

Etty Indrawati, 2024

Volume 10, pp. 125-138

Received: 04th April 2024

Revised: 24th May 2024, 28th May 2024, 31st May 2024

Accepted: 09th April 2024

Date of Publication: 15th June 2024

DOI- <https://doi.org/10.20319/mijst.2024.10.125138>

This paper can be cited as: Indrawati, E. (2024). Law Enforcement Against Trademark Infringement in Indonesia. *MATTER: International Journal of Science and Technology*, 10, 125-138.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AGAINST TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT IN INDONESIA

Etty Indrawati

Faculty of Law, Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, Indonesia

etty.indrawati@uajy.ac.id

Abstract

Trademark as part of intellectual property rights is one of the most important elements in the business world. The number of trademark infringements that occurred in Indonesia from 2015 to 2023 shows an increasing trend. The purposes of this research are to explore and analyze the cause of trademark infringement and to investigate how efforts should be made to solve and reduce the number of trademark infringements in Indonesia. This research is normative legal research underpinned by interviews as well as through library research. Interviews were conducted with resource persons using interview guidelines. Then, data were analyzed using qualitative analysis. The result shows that the reason for trademark infringement is economic reasons. The offending party has bad intentions and assumes that the business whose trademark is to be imitated has good potential and person concerned can obtain a reasonable profit (good turnover potential) if using the same or similar trademark. The second is the party whose trademark is used by another party without rights needs to make a complaint about the trademark infringement because the infringement of intellectual property rights (including

trademark infringement) is a complaint of violation that must be reported by the injured party to the law enforcer.

Keywords

Law Enforcement, Trademark Infringement, Intellectual Property Rights

1. Introduction

Law enforcement of trademark infringement needs attention. This is because Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) infringements that occur in the business world are increasing, especially when it comes to trademark infringement. Trademark as part of intellectual property rights is one of the most important elements in the business world. In line with this, the era of global trade can only be maintained if there is a fair climate of business competition, in which the trademark holds a very important role that requires a more sufficient regulatory system.

A trademark (with its brand image) can meet consumer needs for identification or a very important identifier and is a guarantee of the products or services' quality in free competition. Based on this, a trademark is an economic asset for its owners, both individuals and companies (legal entities) that can generate large profits, and can be accepted if it is utilized with due regard to business and good management processes (Sutedi, 2009).

Trademark protection is one form of legal certainty needed by investors, both domestic and foreign (Rafla & Apriani, 2022). The legal certainty also expects law enforcement that is still lacking. This can be reflected in the number of trademark infringements in court that have not been resolved. It is very ironic, considering that Indonesia already has a definite set of legal rules. Law enforcement of trademark infringement is certainly not only based on the substance component of the provisions of the trademark law but also on how these provisions are enforced by taking into account the elements of legal certainty, expediency and justice (Blakeney, 2005).

The consideration of the part of letter a of Law Number 20 Year of 2016 concerning Trademark and Geographical Indications (hereinafter referred to as Trademark Law) states that in the era of global trade, in line with international conventions which have been ratified by Indonesia, the role of Trademarks and Geographical Indications becomes very important, especially in maintaining fair business competition. Based on this, it becomes interesting and relevant to investigate law enforcement against trademark infringement in Indonesia.

2. Research Method

This research is normative legal research underpinned by interviews as well as through library research by tracing secondary data, using documentation methods and instruments in the form of document studies. Interviews conducted in this research are a complementary or supporting tool for secondary data. Interviews in this research were conducted with two resource persons, namely one person from the Directorate General of Intellectual Property (Ditjen KI) and one person from the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU), using interview guidelines. Then, data were analyzed using qualitative analysis.

