



Education

University of Ottawa (2012) JD
Western University (2009) MSc
(Molecular Biology/Genetics)
Western University (2007) HBS
(Genetics Specialization)

Bar Admissions

Ontario (2013)

Practice Areas

Intellectual Property

Contact

T 416-238-7397
mbrandsma@litigate.com

Martin Brandsma

MARTIN BRANDSMA

is a partner at Lenczner Slaght.

Martin's practice focuses on all aspects of intellectual property litigation and IP strategy including matters relating to patents, copyright, trademarks, trade secrets and industrial designs. He has extensive experience representing a broad range of clients including those in biotechnology, life sciences, consumer goods, technology, telecommunications, sound recording, and collective rights management. He also regularly acts in pharmaceutical patent cases under Canada's *Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations*, representing some of the world's leading pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies, in both the Federal Court of Canada and the Federal Court of Appeal.

Martin is also an active member of the Canadian IP community, participating on various IP-related committees, and is regularly invited to speak on topics affecting protection of and enforcement of IP in Canada.

Prior to attending law school, Martin obtained a M.Sc. in Molecular Biology/Genetics from Western University. His research focused on the design, production and optimization of novel recombinant therapeutic biologics.

RECOGNITION

- Best Lawyers in Canada (2022-2023)
Ones to Watch – Intellectual Property
- IAM Patent 1000 (2024 - 2025)
Patent Litigation: Recommended Individual (Bronze)
- LMG Life Sciences (2023-2024)
Intellectual Property (Rising Star)
- Managing Intellectual Property: IP STARS (2024)
Rising Star
- The Legal 500 Canada (2024)
Intellectual Property (Recommended Lawyer)

SELECT CASES

- **Samsung Bioepis v Janssen Biotech** – Counsel to Janssen in a patent impeachment action regarding Canadian Patent No. 3,113,837, which relates to STELARA (ustekinumab) and its use to treat ulcerative colitis.
- **The DDrops Company Inc v Allmax Nutrition Inc** – Counsel to the Respondent, Allmax Nutrition Inc., in an appeal of a decision of the Canadian Trademarks Opposition Board addressing issues of trademark

confusion and distinctiveness.

- **Gilead Sciences, Inc et al v Pharmascience Inc** – Counsel to Gilead Sciences, Inc. and Gilead Sciences Canada, Inc. in a NOC action in the Federal Court in respect of Canadian Patent Nos. 2,845,553 and 2,990,210.
- **Gilead Sciences, Inc et al v JAMP Pharma Corporation** – Counsel to Gilead Sciences, Inc. and Gilead Sciences Canada, Inc. in a NOC action in the Federal Court in respect of Canadian Patent No. 2,990,210.
- **Gilead Sciences, Inc et al v Natco Pharma (Canada) Inc** – Counsel to Gilead Sciences, Inc. and Gilead Sciences Canada, Inc. in a NOC action in the Federal Court in respect of Canadian Patent No. 2,845,553.
- **Gilead Sciences Inc, et al v JAMP Pharma Corporation** – Counsel to Gilead Sciences, Inc. and Gilead Sciences Canada, Inc. in a NOC action in the Federal Court in respect of Canadian Patent No. 2,845,553.
- **Gilead Sciences, Inc et al v Natco Pharma (Canada) Inc** – Counsel to Gilead Sciences, Inc. and Gilead Sciences Canada, Inc. in a NOC action in the Federal Court in respect of Canadian Patent Nos. 2,845,553 and 2,990,210.
- **Gilead Sciences, Inc et al v Apotex Inc** – Counsel to Gilead Sciences, Inc. and Gilead Sciences Canada, Inc. in a NOC action in the Federal Court in respect of Canadian Patent No. 2,845,553.
- **Adeia Guides v BCE Inc, Ericsson et al** – Counsel to Adeia Guides, Inc. and Adeia Media Holdings LLC in a patent infringement action involving four patents related to digital entertainment technologies.
- **UPL NA Inc v Agracity Crop & Nutrition Ltd** – Counsel to UPL NA Inc. in a patent infringement action in the Federal Court of Canada in respect of Canadian Patent No. 2,346,021.
- **Deeproot Green Infrastructure, LLC v Greenblue Urban North America Inc** – Counsel to Greenblue Urban North America Inc. in a proceeding for contempt following a patent infringement action in the Federal Court of Canada.
- **Bristol-Myers Squibb Canada Co v Teva Canada Limited** – Counsel for Bristol-Myers Squibb Canada Co in a NOC action in the Federal Court of Canada in respect of Canadian Patent Nos. 2,250,840 and 2,317,736.
- **Gentec v Nuheara IP Pty Ltd** – Counsel to Gentec in a summary trial for trademark infringement and passing off in the Federal Court of Canada.
- **Evertz Technologies Limited v Lawo AG** – Counsel to Lawo AG in an action for breach of confidence relating to confidential information and trade secrets in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.
- **Re: Sound v Canadian Association of Broadcasters** – Counsel to Re: Sound on a judicial review from a decision of the Copyright Board of Canada relating to royalties for the use of published sound recordings.

