

TABLE OF CONTENT

COVER	i
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PAGE	iii
STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICITY	iv
PREFACE	v
TABLE OF CONTENT	vii
ABSTRACT	x
INTISARI	xi
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Underlying Background	1
B. Research Problems	12
C. Objectives of the Study.....	12
D. Statement of Authenticity	13
E. Benefits of the Study	14
CHAPTER II.....	15
THEORITICAL REVIEW.....	15

A.	Introduction to Trademark.....	15
A.1.	Definition of Trademark	15
A.2.	Classification of Trademark.....	17
A.3.	Registration of Trademark in Indonesia.....	21
A.4.	Annulment of Trademark.....	27
A.5.	Deletion of Trademark.....	30
A.6.	Dispute Settlement.....	33
B.	Overview of Trademark in Australia.....	39
B.1.	Source of Australian Trademark Law	39
B.2.	Registration of Trademark in Australia	42
CHAPTER III		45
RESEARCH METHOD		45
A.	Type of the Research.....	45
B.	Source of Data.....	46
C.	Data Collection Method.....	48
D.	Data Analysis	49
E.	Limitations and Indications	49
CHAPTER IV		51
RESEARCH FINDING AND ANALYSIS.....		51

A.	Facts of the Case of Hugo Boss vs Hugo Sport	51
A.1.	Disputing Parties	52
A.2.	Petition to Central Jakarta District Court Jakarta	53
A.3.	Decision of Central Jakarta District Court	55
A.4.	Cassation	55
B.	Analysis on the Supreme Court Decision No.92 K/Pdt.Sus-HKI/2017 in the perspective of Indonesian law	60
B.1.	Analysis through the application of prevailing Trademark and Geographical Indications Law (Law No. 20 of 2016)	60
C.	Analysis on the Supreme Court Decision No. 92 K/Pdt.Sus-HKI/2017 in the Perspective of Australian Law	71
C.1.	<i>Samuel Smith & Son Pty Ltd v Pernod Ricard Winemakers Pty Ltd [2016] FCA 1515</i>	71
C.2.	Prevailing Australian Marks Law, the Trademark Act (1995)	78
C.3.	Analysis of Hugo Boss case through Australian Law	84
CHAPTER V	89
CLOSURE	89
A.	Conclusion	89
B.	Recommendation	92