

Sponsored content

# Belvedere brand prevails in Greek court of appeal's trademark dispute ruling

Sponsored by

 PATRINOS & KILIMIRIS  
SINCE 1919

**Maria Kilimiris** August 29 2025



# **Maria Kilimiris of Patrinos & Kilimiris says the decision on the ‘Belvedere Mykonos Club’ mark highlights the importance of complementary goods and services as a factor in opposition cases**

A Greek Administrative Court of Appeal has issued a decision (No. 875/2025) in a trademark opposition dispute concerning the international vodka brand Belvedere. The case involved a comparison between the earlier marks ‘Belvedere’ (for wines and spirits) and ‘Belvedere Intense’ (for vodka), owned by the Polish company Polmos Zyrardow, and the later national mark ‘Belvedere Mykonos Club’, filed for entertainment services under Class 41 of the Nice Classification.

The opposition was initially dismissed by the Greek Trademarks Office and subsequently by an Administrative Court of First Instance, which considered that there was no likelihood of confusion. The first-instance court found that the goods and services at issue – alcoholic beverages on the one hand and nightclub/entertainment services on the other – were unrelated, while it also rejected arguments of bad faith and enhanced protection of a well-known mark.

This reasoning was consistent with an earlier ruling, where the court had found that ‘Belvedere’ possessed low distinctiveness, being a term commonly used to denote a “beautiful view” or tourist location. In that decision, the court stressed that although the compared signs shared the element “Belvedere”, they distinguished unrelated categories – premium beverages versus nightlife services in Mykonos – and that the average consumer could easily differentiate between the opponent’s well-known alcoholic products and the applicant’s business activities.

On appeal, however, the second-instance court took a different approach. Reassessing the facts, it placed emphasis on the dominant role of the word “Belvedere” in both signs. The court held that the additional elements “Mykonos” and “Club” in the contested trademark were descriptive of the location and nature of services covered by the trademark and therefore insufficient to avoid confusion.

Most importantly, the court considered that alcoholic beverages and nightclub services are complementary. Consumers encountering the sign “Belvedere Mykonos Club” in the context of nightlife could reasonably believe that the entertainment services were provided or sponsored by the proprietor of the well-known Belvedere vodka brand, or by an affiliated undertaking. The judgment explicitly aligned its reasoning with established EU case law on the global assessment of likelihood of confusion, including the concept of association.

As a result, the Administrative Court of Appeal overturned the earlier rulings, annulled the acceptance of the ‘Belvedere Mykonos Club’ mark, and upheld the opposition in its entirety.

## **Wider significance of the Belvedere ruling**

This judgment is a reminder that under Greek and EU trademark law, the relationship between goods and services must be assessed not only in terms of strict similarity but also with regard to their complementary nature in practice. The decision reinforces the protection enjoyed by international

brands in Greece and underlines the readiness of national courts to apply EU case law principles consistently in opposition proceedings.

## Topics

Greece

Trademarks

Patrinos & Kilimiris



**Maria Kilimiris**

PARTNER Patrinos & Kilimiris

---