SELECT PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

- **Copyright & AI: Navigating the Creative Frontier** – Martin Brandsma was invited to moderate the panel *Copyright & AI: Navigating the Creative Frontier* as part of the Intellectual Property Institute of Canada (IPIC)'s AI & IP Law Webinar Series. Martin led a discussion on the intersection of copyright law and artificial intelligence. The panel also explored the recent U.S. decisions involving copyright and AI, while examining its potential influence on Canadian legal frameworks.
- **2024 Snapshot: Through the Lens of Lenczner Slaght** – Lenczner Slaght launches our *2024 Snapshot*, which highlights the most significant developments, decisions, and trends in litigation from the past year across 20 areas of expertise. Reflect on 2024 and look ahead to 2025 through the lens of our expert litigators.
- **Bifurcation Motions in Intellectual Property Disputes** – Martin Brandsma was invited to speak at the Canadian Bar Association program titled, *Bifurcation Motions in Intellectual Property Disputes*. Martin shared practical insights and strategies to enhance litigation by leveraging bifurcation to streamline IP cases, reduce costs, and achieve other strategic advantages. He also shared real-world examples and discussed the latest trends in IP disputes related to bifurcating a case.
- **Rules of Evidence: A Refresher for IP Professionals** – Martin Brandsma and Margaret Robbins were invited to present at the Intellectual Property Institute of Canada's webinar titled, *Rules of Evidence: A Refresher for IP Professionals*. Martin and Margaret shared their expertise on tips, tricks, and practical advice for IP professionals on the rules of evidence, including types of evidence, criteria for admissibility, and advice on adducing evidence at trial.
- **Year-in-Review in IP Law 2024** – Martin Brandsma was invited to present at the Intellectual Property Institute of Canada's (IPIC) *Year-in-Review in IP Law 2024*. Martin led this year's panel on copyright law, which included discussion on the most significant IP decisions over the last year.

BLOG POSTS

- **Class Dismissed: Copyright Reverse Class Action Fails to Get Passing Grade** – On July 16, 2025, a long-running effort by several film studios to have claims of copyright infringement decided by way of reverse class action reached a further impasse. In *Voltage Pictures v Robert Salna (Voltage FCA #2)*, the Federal Court of Appeal (FCA) dismissed – for a second time – the studios' appeal for certification of a proposed class of unknown individual defendants.
- **Making Your Patent List and Checking It Twice... but Don't Delay in Submitting It!** – Engaging Canada's *Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations* (the "*Regulations*") requires pharmaceutical patentees to first submit a list to Health Canada of patents to be included on the register – Canada's equivalent to the Orange Book. Any delay in submitting that list after an eligible patent has been issued can have severe consequences on the scope of a patentee's protections under the *Regulations*. The recent Federal Court decision in *Serono v Canada (Health)* is illustrative.
- **Policing Scope Creep: Relevance in Canadian Pharma Disputes for Section 8 Damages** – In Canada, a generic pharmaceutical company can commence an action for damages under section 8 of the *Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations* (the "*Regulations*"), if it successfully defends a patentee's claims in an earlier section 6 prohibition proceeding. Section 8 actions are often complex, requiring a determination of the alleged loss suffered by assessing a "but-