3. Literature Review

Disputes relating to Intellectual Property (IP) protection are gradually increasing. Resolution by state courts resulting in expensive and time-consuming mechanism (Gandhi, 2022). Based on normative regulation, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) disputes can be classified into three categories (Sulistiyono, 2008), namely:

A. Administrative Disputes

Administrative disputes are any disputes that occur between the party applying for Intellectual Property Rights / IPR (applicant) and the Government (Directorate General of Intellectual Property / Directorate General of IP), relating to the rejection of applications made by the Directorate General of IP due to not fulfilling several requirements as stipulated in the normative rules; or disputes between IPR holders and the Directorate General of IP with Third Parties, relating to the lawsuit for the cancellation of IPR due to alleged administrative decision errors that have been issued by the Directorate General of IP.

B. Civil Disputes

Regarding civil disputes in the field of intellectual property rights, the institutions that can be accessed by the public to obtain justice are district courts, commercial courts, arbitration and alternative dispute resolution. Civil disputes can arise due to differences in interpretation of the contents of the agreement or one of the parties defaulting on the agreement (license agreement) that they had previously agreed upon. In connection with this type of dispute, the injured party can file a

lawsuit procedure through a judicial institution (district court, commercial court), arbitration or non-litigation process.

C. Criminal Disputes

Trademark Law relies on the criminal prosecution process based on the principle of complaint offence. Through this principle, the injured trademark owner must first report the infringement that has been conducted by the other party before the prosecution is processed further by the investigator (Utomo, 2010).

Trademark as a form of intellectual property, has an important role in promoting and improving the trading of goods or services in Indonesia (Gultom, 2018). Based on Article 1 number 1 of the Trademark Law, a trademark is a sign that can be displayed graphically in the form of images, logos, names, words, letters, numbers, colour arrangements, in the form of 2 (two) dimensions and/or 3 (three) dimensions, sound, holograms, or a combination of 2 (two) or more of these elements to distinguish goods and/or services produced by persons or legal entities in the trading activities of goods and/or services. Trademarks as stipulated in Article 2 paragraph (2) of the Trademark Law include trademarks and service marks, with the following definitions (Utomo, 2010):

- A.** Trademarks are marks used on goods traded by a person or several persons jointly or legal entities to distinguish from other similar goods.

Example: Coca-Cola, Sanyo, Honda

- B.** Service Marks are marks used on services traded by a person or several persons jointly or legal entities to distinguish from other similar services.

Examples: Bank of America, Bumiputera Insurance, Horison Hotel

The trademarks have important roles. For producers, trademarks are used to guarantee the value of their products, especially regarding quality, convenience of use or things that are generally related to the technology. For traders, trademarks are used for the promotion of merchandise to find and expand the market. For the consumer, the trademark is needed to make a choice of goods to be purchased. The trademark can also serve to stimulate the growth of industry and trade that is fair and beneficial to all parties. (Usman, 2003). In essence, a trademark is used by the producer or owner of the trademark to protect its products, either in the form of services or other trade goods. Based on this, a trademark has the following functions (Purwaningsih, 2005):

- A.** Differentiating function, which distinguishes one company's product from another company's product.
- B.** The reputation guarantee function, which in addition to being a sign of the origin of the product, also personally connects the reputation of the branded product with the manufacturer, as well as providing quality assurance for the product.
- C.** Promotion function, the trademark is also used as a means of introducing new products and maintaining the reputation of old products that are traded, as well as to dominate the market.
- D.** The function of investment stimulation and industrial growth, namely the trademark can support industrial growth through capital investment, both foreign and domestic in facing the free market mechanism.

Along with the advancement of science and technology, a person or legal entity can use science and technology to violate a trademark for profit, one of the examples is the counterfeiting of the trademark. Acts of counterfeiting of trademarks are carried out by parties who have bad intentions to gain as much profit as possible in unfair and dishonest business competition using other parties' registered trademarks (Putri, 2018).

4. Research Results

4.1 Trademark Infringement in Indonesia

Trademark infringement that occurs in Indonesia is about two kinds of trademark similarities, namely similarities in the principle and similarities in the whole. The Explanation of Article 21 section (1) of the Trademark Law explains that what is meant by the similarity in the principle is the similarity caused by the existence of dominant elements between one trademark and another trademark to cause the impression of similarity, both regarding the form, the way of placement, the way of writing or a combination of the elements, as well as the similarity of speech sounds, which is found in the trademark.

