

**Author:** Łukasz Żelechowski

**Title:** Przedawnienie roszczeń o zaniechanie naruszeń praw własności przemysłowej — analiza na tle porównań z prawem rzeczowym / Prescription of claims for injunctive relief in the case of infringements of industrial property rights – analysis against the backdrop of property law

**Source:** Kwartalnik Prawa Prywatnego („Quarterly of Private Law”)

Year: 2025, vol.: XXXIV, number 3 pages: 383-435

**Keywords:** statute of limitation, prescription of claims, acquiescence, injunctions, patent enforcement, trade mark enforcement

**Discipline:** Law (Civil Law)

**Language:** Polish

**Document type:** Article

**Publication order reference:** University of Warsaw [[l.zelechowski@wpia.uw.edu.pl](mailto:l.zelechowski@wpia.uw.edu.pl)]

**Abstract:**

The article examines the issue of the prescription of claims for final injunctive relief in the case of infringements of industrial property rights. It draws comparisons to the issue of the prescription of claims for injunctive relief in the case of infringement of property rights over movable assets (Article 223 § 1 of the Civil Code *a contrario*), as well as of proprietary claims coming into existence because of certain permanent situations (e.g., claims for the establishment of easements or for purchase of another person’s land on which a building has been erected). The most important conclusions from the analysis are as follows. Firstly, the “sequentiality” of the limitation period for claims for injunctive relief in industrial property matters, calculated as of each day of repeated daily infringements, as adopted in the Polish Supreme Court resolution of 18 May 2021, III CZP 30/20 (with regard to the five-year period *a tempore facti*), leads to the factual exclusion of prescription of claims. This outcome contradicts the Court’s intentions, as inferred from its reasoning. Secondly, the “daily” criterion should not constitute an independent basis for distinguishing separate infringing acts occurring sequentially during the extended period of unlawful interference with an exclusive right. Thirdly, the five-year limitation period “*a tempore facti*” under Article 289(1) of the Industrial Property Law should be considered as running from the date of the cessation of a continuous infringement of industrial property rights. This approach results in a practical effect akin to that of “sequential” limitation, meaning that the prescription of the claim for injunctive relief is excluded as long as the infringement persists. However, this approach is based on the correct assumption that a continuous infringement constitutes a single unified act. Fourthly, the “*a tempore scientiae*” limitation period under Article 289(1) of the Industrial Property Law should

commence when the right-holder first becomes aware of the infringement and its perpetrator. Fifthly, the paper proposes a legislative change aimed at clarifying that the limitation period for a claim for injunctive relief, known as “a tempore facti” period, starts running after the infringement of the right has ceased. Alternatively, consideration could be given to abandoning the “a tempore facti” limitation period for the claim for injunctive relief. Nevertheless, it is justified to maintain the limitation period based on knowledge (a tempore scientiae), although consideration should be given to possibly extending it, for example, to five years.