for world” where the generic would have received regulatory approval and commenced sales at an earlier date, but for having been blocked by the operation of the *Regulations*. Depending on the drug(s) and patent(s) at issue, there may be several independent section 8 actions against a patentee, each started by a different generic plaintiff (see our previous post). When distinct section 8 actions are commenced pertaining to the same drug(s), patent(s), and patentee(s), issues as to relevance and scope of each action may arise.

➤ **Inventor Examination Cannot Be Compelled by Proxy, and Other**

Practical Lessons – In the recently released decision *Boehringer Ingelheim Ltd v Jamp Pharma Corporation*, Jamp brought a motion seeking an order that would require Boehringer to make their employee inventors attend to be examined for discovery, failing which the order could be enforced against Boehringer themselves. Boehringer argued that the *Rules* do not contemplate such an order. Associate Judge Duchesne agreed.

➤ **Clarity on the Test for Inducing Infringement in Canadian Patent**

Law – Indirect infringement or “inducement” often arises in pharmaceutical patent infringement cases where a defendant generic manufacturer may not ultimately “use” the drug in question (*i.e.*, directly infringe). Since 2011, the Federal Court of Appeal’s (“FCA”) *Corlac Inc v Weatherford Canada Inc* decision has frequently been cited as the leading authority for the tripartite test for inducement. In 2020, the Federal Court suggested that *Corlac* had changed the law of inducement—particularly at the second step determining influence—thereby requiring “a higher threshold for establishing inducement than was applied in the earlier cases”. In the recent decision of *Teva Canada Limited v Janssen Inc* (“*Paliperidone*”), the FCA has rejected that interpretation of *Corlac*. The FCA held that *Corlac* incorporates the same principles of inducing infringement as had been established in cases dating back to 1906. In doing so, it overturned the lower Court’s inducement determination based on a supposed higher standard and found that the defendant was liable for inducement when the *Corlac* test was properly applied.

SELECT NEWS ARTICLES

➤ **IAM Patent 1000 Highlights Lenczner Slaght’s IP Expertise** –

Canada’s leading litigation firm continues to receive worldwide recognition for its exceptional Intellectual Property expertise.

➤ **Lenczner Slaght Welcomes New Partners in Construction & IP** –

Canada’s leading litigation firm is proud to announce that two of our expert litigators, Aaron Grossman and Martin Brandsma, have been promoted to the partnership.

➤ **Lenczner Slaght Recognized for Patent Litigation Excellence by**

LMG Life Sciences – Lenczner Slaght is pleased to announce its continued recognition for patent litigation expertise in the latest edition of *LMG Life Sciences*, following an in-depth qualitative research process that included peer and client feedback.

➤ **IAM Patent 1000 Recognizes Lenczner Slaght’s Expert IP Team** –

Lenczner Slaght continues to receive worldwide recognition for its intellectual property expertise and is proud to advance to the Silver Tier in the 2024 edition of IAM Patent 1000: The World’s Leading Patent Professionals.

- **Lenczner Slaght Stands Out as a Top-Tier Litigation Firm in Legal 500 Canada** – Canada's leading litigation firm is once again recognized as a "litigation powerhouse" according to *Legal 500 Canada*.
- **Lenczner Slaght Welcomes Martin Brandsma** – Canada's leading litigation firm is pleased to announce that Martin Brandsma has joined its Intellectual Property Group as Counsel.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

- Intellectual Property Institute of Canada
CPD Committee
- Ontario Bar Association
- The Advocates' Society