4 June 2004: BPI v. Bellure et Eva France	164
3. 17 Sept. 2004: BPI v. Bellure and Euro Media	165
4. 23 May 2006: BPI v. Senteur Mazal	166
IV. 2006: Cassation Quash and Divergent Decisions of European Higher Instances	167
1. 13 June 2006: Nejla Bsiri-Barbir v. Haarmann-Reimer	167
2. 16 June 2006: Lancôme v. Kecofa	168



*Table of Contents*

V. 2006-2007: Clear Resistance of Lower French Courts	170
1. 28 Nov. 2006: L'Oréal v. Bellure	170
2. 14 Feb. 2007: BPI v. Senteur Mazal	170
3. 13 Sept. 2007: Lancôme v. Argeville	171
VI 2008-2009: Double Confirmation of Cassation's Position	
.	172
1. 1 July 2008: BPI v. Senteur Mazal	172
2. 22 Jan. 2009: Lancôme v. Argeville	172
VII. 2009-2010: Resistance at Any Cost	172
1. 6 April 2009: Lancôme v. Patrice Farque	172
2. 30 April 2009: BPI v. Coscentra Sales et Autres	173
3. 22 Oct. 2009: L'Oréal v. Bellure	173
4. 20 May 2010: BPI v. Millenium Diffusion	174
5. 10 December 2010: Lancôme v. Argeville	175
VIII. 2012-2013: Judgement and Condamnation!?	176
1. 11 April 2001 and 10 December 2013: Lancôme v. Patrice Farque	176
2. 11 April 2014: Lancôme Parfums et Beauté & Cie et a.c./Pin (Pirate-Parfum)	178
§ 21 Olfactory Form and Implicit Copyright Requirements	179
I. Non-Exhaustive Legal Framing and Intention of Legislation	179
II. Perceptibility of the Olfactory Form	182
1. Stability of the Olfactory Form	182
2. Objective Description of the Olfactory Form	184
III. Determination and Pitfalls of Originality	186
1. Personal Imprint	186
2. Novelty	187
3. Success	188
4. Creative Process	189
§ 22 Is an Olfactory Form a Work of Intellect?	190
I. Intellectual Activity and Know-How in Perfumery	190
1. Perfume and Music	190
2. Perfume and Culinary Recipes	192
3. Perfume and Industrial Environment	194
4. Chemists or Artists?	195

II. The Ambivalent Position of the Cour de Cassation	198
1. A Devious Reasoning?	198
a) Introduction of a Preliminary Obstacle	198
b) Arbitrary Exclusion of a Style	199
c) Incontestable Interaction of Art and Know-How	201
2. Or a Wise Decision?	202
a) Fear of Consequences	202
b) Limits of Chemical Senses	203
c) Applicability to Fragrances Opens a Wide Way	204
(i) Dangers of a Too Welcoming Right	204
(ii) Unpleasant Smells	205
(iii) Other Sensorial Creations	206
d) Legal Consequences for the Fragrance Industry	207
e) Economic Repercussions	210
§ 23 Conclusion of Part 4	211
§ 24 Recapitulation and Final Summary	212
I. Recapitulation	212
1. Mitigated Relevance of Patent Protection for Olfactory Inventions	212
2. The Unlucky Fate of Olfactory Marks	213
3. The Ambivalent Negation of Olfactory Works	215
II. Final Summary	215
Bibliography	221



## Table of Abbreviations

Art.	Article
AU	Australia
BGH	Bundesgerichtshof (Germany)
BOA	Board of Appeal
BPI	Beauté Prestige International
BPatG	Bundespatentgericht (Germany)
CA	Cour d'appel (France)
Cass. civ.	Cour de Cassation, chambre civile (France)
Cass. com.	Cour de Cassation, chambre commerciale (France)
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
Ch.	Chambre (Chamber)
CPI	Code de la Propriété Intellectuelle
CSUSA Journal	Journal of the Copyright Society of the USA
CTM	Community Trade Mark
D.	Recueil Dalloz
DE	Germany
EC	European Community
ECJ	European Court of Justice
e.g.	for example
EIPR	European Intellectual Property Review
EP	European Patent
EPC	European Patent Convention (Munich Convention)
EPO	European Patent Office
EU	European Union
FR	France
Gaz. Pal.	Gazette du Palais
GC	Gas Chromatography
GRUR	Gewerblicher Rechtsschutz und Urheberrecht
GRUR Int.	Gewerblicher Rechtsschutz und Urheberrecht, internationaler Teil
HPLC	High Performance Liquid Chromatography

## *Table of Abbreviations*

HR	Hoge Raad der Nederlanden (Netherlands)
IIC	International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law
IDEA	IDEA: The Intellectual Property Law Review
IFF	International Flavors and Fragrances
INPI	Institut National de la Propriété Industrielle (France)
IR	Infrared
ISIPCA	Institut Supérieur du Parfum de la Cosmétique et de l'Aromatique Alimentaire
JCP	Juris-Classeur Périodique (La Semaine Juridique)
JDI	Journal du Droit International
LMZ	Lebensmittel Zeitung
LPA	Les Petites Affiches
MarkenR	MarkenRecht Zeitschrift
MarqIntellPropLRev	Marquette Intellectual Property Law Review
MS	Mass Spectrometry
MitttdtPatA.	Mitteilungen der deutschen Patentanwälte
No.	Number
NMR	Nuclear Magnetic Resonance
NZ	New Zealand
OHIM	Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market
p. /pp.	Page /pages
para.	Paragraph
P&F	Perfumer & Flavorist Magazine
PIBD	Propriété Industrielle Bulletin Documentaire
Propr. Intell.	Propriétés Intellectuelles
RDPI	Revue du Droit de la Propriété Intellectuelle
RIDA	Revue Internationale de Droit d'Auteur
RIPIA	Revue Internationale de la Propriété Industrielle et Artistique
RJJ	Revue Jurassienne de Jurisprudence
RLDC	Revue Lamy de Droit Civil
RRJ	Revue de la Recherche Juridique
RSJ	Revue Suisse de Jurisprudence
SCF	Super Critical Fluid
SPME	Solid Phase Micro Extraction

*Table of Abbreviations*

T.com	Tribunal de commerce (France)
TGI	Tribunal de grande instance (France)
TMR	The Trademark Reporter
TTAB	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (United States)
USPTO	United States Patent and Trademark Office
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
UV	Ultraviolet
v.	Versus
Vol.	Volume
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organisation
WIPO Mag.	World Intellectual Property Organisation Magazine
WiWo	Wirtschaftswoche
WRP	Wettbewerb in Recht und Praxis