A trademark is an identifier of goods or services for one company with other companies (Greene & Wilkerson, 2012). As an identifier, then the trademark in one classification of goods/services should not have similarities between one and the other either in the whole or in the principle (Sutedi, 2009). Harahap states that, "The similarity in the whole is the similarity of all the elements. Such a similarity is by the doctrine of entires similar or similar to the whole

elements" (Jened, 2015). The definition of "similar in the principle" is that the trademark used by the unauthorized party is not the same as the registered trademark, but it can still mislead consumers, especially consumers who are in a hurry to choose goods because between the registered trademark and the trademark used without the right is similar. This may occur in terms of colour combinations, fonts or other characteristics that are similar to the registered trademark (Miru, 2005).

The existence of similarity in the principle or the whole of a trademark with another trademark can be analyzed from the jurisprudence of the Supreme Court, namely (Shidarta, Susanto, Savitri and Chandra, 2014):

- A.** Similiarity in appearance confusing in appearance means similarity in appearance and confusing in appearance.
- B.** Similiarity in sound = confusion when pronounced means similarity in sound.
- C.** Similiarity in concept = similarity in concept means very similar which is called similarity.

Concerning trademark infringement, Poltorak and Lerner in their book entitled *Essentials of Intellectual Property* say that a mark that is confusingly similar to other marks cannot serve to distinguish the goods on which it is used from those of others. A mark that is confusingly similar to other marks, cannot serve to distinguish the goods of that mark from the goods of other marks (Poltorak and Lerner, 2002).

Common logic certainly understands that any act of counterfeiting, misleading or using other's trademarks without rights, imitation, reproduction, copying, pirating or piggybacking on the fame of others' trademarks, in trademark studies are considered acts: fraud, deception, misleading, using other's trademarks without rights (unauthorized use), is a violation of the law (Udin, S., 2024). This will certainly be appropriate if included in the realm of criminal law as stipulated in the Criminal Code (KUHP) or related laws, for example, which regulate trademarks (Damayanti, 2020).

The problem that then arises is regarding the infringement of intellectual property rights in this case the act of trademark infringement which could potentially qualify as unfair business competition (Chronopoulos, 2013). The reason for trademark infringement is economic reasons (Zaichkowsky, 2020). The offending party has bad intentions and assumes that the business whose trademark is to be imitated has good potential and person concerned can obtain a

reasonable profit (good turnover potential) if using the same or similar trademark. An act of trademark infringement can be qualified as an unfair business competition if the same type of business is conducted (Situmorang, 2019).

Famous trademark infringement cannot be solely based on the provisions stipulated in the Trademark Law only. This is because trademark infringement is related to the unlawful act stipulated in Article 1365 of the Civil Code or related to fraudulent competition stipulated in Article 382bis of the Criminal Code (KUHP). In other countries, trademark infringement is also related to the issue of fraudulent competition, for example: Japan in addition to having a Trademark Law, also has an Anti-Fraudulent Competition Law (Maulana, 2000).

Based on the few verdicts on trademark infringement, all actions that are included in the act of imitating, copying, or piggybacking on the fame of someone else's more famous or registered trademark, causing confusion and misleading the public, are not only classified as trademark infringement (Rumadan, 2020), however, it can also be qualified as an act of fraudulent competition or unfair business competition.

4.2 The Efforts to Solve and Reduce the Number of Trademark Infringements in Indonesia

The registered trademark holders whose trademarks are used by other parties without rights must take legal action against trademark infringement, both similarities in the principle and similarities in the whole with the trademarks owned (Mashdurohatun & Limbong, 2020). This needs certainly to be done so as not to become a bad precedent and as a form of proactive action in law enforcement against trademark infringement.

Law enforcement efforts through the courts and the police are used as the ultimate weapon or *ultimum remidium* when persuasive efforts have been made and are not responded to properly. Kinship approaches, warning letters and invitations to settlement have been made, but these persuasive efforts are often ignored.

