

MININTCO Ltd v. DOBUSJES Ltd

[Rwanda COMMERCIAL HIGH COURT – RCOMA00402/2017/CHC/HCC (Mutajiri, P.J.) 29 December 2017]

Intellectual property – The right on trademark – A company with a registered trademark has the right to sue who counterfeits it or a trader who has products that confuse his/her products.

Intellectual property – Destroying counterfeit products – The court is under no obligation to order that the products with counterfeit trademark be destroyed because it can order to be destroyed or to be removed from the market in its discretion – Law N° 31/2009 of 26/10/2009 on the protection of intellectual property, article 284.

Facts: MININTCO ® Ltd registered the trademark of KANTA in the Rwanda Development Board (RDB). That company learned that DOBUSJES Ltd imported products with a trademark KANTO BLACK HAIR DYE, counterfeiting that of KANTA, which confuses with it. Therefore, it sued DOBUSJES Ltd in the Commercial Court of Nyarugenge requesting that those products with the counterfeit trademark be destroyed.

In its judgment, the Court held that the trademark of KANTO which are on the products imported in Rwanda by DOBUSJES Ltd is a counterfeit of KANTA which was registered by MININTCO ® Ltd which causes confusion, however it held that the products should not be destroyed but it ordered DOBUSJES Ltd not to sell those products on the Rwandan market. MININTCO ® Ltd was not contented by that decision and appealed in the Commercial High Court claiming that the previous court refused to that that those products bearing the trademark of KANTO Black Hair Dye be destroyed, did not award it the damages resulting from the loss caused, it was silent on the issue of publishing the judgment in the most popular newspapers, it requested for the damages for being dragged in unnecessary lawsuits, procedural and counsel fees.

The court first examined the objection of lack of legal standing of the plaintiff on the ground that he cannot sue someone on for counterfeiting the trademark without proving that he is an industrialist and also the defendant should not be sued because it's not an industry but is a trader who buys products and resell them as they are without changing anything.

On that objection, MININTCO ® Ltd states that it has no merit because as a commercial company with a moral personality that registered its trademark in Rwanda has the right to sue whoever counterfeits it, therefore DOBUSJES Ltd issued for importing products with counterfeit trademarks which confuse. The Court overruled the objection because MININTCO ® Ltd has the right to sue whoever infringes on its trademark rights.

In its defence, DOBUSJES argues that the claim of MININTCO that it is misinterpreting the law because it does not provide that the judge has to decide in any case to destroy those products (peut ordonner non doit ordonner), therefore in his discretion he found that those products should not be destroyed, furthermore the trademark of MININTCO Ltd was not counterfeited because it did not get the products of KANTO from the industry but from the shop. Regarding the damages requested by MININTCO for the loss caused, it argues that they should not be awarded because it was awarded damages in the summary claim case and moreover those damages are requested

in the merits of the case and in case they are awarded it would mean that they would have been awarded twice, DOBUSJES also requests for procedural and counsel fees.

Held: 1. A company with a registered trademark has the right to sue who counterfeits it or a trader who has products that confuse his/her products. Therefore, MININTCO Ltd has the right to sue anyone who infringes on its trademark.

2. The court is under no obligation to order that the products with counterfeit trademark be destroyed because it can order to be destroyed or to be removed from the market in its discretion.

3. The damages resulting from the loss requested by the appellant are not awarded because it failed to prove the loss caused by the products of the defendant especially that those products never accessed the market.

The appeal lacks merit.

Statute and statutory instrument referred to:

Law N° 31/2009 of 26/10/2009 on the protection of intellectual property, article 284.

Law N° 21/2012 of 14/06/2012 relating to the civil, commercial, labour and administrative, article 2.

No cases referred to.

Judgment

I.BRIEF BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

[1] This case started at Commercial Court of Nyarugenge, whereby MININTCO Ltd sued DOBUSJES Ltd requesting to destroy its boxes which have a trademark of KANTO Black Hair Dye.

[2] The origin of this issue is that on 10/04/2012, the Registrar General issued a certificate for the registration of a trademark of "KANTA BRAND" to MININTCO ® Ltd pursuant to the Law N°31/2009 of 26/10/2009 on the protection of intellectual property.

