

Policy on the Management of Conflicts of Interest

Basic principles

Before commencing any new work, WP Thompson will undertake appropriate checks to identify any circumstances that might give rise to a conflict of interest, and will take steps either to avoid or to mitigate sufficiently any such conflict.

Avoidance of conflict

As a regulated person, WP Thompson will cease to act for an existing client, or will decline to act for a potential client, where it becomes apparent that the interests of WP Thompson will conflict with those of an existing, potential or former client, or where we know, or have reasonable grounds for suspecting, that the interests of any partner or director of WP Thompson, or of any regulated person or staff employed by a company under the control of WP Thompson, conflict with those of an existing, potential or former client.

We will refuse to act on behalf of conflicting or potentially conflicting parties in contentious matters, in all circumstances where our actions would not be seen to be neutral or where accepting instructions from both parties would risk:

- Breaching confidentiality in respect of any party; or
- Compromising our independence or integrity; or
- Damaging the dignity and good standing of the patent or trade mark professions.

In forming a judgement on whether or not to act, we will apply the knowledge available to us, which will be all relevant knowledge, and may be knowledge that is not widely disseminated or available to the public.

Mitigation of conflict

We may act for two or more existing clients, or for an existing client as against a former client, in relation to the same or a related matter in a situation of conflict, or possible conflict, but only if:

- Appropriate safeguards to protect confidentiality can be put in place; and
- All of the parties have given their informed consent in writing; and
- In all the circumstances it is reasonable to do so.

Notwithstanding the giving of informed consent, we will at all times decline to act for parties where acting would not be seen as neutral, or could breach confidentiality, compromise our independence, or damage the reputation of the patent or trademark professions.