

THE COMPANIES TRIBUNAL OF SOUTH AFRICA

CASE NO: CT005Aug2016

In the matter between:

Growthpoint Properties Limited

Applicant

(Registration number: 1987/004988/06)

and

Growthpoint Projects (Proprietary) Limited

Respondent

(Registration number: 2016/048099/07)

Coram: S. Gounden

Decision handed down on 30 November 2016

DECISION

INTRODUCTION

- [1] The Applicant applies in terms of section 160 of the Companies Act 71 of 2008 (“Act” / “Companies Act”) and regulations 143 and 153 of the Companies Regulations (GN R351 in GG 34239 of 26 April 2011) (“Companies Regulations” / “regulations”) for a default order that the respondent be ordered to choose a new name (and to change its name) and file an amendment accordingly;

BACKGROUND

- [2] The Applicant is the proprietor of the trademark in South Africa “GROWTHPOINT” for some 9 years and has been conducting business under that name.
- [3] The Applicant filed an objection to the name “Growthpoint Projects” as stated above as prescribed by regulation 142 (1) (a), together with a supporting

affidavit as required by regulation 142 (1) (b). Roland Krabbenhoft, the Company Secretary of Growthpoint Properties Limited has signed the affidavit and states that he was duly authorised to act for and on behalf of the Applicant.

[4] The copy of the application was served at the address of the respondent by Sheriff on the 16 August 2016 and 20 August 2016. The respondent duly signed the acknowledgement of receipt. In terms of regulation 142 (2) it should be served on the respondent within 5 days of filing it with the Companies Tribunal. The date stamp of the Companies Tribunal on the CTR 142 is the 10 August 2015.

[5] Regulation 142 provides as follows:

“(2) The applicant must serve a copy of the application and affidavit on the respondent named in the application, within 5 business days after filing it.”

[6] In terms of regulation 153 (1) read with regulation 143 (1), the first respondent has 20 days to respond, failing which the Applicant is entitled to apply for a default order as provided for in regulation 153 (1).

[7] The Applicant therefore applies to the Companies Tribunal in terms of regulation 153 (2) that said Companies Tribunal makes a default order in terms of regulation 153 (1).

ISSUES

[8] A resolution of the Board of the Applicant authorising Ronald Krabbenhoft to act for and on behalf of the Applicant was **not** included in the application.

[9] However, based on the findings of the Companies Tribunal on the substantive law, it is not necessary to make a finding as to defects, in [8] above, and the possible application of section 6 (9) and (10) of the Companies Act in respect of substantial compliance.

[10] The Applicant requests that the Companies Tribunal grants the relief in the form that the Respondent be ordered to choose a new name (and to change its name) and file an amendment accordingly; on the grounds that the use of

the name “Growthpoint Projects” by the Respondent is in contravention of sections 11 (2) (b) and (c) (i) of the Companies Act.

[11] The Applicant is the registered proprietor of the “Growthpoint” trade mark in South Africa under trade mark registration number:

- 2007/17204; class 35 – in respect of advertising and business services of all kinds;
- 2007/17205; class 36 – in respect of insurance, assurance, reinsurance and consultancy services of all kinds;
- 2007/17206; class 35 – in respect of advertising and business services of all kinds;
- 2007/17207; class 36 – in respect of insurance, assurance, reinsurance and consultancy services of all kinds;
- 2007/17208; class 35 (LOGO) – in respect of advertising and business services of all kinds;
- 2007/17209; class 36 (LOGO) – in respect of insurance, assurance, reinsurance and consultancy services of all kinds;

[12] The Applicant submit that the dominant and memorable feature of the Respondent’s name “Growthpoint Projects” is the word “Growthpoint” , which is visually, phonetically and conceptually identical to the Applicant’s “Growthpoint” trade mark. The Applicant contends that the remaining portion “Projects” is insufficient to distinguish the Respondent from the Applicant.

[13] The Applicant claim that the Respondent’s principal business activities are not restricted. However, the addition of the descriptive words “Projects” to its name does not distinguish itself from the striking “Growthpoint” for which the Applicant has a registered trademark right.

APPLICABLE LAW

[14] The jurisdiction of the Companies Tribunal is stated in section 160 of the Act and is as follows:

“(1) A person to whom a notice is delivered in terms of this Act with respect to an application for reservation of a name, registration of a defensive name, application to transfer the reservation of a name or the registration of a defensive name, or the registration of a company’s name, or any other person with an interest in the name of a company, may apply to the Companies Tribunal in the prescribed manner and form for a determination whether the name, or the reservation, registration or use of the name, or the transfer of any such reservation or registration of a name, satisfies the requirements of this Act.

(2) An application in terms of subsection (1) may be made—

(a) within three months after the date of a notice contemplated in subsection (1), if the applicant received such a notice; or

(b) on good cause shown at any time after the date of the reservation or registration of the name that is the subject of the application, in any other case.

