

## Peter Creighton-Selvay



Peter Creighton-Selvay practises in general commercial litigation and has specialist expertise in intellectual property litigation

---

### QUALIFICATIONS

Bachelor of Laws (Hons)  
Master of Laws (Hons)  
Bachelor of Arts

### CORRESPONDENCE

**P** 03 9225 8558  
**F** 03 9225 8668  
**E** creighton-selvay@vicbar.com.au

### CHAMBERS

Emmerson Chambers  
Level 18 Room 10  
200 Queen Street  
Melbourne VIC 3000

---

### COMMERCIAL LAW

Consumer Law | Contractual Disputes | Corporations & Securities | Equity & Trusts

### INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Appellate | Confidential Information | Copyright & Designs | Information Technology | Media & Entertainment | Patents | Privacy & Data Protection | Telecommunications | Trade Marks

Peter has significant trial and appellate experience and is regularly briefed to appear in the Federal Court, Supreme Court and IP Australia in a wide range of commercial and intellectual property proceedings.

Peter has for many years been ranked as “*preeminent*” or “*leading*” junior counsel in Doyle’s Guide to Technology, Media & Telecommunications Barristers (Australia and Victoria) and Doyle’s Guide to Intellectual Property Barristers (Australia and Victoria).

He is recommended in Chambers and Partners, which states: “*That Peter Creighton-Selvay is “one of Australia’s leading junior IP counsel” across all areas of the discipline is a view commonly expressed by sources, one of whom calls him “the top IP junior at the moment, whom I use in preference to any other,” going on to cite his “impeccable paperwork, and cross-examination skills better than those of many silks.” Another contributor, who describes him as “a strong black-letter lawyer and eloquent advocate,” notes that he is especially sought after for trade mark cases”.*

He is similarly recommended in The Legal 500, in which he is described as: “*One of Australia’s leading junior IP counsel*”, an “*outstanding technician for patent, trade mark and copyright cases*”, and “*the recommended junior of many IP silks and also extremely capable of running cases himself*”.

Prior to joining the Bar, Peter was a solicitor at Mallesons Stephen Jaques in Melbourne and a managing associate at Linklaters in London. He holds a Bachelor of Laws from the University of Melbourne (first class honours) and was a Patrick Moore scholar at the University of Cambridge, where he completed a Master of Laws (also first class honours) and specialised in international commercial litigation, international intellectual property and restitution.

*Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation*

## Recent Cases

### INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

*Calidad v Seiko Epson* – consideration of the “exhaustion” and “implied licence” doctrines and the extent of modifications which may be made to patented products (High Court, with D Shavin QC).

*Lumen Australia v Frontline Australia & Ors* – alleged infringement of copyright, circuit layout rights, trade marks, misuse of confidential information, misleading or deceptive conduct, passing off, and breach of contract, in relation to the manufacture of trailer wiring harnesses; claims for pecuniary relief and additional damages (Federal Court, with E Heerey QC).

*Pham Global v Insight Clinical Imaging* – alleged trade mark infringement, passing off and misleading or deceptive conduct in relation to radiology services; cross-claim for revocation of registered trade mark (Full Federal Court, with T Cordiner QC).

*SNF (Australia) v Ciba Speciality Chemicals Water Treatments* – long running patent litigation, involving numerous opposition proceedings, Federal Court appeals concerning validity, and infringement proceedings seeking an account of profits, regarding a process of treating mine tailings (APO, Federal Court, and Full Federal Court, with D Shavin QC).

*Australian Meat Group v JBS Australia* – appeal from trial judgment finding trade mark infringement

in the meat industry involving consideration of the relevance of reputation to the assessment of deceptive similarity (Full Federal Court, with B Caine QC and E Heerey QC).

*Tasmanian Alkaloids v TPI Enterprises* – alleged infringement of innovation patents relating to high codeine poppies and cross-claim for invalidity; appeal from APO decision concerning the validity of a related standard patent (Federal Court, with G Dalton QC).