The Directorate General of Intellectual Property has an important role as the institution that is responsible for the registration, protection and settlement of trademark disputes in Indonesia (Ramin, 2023). Ignatius MT. Silalahi, Head of the Sub-Directorate of Investigation of the Directorate General of Intellectual Property responded that what was done by the party whose trademark was used by another party without the right to make a report (complaint) about the trademark infringement was the right effort in following up on trademark infringement. This

is because the case related to the violation of intellectual property rights is a complaint offence that must be reported by the injured party to the law enforcer (Majid, 2014). Based on this, the party whose trademark is used by another party without rights needs to make a complaint about the trademark infringement and/or file a civil lawsuit, in the form of compensation, to stop the use of the infringed mark (Sinaga & Ferdian, 2020).

Unfair business competition in the use of trademarks without rights can also be sued based on acts against the law, where the plaintiff must prove that because of the defendant's unlawful acts, the plaintiff suffers a loss. Based on civil law, unfair business competition is said to be an act against the law if it meets the elements in Article 1365 of the Civil Code (Putri, 2018), namely:

- A.** Carried out against the law;
- B.** Causing losses for business competitors;
- C.** Made by mistake (intentionally or negligently);
- D.** There is a causal relationship between the act and the loss resulting from the act of a business which is against the law, that is if:
 - 1)** These acts are prohibited by law;
 - 2)** The act is contrary to decency;
 - 3)** The act is against public order;
 - 4)** The act is against compliance;
 - 5)** The act is contrary to honesty.

The process of implementing the trademark law policy will run according to the objectives if law enforcement is carried out consistently by applicable laws and regulations. Law enforcement related to the content of the policy stated by Jan Merse, namely the handling of violations of trademark law is related to law enforcement by the contents of the Trademark Law which contains sanctions for the infringers as well as the authority of the investigators and the process of determining the penalty for the infringers. Expectations or objectives of the implementation of trademark law policy will not run effectively if law enforcement does not run effectively (Wahyuni, Erma, Bahri and Tangkilisan, 2007).

An increase in law enforcement can be implemented through the empowerment of Commercial Court Judges and the political will of the government to enforce trademark law proportionally by providing appropriate penalties according to the article of violation and legal

sanctions to create a healthy economic climate nationally and internationally (Wahyuni et al., 2007). In this regard, the criminalization of the perpetrators of infringement of Intellectual Property Rights / IPR is intended by the lawmakers so that the offenders become deterrent after being subjected to criminal sanctions and other members of society are expected to be afraid when knowing the criminal sanctions on IPR infringement (Sulistiyono, 2008).

Sudikno explained that society expects legal certainty because with legal certainty society will be well-ordered. The law is responsible for creating legal certainty because it aims to create public order. The community on the other hand expects benefits in the implementation or enforcement of the law. Law is for humans, so the implementation of the law or law enforcement must provide benefits or be useful for the community. The community is very concerned that in the implementation or enforcement of the law, the element of justice is considered (Shidarta et al., 2014).

The resource person from the Directorate General of Intellectual Property said that the value of legal certainty has been fulfilled because there has been a decision, although there may be inconsistencies with the provisions of the Trademark Law. The value of justice and expediency may not have been obtained by the complainant/victim (Afif & Sugiyono, 2021). The value of justice may have been obtained by the defendant, but the defendant may also feel that he has not obtained justice because he feels not guilty (Situmorang, 2019). Based on Sudikno, in practice, it is not always easy to attempt a proportional (balanced) compromise between legal certainty, expediency and justice (Shidarta et al., 2014).

The parameters of the effectiveness of court decisions on trademark infringements start from the prosecution or *requisitur* of the Public Prosecutor (JPU) which should be by the provisions of the Trademark Law. This is because what is decided by the judge is based on what is demanded by the prosecutor. Usually, the judge's decision is below the prosecutor's demands (Situmorang, 2019).