(3) after considering an application made in terms of subsection (1), and any submissions by the applicant and any other person with an interest in the name or proposed name that is the subject of the application, the Companies Tribunal—

(a) must make a determination whether that name, or the reservation, registration or use of the name, or the transfer of the reservation or registration of the name, satisfies the requirements of this Act; and

(b) may make an administrative order directing—

(i) the Commission to—

(aa) reserve a contested name, or register a particular defensive name that had been contested, for the applicant;

(bb) register a name or amended name that had been contested as the name of a company;

(cc) cancel the reservation of a name, or the registration of a defensive name; or

(dd) transfer, or cancel the transfer of, the reservation of a name, or the registration of a defensive name; or

(ii) a company to choose a new name, and to file a notice of an amendment to its Memorandum of Incorporation, within a period and on any conditions that the Tribunal considers just, equitable and expedient in the

circumstances, including a condition exempting the company from the requirement to pay the prescribed fee for filing the notice of amendment contemplated in this paragraph.”

[15] Section 11 (2) of the Companies Act, as far as it is relevant for the present application, provides as follows:

“(2) The name of a company must—

(a) not be the same as—

(i) the name of another company, domesticated company, registered external company, close corporation or co-operative;...

(b) not be confusingly similar to a name, trade mark, mark, word or expression contemplated in paragraph (a) unless,—

(i) in the case of names referred to in paragraph (a)(i), each company bearing any such similar name is a member of the same group of companies;...;

(c) not falsely imply or suggest, or be such as would reasonably mislead a person to believe incorrectly, that the company—

(i) is part of, or associated with, any other person or entity;...”

EVALUATION

[16] The question that needs to be answered is whether “Growthpoint” as in the name of the Respondent is in contravention of sections 11 (2) (b) and (c) (i) of the Companies Act.

[17] “Growthpoint” as used by the Applicant is a trading name and is the name of the company. The name of the Respondent, “Growthpoint Projects” is not the same as the name of the Applicant, and therefore there is no contravention of section 11 (2) (a) (i).

[18] “Similar” as in section 11 (2) (b) would be “having a marked resemblance or likeness” and that the offending mark (or name) should immediately bring to

mind the well-known trademark (or other name): *Bata Ltd v Face Fashions* CC 2001 (1) SA 844 (SCA). As to the requirement for “confusingly” similar, the test, as in the case of passing-off, should be: “...a reasonable likelihood that ordinary members of the public, or a substantial section thereof, may be confused or deceived into believing that the goods or merchandise of the former are the goods or merchandise of the latter or are connected therewith. Whether there is such a reasonable likelihood of confusion or deception is a question of fact to be determined in the light of the particular circumstances of the case.”: *Adidas AG & another v Pepkor Retail Limited* (187/12) [2013] ZASCA 3 (28 February 2013) para 28; *Capital Estate and General Agencies (Pty) Ltd and Others v Holiday Inns Inc and Others* 1977 (2) SA 916 (A) at 929.

The name of the Respondent therefore can clearly be confusingly similar to the trademark of the Applicant, which is “Growthpoint”. In fact it is clearly similar, and therefore there is contravention of section 11 (2) (b) (i).

[19] Section 11 (2) (c) (i) therefore requires that the name of a company must not:

- falsely imply or suggest that the company is part of or associated with any other person or entity
- be such that the name would reasonably mislead a person to believe that the company is part of or associated with any other person or entity

[20] The same principles as in respect of section (2) (b) (i) would also apply in respect of section (2) (c) (i) because in this instance, apart from the requirement that the name must falsely imply, which, it is submitted, requires fault, it can, alternatively also reasonably mislead a person to hold a certain belief. The requirements to “reasonably believe”, should be the same as in *Adidas AG & another v Pepkor Retail Limited* case *supra*; *Capital Estate and General Agencies (Pty) Ltd and Others v Holiday Inns Inc. and Others* case *supra*.

In this case, using the name “Growthpoint” would reasonably mislead a person to believe that the company is associated with “Growthpoint Properties” as it is a well-known trademark. The remaining portion of the

name increases the confusion given that the Respondent's business activities are not restricted.

FINDINGS

- [21] The name of the Respondent is in contravention of section 11 (2) (b) of the Companies Act.
- [22] The name of the Respondent is in contravention of section 11 (2) (c) (i) of the Companies Act.
- [23] It can be said that "Growthpoint Projects" will reasonably mislead the reasonable man (person) to believe incorrectly that there is an association with "Growthpoint". The whole name "Growthpoint Projects" is not desirable as the name is confusingly and deceptively similar to the trademark "Growthpoint" registered by the Applicant. The fact that the Respondent's business is not listed in its company registration documents, will increase the likelihood / possibility that the reasonable man (person) will be misled, as under section 11 (2) (b).

ORDER

- [24] The application is granted, that the Respondent must choose a new name, (and change its existing name) and file an amendment to CIPC accordingly. This must be effective within 90 days from the date of this ruling.

S. Gounden
MEMBER OF THE
COMPANIES TRIBUNAL
Pretoria
30 November 2016