*Nutrifield v Smart Garden Products* – appeal from ATMO decision removing registered mark on the ground of non-use (Federal Court, unled).

*Stone & Wood Group v Intellectual Property Development Corporation* – alleged passing off, misleading or deceptive conduct and trade mark infringement in relation to beer and cross-claim for groundless threats; trade mark opposition to registration of “Pacific Ale” on the basis of sections 41 and 44 of the *Trade Marks Act* (Federal Court and Full Federal Court, with C Golvan QC; ATMO, unled).

*ESCO v CQMS* – alleged groundless threats and claim for revocation of patent relating to improvements in excavator teeth; cross-claim alleging patent infringement (Federal Court, with E Heerey QC).

*Wilson v Microsoft* – alleged patent infringement and misuse of confidential information in relation to computer software (Federal Court, with A Ryan SC).

*Delfi Chocolate Manufacturing v Mars Australia* – appeal from ATMO decision refusing to register “Maltitos” by reason of prior registration of “Maltesers” (Federal Court, with A Ryan SC and E Heerey).

*Telstra v Phone Directories Company* – alleged misleading or deceptive conduct and passing off in relation to the use of the colour yellow (Federal Court, with M Wyles QC and S Rebikoff).

*More Group v Ronan Czesler & Ors* – alleged infringement of copyright and misuse of confidential information in relation to dental implant courses (Supreme Court, unled).

*Southcorp Brands v Australia Rush Rich Winery & Ors* – alleged infringement of the “Penfolds” trade mark by use of Chinese character mark and “Ben Fu”; summary and default judgment (Federal Court, with E Heerey QC).

*Aristocrat v Commissioner of Patents* – consideration of whether patents relating to electronic gaming machines claim a “manner of manufacture” (Federal Court and Full Federal Court, with D Shavin QC).

*Banjo v FundIT Technology* – opposition to registration of “Banjo” trade marks based on sections 42(b) and 60 of the *Trade Marks Act* and resulting appeal (ATMO and Federal Court, unled).

*Silver Top Taxi Service v Taxi's Combined Services* – opposition to registration of “Silver Service” in relation to taxi services (ATMO, unled).

*Re Ab Initio Software* – application to register greater than symbol as trade mark in respect of computer software and related services and consideration of issues arising under section 41 of the *Trade Marks Act* (ATMO, unled).

*International Warehousing Distribution v Justin Trail* – alleged misuse of confidential information and copyright infringement by a former employee of a craft brewing company, including interlocutory

application for digital inspection of computing devices (Federal Circuit Court, unled).

*Aquila v Auqua Swimwear* – opposition to application by Auqua Swimwear for partial removal of Aquila trade mark on the basis of non-use; opposition to application by Auqua Swimwear for registration of “Auqua” on the basis of sections 44 and 60 of the *Trade Marks Act* and resulting appeal (ATMO and Federal Court, unled).

*Sparkling Juice Company v Tru Blu Beverages* – application to revoke the registered trade mark of, and alleged misleading or deceptive conduct, passing off and trade mark infringement of, a company involved in the sale of non-alcoholic beverages (Federal Court, with C Golvan QC).

*The National Building Suppliers Group v Mitre 10 Australia* – application for interlocutory injunction and digital inspection of computers by reason of alleged misuse of confidential information, copyright infringement, and conversion, in relation to documents made available on confidential online portal (Federal Court, with E Heerey QC).

*Salon Concepts v BSB Pacific* – alleged trade mark infringement, misleading or deceptive conduct, passing off, breach of contract and debt claim in relation to spray tan products (Federal Circuit Court, unled).

*MG Icon v Caprice Australia* – interpretation and application of *Raising the Bar* amendments (ATMO, unled).

*Enterprise Glue v Shopify* – alleged infringement of patent concerning a data access system and cross-claim for invalidity (Federal Court, unled).

*ECS Property Group v Goodridge Nominees* – alleged misuse of confidential information and misleading or deceptive conduct in relation to a business opportunity (Federal Court, with C Golvan QC).

*Re Fodmapped Foods Pty Ltd* – opposition to revocation of acceptance of trade mark (ATMO, unled).