[3] MININTCO ® Ltd sued claiming that DOBUSJES Ltd imported 99 boxes which have the trademark of KANTO BLACK HAIR DYE, and those boxes were seized at custom because they had a trade mark counterfeiting the trade mark of KANTA; that is why it sued requesting to be confiscated and destroyed and the cost of destroying them be paid by the owner; if there are any put on the market to be withdrawn, because to use and import in Rwanda the products of KANTO BLACK HAIR DYE which counterfeits those of KANTA is unfair competition and it is contrary to the law and trust because it counterfeits of KANTA and it confuseson.

[4] It further requests that the importer should inform MININTCO ® Ltd the names of the other people, commercial companies and factory which participate in distributing the products

that have the trademark of KANTO and it requests also that it should be ordered to pay MININTCO ® Ltd various damages.

[5] DOBUSJES Ltd pleaded stating that it bought in bulky those products from China, it did not know that the product has some problems, that after reaching in Rwanda it was surprised by the seizure of its products at the customs because they were counterfeit. it requested that the claim of MININTCO ® Ltd should not be admitted because the plaintiff lacks the legal standing to sue and the defendants to be sued since the subject matter is counterfeiting the other's innovation especially that DOBUSJES Ltd has no industry for it to manufacture KANTO the counterfeits of KANTA.

[6] In rendering the judgment the Court overruled the objection on inadmissibility of the claim raised by DOBUSJES, held that the claim of MININTCO has merit in parts, held that the trademark of KANTO which is on the products imported by DOBUSJES Ltd is a counterfeit of KANTA which was registered in Rwanda by MININTCO ® Ltd, held that it causes confusion however that the products should not be destroyed. It ordered DOBUSJES Ltd not to bring those products with the trademark of KANTO on the Rwandan market and ordered it to pay court fees, procedural and counsel fees to MININTCO ® Ltd.

[7] MININTCO ® Ltd was not contented with the decision , thus Counsel MHAYIMANA Isaie appealed claiming that for the court to rule that the 99 boxes of « KANTO Black Hair Dye » should not be destroyed because DOBUSJES imported them with no intention of causing harm to MININTCO (R) Ltd, it disregarded the provisions of article 258 and 284 of the law on the protection of intellectual property, the Court did not award MININTCO ® Ltd damages resulting from the loss it incurred due to various unfair activities of DOBUSJES, the court was silent on the issue of the judgment being published in the most popular newspapers . He concludes by requesting damages for being dragged in frivolous litigations, procedural and counsel fees.

[8] In response to the grounds of appeal, KIGALI PARTNERS IN LAW states that they are baseless because as decided by the court, in importing the products of KANTO, Dobusjes ltd had no ill intentions of sabotaging MININTCO ®LTD on the ground that it was not the only product it brought but it bought it together with others. It concludes by requesting for procedural and counsel fees.

[9] In this case the issues to be examined are, whether the Court had to order that the 99 boxes of « KANTO Black Hair Dye » had to be destroyed, whether the court had to order that MININTCO ® Ltd be awarded damages for the loss it incurred, whether the judgment had to be published in the most popular newspapers, whether the damages for frivolous litigation, procedural and counsel fees claimed by MININTCO ® Ltd and those requested by DOBUSJES should be awarded.

II. ANALYSIS OF THE LEGAL ISSUE

Determining whether the plaintiff and the defendant has the legal standing

[10] Counsel Mutarindwa Félix and Counsel Ndagijimana Augustin state that the court should first examine the objection which was raised in the Commercial Court which was rejected, whereby they find neither the plaintiff nor defendants have the legal standing. The defendant should not be sued for infringement of the innovation while he is not an industry but a merchant who only buys goods and sells them as they are. The plaintiff also has no standing to sue for infringement of the innovation while he cannot demonstrate that he has an industry or he used to have the industry but not known.

[11] Counsel Mhayimana Isaie state that MININTCO Ltd has the legal standing on the claim of infringement of the innovation on its product of KANTA because it is a commercial company with legal personality. It is suing for infringement on its rights as a company that registered its trademark in Rwanda. Whereby it should be protected but DOBSJES Ltd infringed it. DOBUSJES Ltd issued for infringing on the trademark of KANTA, whereby it did it from China, whereby it imported the products labeled KANTO which was infringing on the trademark KANTA and was caught with them and up to now they are still seized at customs. Thus there is no way DOBUSJES Ltd could claim that MININTCO has no standing to sue DOBUSJES for infringement as held by the Commercial High Court.

