

**CITY OF LONDON LAW SOCIETY (“CLLS”) IP LAW COMMITTEE**  
**(THE “COMMITTEE”)**

Minutes of the Committee Meeting held at 6:00pm on 5 November 2025 at the offices of Lewis Silkin LLP 255 Blackfriars Rd, London SE1 9AX (the “**Meeting**”) hosted by Oliver Fairhurst.

**Present:** David Parrish, CMS (Chair)  
Rachel Anderson, CMS (RA) (Secretary)  
Oliver Fairhurst, Lewis Silkin (OF)  
Jessica Le Gros, Baker McKenzie (JLG)  
Beverley Potts, A&O Shearman (BP)  
Huw Evans, Gowling (HE)  
Jonathan Turnbull, Herbert Smith Freehills (JT)  
Priya Nagpal, Simmons & Simmons (PN) (virtual)

**Apologies:** Kevin Hart, CLLS (KH)  
Mike Knapper, Norton Rose Fulbright (MK)  
Caroline Young, Charles Russell Speechlys (CY)  
Adam Rendle, Taylor Wessing (AR)  
Morag Macdonald, Bird & Bird (MM)  
Emily Nuttall-Wood, Addleshaw Goddard (ENW)

together, the “**Members**”.

**1. Introductions**

The Chair opened the meeting, and apologies were given from those who were not able to attend.

**2. Minutes from July Meeting**

The minutes from the July meeting were approved for upload to the CLLS website.

**Action:** July minutes to be uploaded to the CLLS IP Committee webpage.

**3. CLLS Committee Chairs Meeting**

The Chair had circulated notes from the recent CLLS Committee Chairs meeting. It was noted that the Committee had found it difficult to comment on the Copyright consultation due to the broad-church of client interests and opposing views. Other committee chairs had encountered similar difficulties in providing unified positions on policy decisions. The CLLS remains keen for committees to contribute to consultations where possible.

**4. Company Names Tribunal Delays**

The Chair reported on ongoing work with the Law Society's IP Committee to address delays at the Company Names Tribunal. Statistics had been collated demonstrating significant delays, including instances where it had taken the Tribunal three months just to process an initial application. The Chair has made the Law Society's IP Committee aware of these issues, given they are in discussions with the Company Names Tribunal on this matter.

Members discussed additional concerns, including the increasing number of companies with names that appear fraudulent, and difficulties in enforcing Tribunal orders where companies have breached terms.

It was suggested that a streamlined or pro forma initial complaint process could be beneficial, similar to the approach used at the EUIPO where the initial opposition filing is very simple, with detailed submissions and evidence are required later. Given that very few complaints are defended (statistics showed decisions in only 4 defended applications in 2024), a simplified initial form was considered reasonable.

**Action:** Chair to follow up with contact at the Law Society's IP Committee and provide an update at the next meeting.

## **5. UKIPO Designs Consultation**

The Committee discussed the UKIPO Designs consultation, which contains 214 questions. The deadline to submit responses is 27 November 2025. The Law Society's IP Committee had approached the Committee to ask whether they were contributing to the consultation.

Some firms had decided not to contribute due to the broad range of client interests, whilst others are contributing on behalf of clients. It was noted that not all questions require a response, and some are directed specifically at businesses.

The Committee agreed to contribute responses to selected questions where a consensus position could be reached. There are a number of questions on animated designs which were considered less controversial.

The Vice Chair shared with the Chair details of an event in the following week in which the UKIPO would give an overview of the designs consultation.

**Action:** Chair to distribute a highlighted version of the questions indicating areas where the Committee may be able to respond.

## **6. INTA 2026 Annual Meeting**

The Committee discussed potential activities for the INTA 2026 Annual Meeting taking place in London.

It was noted that the Commercial Law Committee had prepared a one-page document promoting English law and English lawyers, which could serve as a model for IP-specific messaging. Members discussed the possibility of creating similar materials highlighting London as a forum for trade mark disputes and explaining why international disputes are often coordinated from London. Materials could highlight the benefits of conducting such litigation in London – including the shorter trials scheme and being the home of firms that have been named "UPC Firm of the Year".

The Committee decided against hosting a formal event during the conference itself, so as to not detract from INTA's events. Instead, the Committee agreed to prepare information materials welcoming delegates to London, and showcasing the depth of IP practice in the City.

A separate event aimed at young practitioners, focused on diversity in the profession, was considered worthwhile but should be organised independently of INTA.

**Action:** Members to consider content for promotional materials about London's IP offering.

**Action:** Members to explore booking space at the Law Society for a potential young practitioners' event.

## **7. AOB**

The Committee discussed the date for the next meeting. It was agreed that meetings would remain in-person and in the evening. Lunchtime meetings would be too difficult from a scheduling perspective.

**Action:** Secretary to send a placeholder for Thursday 22 January 2026. Call for members to volunteer hosting the next meeting.

No other areas of business were raised. The Chair closed the Meeting.