*Monash University v Sue Shepherd* – alleged misleading or deceptive conduct and misuse of confidential information in relation to the creation and promotion of the Low FODMAP Diet (Federal Court, with A Ryan SC).

*Australia Post v Digital Post Australia* – alleged trade mark infringement and misleading or deceptive conduct in relation to a digital mail service (Federal Court, with W Houghton QC and S Rebikoff).

*Toddler Kindy Gymparoo v Gym-Mark* – opposition to application for removal of trade mark due to non-use (ATMO, unled).

*Global Tiger Logistics v Cargo Traders SA* – alleged trade mark infringement, misleading or deceptive conduct and passing off in relation to logistics services (Federal Circuit Court, unled).

*Boehringer Ingelheim v Elanco New Zealand* – appeal from APO decision permitting amendments under s 104 to a patent for an anti-infective formulation to prevent or ameliorate bovine mastitis (Federal Court, with E Heerey).

*Jack Gance & Mario Verrochio v Ian Tauman* – opposition to registration of three trade marks in respect of pharmacy services based on the prior registration and use of various “Chemist Warehouse” trade marks (ATMO, unled).

*World Expeditions Travel Group Pty Ltd v Franklin River Rafting* – opposition to registration of trade mark on the basis of section 41 of the *Trade Marks Act* (ATMO, unled).

*Monster Energy v Rodney Jane Racing* – appeal from ATMO decision upholding opposition to registration of trade marks on the basis of section 60 of the *Trade Marks Act* (Federal Court, with E Heerey QC).

*Progressive Green v Flow Systems* – opposition to registration of trade mark on the basis of sections 58, 59 and 60 of the *Trade Marks Act* and related Federal Court proceedings for trade mark infringement and misleading or deceptive conduct (ATMO and Federal Court, unled).

#### COMMERCIAL LAW

*Ying Mui v Frank Hoh* – alleged breaches of fiduciary and statutory duties by former directors of companies acting as trustees of family trusts, knowing receipt and knowing assistance, replacement of trustees (Supreme Court and Court of Appeal, with M Osborne QC).

*Fonterra Brands v Bega Cheese* – alleged breaches of express and implied terms of licensing agreement, restraint of trade, rectification, misleading or deceptive conduct, estoppel and waiver; related interlocutory disputes concerning privilege, waiver and fraud under sections 122 and 125 of the *Evidence Act* (Supreme Court, with G Dalton QC).

*Uniting Church of Australia v Westpac & Denham* – alleged breaches of contract, negligence, conversion and misleading or deceptive conduct of bank and auditor in the context of a fraud perpetrated by a company employee (Supreme Court, with P Solomon QC).

*Brainwave Technology v Aaron Leibovich* – alleged breaches and repudiation of contract by inventor of a smart chip for mobile phones (Supreme Court, with C Golvan QC).

*Ecopave Australia Holdings v Adbri Masonry Group* – application for leave to appeal to the Full Court of the Federal Court (Federal Court, unled).

*Re Frosthollow Pty Ltd* – application for judicial advice by corporate trustee as to whether to defend claims for breaches of trust, indemnity out of trust assets, and replacement of trustee (Supreme Court, with M Osborne QC).

*SNF (Australia) v Ciba Speciality Chemicals Water Treatments* – application to re-open proceedings on the basis of allegations of equitable fraud (Federal Court, with D Shavin QC).

*Komipharm International v Bio and Gene* – alleged breaches of contract and misleading or deceptive conduct in relation to clinical trials; application for freezing orders on the basis of alleged fraud (Supreme Court, unled).

*Business Health v DKN Financial Group* – alleged breaches of contract, restitution, misleading or deceptive conduct and copyright infringement in relation to software development (County Court, with P Solomon QC).

*Progress Software v Crown Melbourne* – alleged breaches of contract, restitution and copyright infringement in relation to the licensing of computer software (Supreme Court, with N Hopkins QC).

## Memberships

Intellectual Property Society of Australia and New Zealand (IPSANZ)