COURT'S DETERMINATION

[12] Article 2 of the Law N° 21/2012 of 14/06/2012 relating to the civil, commercial, labour and administrative provides that « claim cannot be accepted in court unless the plaintiff has the status, interest, and capacity to bring the suit. The provisions of Paragraph One of this Article shall also apply to the associations, organizations, and institutions without legal status which cannot file cases before courts without precluding their possibility to be sued.»

[13] The Court finds the arguments of DOBUSJES Ltd that the claim should not be admitted because neither the plaintiff nor the defendant lack the legal standing especially that the defendant sued for infringement on others products is not an industry but a business person who buys in wholesale are groundless because MININTCO not being an industry producing KANTA does not preclude as a company which registered the trademark of KANTA from having the interest, legal standing and capacity provided by article 2 of the Law N° 21/2012 of 14/06/2012 mentioned above, therefore it has all the right to sue anyone who infringes or unlawfully use that trademark.

[14] The Court finds that DOBUSJES Ltd not being an industry producing KANTA do not exonerate it from being sued because what is being sued for is infringing and selling of a product with a trademark which causes confusion of KANTO Black Hair Dye, for DOBUSJES Ltd to be sued does not require that it is the one which produces that product which causes the confusion especially that among the claims against it is selling and supplying that product.

Whether the Court should have ordered to destroy the 99 boxes of 99 « KANTO Black Hair Dye »

[15] Counsel Mhayimana Isaie states that the Judge violated the law in not deciding that those boxes be destroyed. And another issue is that on his motion the judge brought the issuer of bad

faith and good faith while there is a law in place, and this is not the first time that Murekatete the director of DOBUSJOS Ltd had engaged in those activities because he had done it before.

[16] He further states that MININTCO ® Ltd was not contented by the decision in paragraph 47 of the appealed judgment and the motivations in paragraph 29 regarding the refusal to destroy the 99 boxes of KANTO Black Hair Dye seized at the customs, since the Court also had declared that those products were counterfeit which also brought confusion, which was seized at the customs in order to prevent them from being sold at the Rwandan market: its therefore not understandable how the Court can change and accept that DOBUSJES be given those products and even allowed to sell them abroad. Its also not understandable how the Court disregarded the evidence produced demonstrating how DOBUSJES and its director MUREKATETE Fabiola have been engaging in the activities of importing the products infringing on the innovation of KANTA, and also disregarded article 5.1 and 258 and also 284 of the Law on the protection of intellectual property which details and provides penalties for the counterfeit products and suddenly it changed and held that DOBUSJES did not act in bad faith when it imported KANTO in Rwanda which is counterfeit and causes confusion. And among the produced evidence demonstrated the bad faith of DOBUSJES. In its pleadings, DOSUBJES never contested the bad faith it had instead it stated that it does not want MININTCO Ltd to continue monopolizing that product, see how it explains it in paragraph 20 of the judgment. There are statements made by MUREKATETE Fabiola, the Director of DOBUSJES on the letter dated 11/07/2012 which MININTCO Ltd wrote to DOBUSJES Ltd warning it to stop selling counterfeit KANTA. At that time DOBUSJES Ltd accepted that it had a few of them which it was supplied by people it does not know where they get them from. There is no hair dye of KANTA produced in China. It is manufactured in India but sold only in Africa. Therefore there is no reason the Chinese should manufacture counterfeit products that they could not use themselves. Instead, its known by everyone that the merchants (including DOBUSJES Ltd) are the ones who go to China to order for those counterfeit products because they cannot be allowed to buy the original KANTA in India. Therefore DOBUSJES Ltd goes to China with an original KANTA and orders the Chinese to counterfeit it and later they bring them for sale and that is when they were seized. Its not understandable haw after five years (2012-2017) DOBUSJES warned to stop its activities of importing the hair dye counterfeiting KANTA, the Court held that DOBUSJES did not have the bad faith (See the letter dated 11/7/2012 MININTCO Ltd wrote to DUBUSJES Ltd requesting it to stop selling counterfeited KANTA and it also accepted that indeed it sells them) which was registered in Rwanda.