The Criminal Provisions in Article 100 section (2) of the Trademark Law stipulates that any person who without right uses a trademark that is similar in principle to a registered trademark owned by another party for similar goods and/or services that are produced and/or traded shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of 4 (four) years and/or a maximum fine of Rp2,000,000,000.00 (two billion rupiahs). Some cases show that the prosecutor's demands for

the trademark infringement have been very low, so the judge's decision against the trademark infringer also becomes low.

A resource person from the Directorate General of Intellectual Property said that he did not agree if the punishment for the trademark infringer is based on the reason that the trademark infringement has not been committed for a long time. This is because the prosecutors and judges must pay attention and explore the provisions in the Trademark Law and the facts in the court. Another parameter is that the court's decision must have a deterrent effect on the trademark infringer. Court decisions on trademark infringements have not provided a deterrent effect for trademark infringers and have not been effective and efficient because trademark infringements continue to occur and the number is increasing (Situmorang, 2019).

The number of trademark infringements that occurred in Indonesia from 2015 to 2023

No.	Year	The number of trademark infringement
1.	2015	134
2.	2016	60
3.	2017	139
4.	2018	151
5.	2019	172
6.	2020	120
7.	2021	182
8.	2022	208
9.	2023	290

Source: data obtained from the Administrative Unit of the Directorate General of Intellectual Property

5. Conclusion

Based on the research and discussion, it can be concluded that the reason for trademark infringement is economic reasons. The offending party has bad intentions and assumes that the business whose trademark is to be imitated has good potential and person

concerned can obtain a reasonable profit (good turnover potential) if using the same or similar trademark. The party whose trademark is used by another party without rights needs to make a complaint about the trademark infringement and/or file a civil lawsuit, in the form of compensation, to stop the use of the infringed mark.

Based on the conclusion mentioned above, the suggestions given are as follows:

- A.** The authority to supervise monopolistic practices and unfair business competition is to the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). KPPU's response regarding trademark infringement tends to be positivistic (only looking at the provisions in the Business Competition Law). KPPU does not elaborate on what is happening in the community and is less concerned with actions that can be categorized as unfair business competition. It is necessary to optimize the implementation of KPPU's duties in examining allegations of unfair business competition that occur in the community but which are not or have not been regulated in the articles of the substance of the Business Competition Law.
- B.** Law enforcers, in this case, investigators, prosecutors and judges need to have an adequate understanding of trademark law and law enforcement of trademark infringement so that the process of law enforcement for trademark infringement can run well.

REFERENCES

Law and Regulation

Civil Code (*Staatsblad* Number 23 Year of 1847 about *Burgerlijk Wetboek Voor Indonesie*).

Law Number 20 the Year 2016 about Trademark and Geographical (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 252 the Year 2016, Addition State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5953).

Books, Journal Articles, Research Report, Magazine, Website Content

Afif, M. S., & Sugiyono, H. (2021). Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Pemegang Merek Terkenal Di Indonesia. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, 4(2), 565-585. doi:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.26623/julr.v4i2.4097>

Blakeney, M. (2005). Guidebook on enforcement of intellectual property rights. *Queen Mary Intellectual Property Research Institute*.