[17] The certificate RW-M100000413 of 10/04/2012 for registering the trademark. Article 284 of the law on the protection of intellectual property which the Court based on in paragraph 28 provides that where imported goods have been found to be infringing or are causing serious injury to intellectual property right, the competent court may order the destruction of infringing goods and the disposal of them outside the channels of commerce in such a way as to preclude injury to the owner. While article 280 provides for a competent court may take special border measures aimed at preventing the importation of goods which infringe intellectual property rights conferred in Rwanda. These two provisions complement each other. Instead the previous Court should have noted that the seized products if were released to DOBUSJES Ltd in Rwanda where the trademark of KANTA was registered and had to be protected, then all the claims of MININTCO Ltd would be in vain, because DOBUSJES Ltd would have been given a chance to continue in unfair activities it is used to. The seizure would have no importance in case the Court

found that counterfeit and confusion were done but instead of DOBUSJES Ltd being punished for it was just told to not put it on the Rwanda market because it can also sell it secretly. Therefore according to the articles indicated above by the Court, MININTCO (R) finds that the decision on those seized 99 boxes is being destroyed and at the expense of DOBUSJES as it has been held in similar cases.

[18] Counsel Mutarindwa Félix and Counsel Ndagijimana Augustin argue that the arguments of counsel Mhayimana Isaie are baseless because he is misinterpreting the law because it does not provide that the judge has to decide in any case to destroy those products (peut ordonner non doit ordonner), therefore in his discretion he found that those products should not be destroyed. On the issue of *bad faith (bonne ou mauvaise foi)* he argues that his client brought those products without any intent to cause a loss to MININTCO Ltd, and the judge did what the law provides for him. They also argue that their client brought many varieties and that the KANTO product was the first time to be imported. Basing on the letter written in the year 2012 is unrealistic because by that time DOMUSJOS did not import goods but it brought goods within the country, that letter was written to many traders and at that time his clients replied and indicated that it was KANTA which is not the subject matter now. They argue that the evidence of KANTO produced they refute it because it is not the same as the ones seized in the customs that he should have proved that the box he submitted is among those seized at customs.

[19] They further argue that as held by the Court indeed Dobusjes ltd in importing the products of KANTO it did not harbour any bad faith against MININTCO ® LTD because that was not the only product it imported but it imported it together with other 16 products which it brought from one shop called chenmin import&exort co, ltd where many people usually buy goods.

[20] Regarding the issue of infringing on the trademark of MININTCO ® LTD, he states that it's not true because DOBUSJES Ltd did not get that product from the industry but in the shop. That shop also got it from WENLING JINGHUI COSMETIC CO, LTD as the elements of evidence on the annex indicate.

[21] On the issue of the case laws which MININTCO pursued the Court to rely on, he finds that they are not similar with this one at hand because the subject matter is not the same and even the parties accept that the products they imported are KANTA which have the same name of KANTA which belongs to MININTCO ® Ltd whereas their imported products do not have the same name and they were not ordered to be manufactured but they were brought from a known shop.

[22] They conclude making a statement on the letter cited by MININTCO wrote in 2012, arguing that it stated traders who import product and they put a trademark of KANTA. By then DOBUSJES was not an importer and what it replied were boxes which were brought which had a mark KANTA it is not the product of HAIR DYE which is a gist of action in this case.

COURT'S DETERMINATION

[23] Article 284 of the Law N° 31/2009 of 26/10/2009 on the protection of intellectual property provides that where imported goods have been found to be infringing or are causing serious injury to intellectual property right, the competent court may order the destruction of infringing goods and the disposal of them outside the channels of commerce in such a way as to preclude injury to the owner.

[24] The Court finds that the main issue to be examined is to determine whether the 99 boxes of 99 KANTO Black Hair Dye have to be destroyed because it's the ground of appeal and was the subject of the debate in the appeal, the issue of the products being counterfeit was not a ground of the appeal.

[25] The Court finds that as held by the previous judge in paragraph 27 of the appealed judgment that the product of KANTO Black Hair Dye is counterfeit and it causes confusion on the product of KANTA and he ruled that it should not be sold in Rwanda but it should not be destroyed he did not err because article 284 of the Law N° 31/2009 of 26/10/2009 mentioned above does not impose the judge to order the products to be destroyed but it provides that the judge can order those products to be destroyed;

[26] The Court finds that the claims of the counsels of MININTCO Ltd that the 99 boxes be destroyed is baseless because as explained by the previous judge that the importer is not the one who made the trademark of KANTO Black Hair Dye, but she brought it at wholesale like any other products and importing it in Rwanda there is no proof that he had a bad faith against MININTCO ® Ltd, this court also finds that to order DOBUSJES Ltd to destroy those products might cause it irreversible loss, instead as held by the previous judge its not allowed to sell them in Rwanda meaning that it has to take its products from Rwanda.

Whether the judgment should have been published in a widely read newspaper

[27] Counsel Mhayimana Isaie states that among the claims of MININTCO ® Ltd to the Court was to order DOBUSJES Ltd that the judgment on this claim should be published in the most popular newspapers in Rwanda like Imvaho Nshya, the new times, igihe.com on the cost of DOBUSJES when the court finds unfair competition on the part of DOBUSJES Ltd, but the Court was silent on that issue. That is the reason he prays to this court to make that order

[28] Counsel Mutarindwa Félix states that the one who has the interest to publish the judgment in the most read newspaper is the one to pay since it is not prohibited by the law.

[29] Counsel Ndagijimana state that even when the judgment is pronounced it is deemed to be published, therefore he does not require to request that publication from the Court, if the outcome is pleasant to it, then it can publish it.

COURT'S DETERMINATION

[30] The Court finds that the arguments of MININTCO Ltd that the judgment should have been published in the most popular newspapers are groundless because for BUSJES being ordered not to sell those products in Rwanda and even there are no other similar products which MININTCO Ltd can possess that DOBUSJES put them on the market for the publication of that

judgment to be aimed at informing people that those products are prohibited therefore there is no reason for the judge to order for the publication of that judgment, however in case MININTCO Ltd wishes to publish it can do it in its interests.

Whether the court should have been awarded to MININTCO ® Ltd for the loss it incurred

[31] Counsel Mhayimana Isaie state that MININTCO Ltd was not awarded damages in the summary procedure RCOM 00654/2017/TC/Nyge as if it was at fault and even the damages for the loss caused by the activities of DOBUSJES Ltd of counterfeit and confusing the trading is carried out for which it was found reliable. MININTCO ® Ltd after noticing that the case N° RCOM 0149/2017/TC/Nyge was given a far date of 06/04/2017 and considering the laws governing the summary procedures because after those products being seized should not have exceeded ten days , it wrote to the president of the Commercial Court requesting that the case should be scheduled to a near date (see letters sent on IECMS) was not responded to that is the reason he applied for the summary procedure aimed at the seizure of those 99 boxes which was in customs in the judgment N° RCOM 0311/2017/TC/Nyge, the Court ordered for the seizure of twenty working days , after those days it filed a claim based on article 277 of the law on the protection of the intellectual property because the principal case was not yet heard and registered on number RCOM 00654/2017/TC/Nyge.

[32] MININTCO Ltd requests for the procedural and counsel fees and even the court fees paid on that case equal to 1,000,000 Frw and moral damages for the activities of DOBUSJES Ltd of counterfeit and causing confusion against MININTCO Ltd of 5,000,000 Frw based on the loss it incurred because of DOBUSJES Ltd which led it into lawsuits. The court should base those damages on the 99 boxes whereby each contains 24 small boxes which contain 12 bottles of KANTO considering that each bottle buys at least two hundred Rwandan francs, that is also the numbers of bottles for KANTA, thus the loss for MININTCO Ltd is caused by those counterfeit products imported by DOBUSJES Ltd because it should have been KANTA imported but KANTO was imported and it loses its profits.

[33] The counsel for the defendant argues that those damages should not be awarded because they filed a summary procedure and were awarded damages and those damages are requested together with the principal claim, therefore their request is aimed at the double payments and should not be awarded because they lost the summary procedure case.

[34] They further argue that instead DOBUSJES Ltd is the one which should have been awarded those damages in that case although it was not awarded and even on merits it was not awarded. On the damages resulting from the trademark which confuses, they again state that they are baseless because the plaintiff was not able to demonstrate what happened was intended to prejudice MININTCO Ltd.

[35] On the issue of the damages for the loss incurred, he argues that they should not be awarded because it does not prove that loss. And if its damages to be awarded to the (une personne morale) it should not be awarded.

[36] Counsel Ndagijimana Augustin states that concerning the damages for the summary procedure claims which they were awarded should not have been awarded to them because such damages are not awarded in the principal cases. He state that its MININTCO Ltd which caused

many lawsuits because it's the one which on occasion requested to extend the seizure of those products.