- Chronopoulos, A. (2013). Goodwill Appropriation as a Distinct Theory of Trademark Liability: A Study on the Misappropriation Rationale in Trademark and Unfair Competition Law. *Tex. Intell. Prop. LJ*, 22, 253.
- Gandhi, V. H. (2022). Intellectual property disputes and resolutions. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights (JIPR)*, 26(1), 14-19. doi: [10.56042/jipr.v26i1.39447](https://doi.org/10.56042/jipr.v26i1.39447)
- Greene, T. D., & Wilkerson, J. (2012). Understanding Trademark Strength. *Stan. Tech. L. Rev.*, 16, 535.
- Gultom, M. H. (2018). Perlindungan hukum bagi pemegang hak merek terdaftar terhadap pelanggaran merek. *Warta Dharmawangsa*, (56). doi: <https://doi.org/10.46576/wdw.v0i56.14>
- Jened, R. (2015). *Hukum Merek (Trademark Law) dalam Era Global dan Integrasi Ekonomi*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- Majid (2014). *Menelisik Lebih Dekat Kasus Pelanggaran Merek di Bisnis Waralaba*. Jakarta: Majalah Info Franchise.
- Maulana, I.B. (2000). *Pelangi HaKI dan Anti Monopoli*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Klinik HaKI, Pusat Studi Hukum FH UII Yogyakarta.
- Miru, A. (2005). *Hukum Merek: Cara Mudah Mempelajari Undang-Undang Merek*. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Mashdurohatun, A., & Limbong, F. S. (2020). Legal Protection of Trademarks Based On The Justice Value. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity And Change*, 12(12), 1211-1225.
- Poltorak, A., & Lerner, P. (2002). *Essentials of Intellectual Property*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Purwaningsih, E. (2005). *Perkembangan Hukum Intellectual Property Rights*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Putri, I. R. A. (2018). Perlindungan Hukum Merek Terkenal Terkait Dengan Persaingan Usaha Tidak Sehat. *Thesis*. Published. Master of Law Study Program Faculty of Law Universitas Lampung. Bandar Lampung.
- Rafli, C. F., & Apriani, R. (2022). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pemilik Merek Atas Pemalsuan Merek Oleh Pelaku Usaha Melalui Transaksi Perdagangan Elektronik (E-

- Commerce). *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 8(22), 181-190.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7325175>
- Ramin, M. (2023). Sengketa Merek Dagang di Indonesia: Sebuah Studi Literatur. *ANAYASA: Journal of Legal Studies*, 1(1 Juli), 23-30. doi: <https://doi.org/10.61397/ays.v1i1.6>
- Rumadan, I. (2020, May). Bad Faith's Criteria in the Famous Trademark Dispute Settlement That Has an Element of Equality in Principle in the Court. In *International Conference on Law, Economics and Health (ICLEH 2020)* (pp. 600-608). Atlantis Press. doi: [10.2991/aebmr.k.200513.116](https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200513.116)
- Shidarta, Susanto, A. F., Savitri, N., & Chandra, A. A. (2014). *Disparitas Putusan Hakim: "Identifikasi dan Implikasi"*. Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal Komisi Yudisial Republik Indonesia.
- Sinaga, N. A., & Ferdian, M. (2020). Pelanggaran Hak Merek Yang Dilakukan Pelaku Usaha Dalam Perdagangan Melalui Transaksi Elektronik (E-Commerce). *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dirgantara*, 10(2), 76-94. doi: <https://doi.org/10.35968/jh.v10i2.463>
- Sulistiyono, A. (2008). *Eksistensi dan Penyelesaian Sengketa HaKI*. Surakarta: Lembaga Pengembangan Pendidikan (LPP) UNS dan UPT Penerbitan dan Pencetakan UNS (UNS press).
- Sutedi, A. (2009). *Hak atas Kekayaan Intelektual*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Udin, S. "Penegakan Hukum di Bidang Merek dan Permasalahannya". Retrieved from <https://syafuruddinsh.blogspot.com/search?q=Penegakan+Hukum+di+Bidang+Merek+dan+Permasalahannya>, Accessed April 8, 2024.
- Usman, R. (2003). *Hukum Hak atas Kekayaan Intelektual; Perlindungan dan Dimensi Hukumnya di Indonesia*. Bandung: PT. Alumni.
- Utomo, T. S. (2010). *Hak Kekayaan Intelektual (HKI) di Era Global: Sebuah Kajian Kontemporer*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Wahyuni, Erma, Bahri, T. S., & Tangkilisan, H. N. S. (2007). *Kebijakan dan Manajemen Hukum Merek*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Pembaruan Administrasi Publik Indonesia (YPAPI).
- Zaichkowsky, J. L. (2020). *The psychology behind trademark infringement and counterfeiting*. Psychology Press.

Personal Communications

Interview with Ariestrada Situmorang, the Directorate General of Intellectual Property staff.
December 19, 2019.

Ima Damayanti, the Head of the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) Legal
Bureau. January 9, 2020.