[37] He further argues that MININTCO ® Ltd has spent almost five years without importing KANTA because of taxes it was charged, it is not understandable how someone can prohibit people from importing those products while he also does not import them, the law on consumer protection should be consulted on this issue. He adds that those products are of standard quality as proved.

[38] On the issue of whether damages were awarded in the summary procedure case, they responded that they were awarded, but case N° RCOMA00162/2017/CHC/HCC which was removed from the registry was produced in which damages provided by the practice notice of the President of Supreme Court was awarded.

COURT'S DETERMINATION

[39] Article 320, paragraph 4 of the Law N° 21/2012 of 14/06/2012 relating to the civil, commercial, labour and administrative procedure provides that damages and other expenses incurred in the summary claim case are filed with the principal claim.

[40] The Court finds that the damages for the loss requested by MININTCO ® Ltd should not be awarded because it has not proved the loss it incurred due to the products of DOBUSJES Ltd especially that those products were not sold on the market for the trade of MININTCO ® Ltd to be prejudiced.

[41] The Court finds the damages for the procedural and counsel fees which are requested for the case N° RCOM00311/2017/TC/NYGE and N° RCOM 00654/2017/TC/Nyge are groundless because as the case N° RCOM 00311/2017/TC/NYGE those damages were awarded in the principal case which is being appealed as indicated in paragraph 37 and 49 of that judgment.

[42] In the case N° RCOM00654/2017/TC/Nyge those damages were not requested in the first instance, so they cannot be awarded because he does not prove them.

Whether the procedural and counsel fees claimed by MININTCO ® Ltd should be awarded

[43] Counsel Mhayimana Isaie states that MININTCO ® Ltd is claiming for damages for being dragged in lawsuits unnecessary, procedural and counsel fees 1,000,000 Frw because of the illegal activities of DOBUSJES Ltd led to lawsuits and hired the service of advocates which was not necessary.

[44] KIGALI PARTNERS IN LAW states that the requested damages should not be awarded and even that which was awarded to it should be annulled because it is unlawful. Another one is that MININTCO ® Ltd is the one which initiated the lawsuits willingly.

COURT'S DETERMINATION

[45] The court finds that those damages should not be awarded because the claimant loses the case.

Whether the procedural and counsel fees claimed by DOBUSJES should be awarded

[46] The counsels for DOBUSJES Ltd state that since MININTCO ® Ltd initiated lawsuits against DOBUSJES it has been summoned in more than 5 cases and it would send a counsel and it would incur other expenses, that is the reason it is requesting in the discretion of the court to be awarded 2,000,000 Frw.

[47] Counsel Mhayimana Isaie states that MININTCO LTD finds that those damages have no merit because the lawsuits were caused by the activities of DOBUSJES Ltd of importing counterfeit products which infringe on the product of KANTA which is registered in Rwanda. Therefore it should not claim for damages because it's the one which caused it because MININTCO Ltd had to protect its rights.

COURT'S DETERMINATION

[48] Article 258 of the Law 30 July 1888 establishing civil code (CCBIII) provides that any act or omission by a man that causes another injury, requires that the former, due to the wrongly act committed, to repair it.'

[49] The Court finds that the damages for procedural and counsel fees requested by DOBUSJES Ltd has merit and they are based on article 258 of the decree Law of 30 July 1888 mentioned above, because MININTCO ® Ltd after winning the case on the first instance appealed and led DOBUSJES Ltd to incur expenses on that appeal and as explained the appeal has no merit, therefore it is reliable for the loss it caused to DOBUSJES Ltd, thus it should pay 700,000 for procedural and counsel fees awarded in the discretion of the court because the one requested is excessive

III. DECISION OF THE COURT

[50] Admits the appeal of MININTCO ® Ltd, but on its examination, it finds it without merit.

[51] Sustains judgment RCOM 00149/2017/TC/NYGE.

[52] Orders MININTCO ® Ltd to pay DOBUSJES Ltd 700,000Frw for procedural and counsel fees on the appellant level.

[53] Orders that the products of DOBUSJES Ltd with a trademark of KANTO Black Hair Dye are prohibited to be sold on the Rwandan market, customs should release them and it gets elsewhere it takes them.

[54] Orders that the 75,000 Frw of the court fees which MININTCO ® Ltd paid remains in the government treasury.