



6 May 2025 | News | Patents | Sarah Speight

'Nothing can stand in the way of our work': Ukraine resumes IP system

As Ukraine lifts the wartime pause on IP deadlines, the country's lawyers are determined to get back to business as usual—in spite of the ongoing missile attacks and power outages, finds Sarah Speight.

As the Russia-Ukraine war continues, and the promise of a ceasefire having apparently evaporated, Ukraine's parliament is nevertheless signalling its intention to get the country's economy and legislature back on track.

Last week, on April 29, President Volodimir Zelenskyy signed a new law which essentially repeals the previous wartime suspension of IP deadlines, put in place in April 2022. Martial law remains in place in Ukraine and has recently been extended until August 7, 2025.

The new law (No. 4362-IX) was published on May 1 and will enter into force 30 days after this (May 31), when all IP-related deadlines will resume.

According to [Riikka Palmos](#) of [Papula-Nevinpat](#) (see more below), “this transition will be critical to rebuilding trust and ensuring that Ukraine’s IP system can support post-war recovery, economic resilience, and international engagement”.

But it means there will be work ahead. Ukraine’s IP office (the Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations, or [UANPIO](#)) faces a backlog, rights holders face potential extra admin and costs, and the wartime pause on IP deadlines has led to a rash of counterfeits and increased infringement, alongside weakened enforcement.

Under the new law, rights owners will have a 75-day grace period from May 31 until August 14 to complete any action that was postponed under the previous law, or to pay overdue fees—even if the deadline falls sooner than the 75-day grace period expires.

Patent annuities that were due during the suspension period will be deemed as settled if paid within 75 days from the day the new law takes effect, otherwise IP rights will retroactively lapse as if they were never extended.

Trademark renewal fees due during the suspension period will also be considered settled if paid within the 75-day statutory grace period. Timely renewals will extend trademark validity for a further 10 years.

To explain the reasons for and implications of this legislative shift, three IP lawyers talk to **WIPR**: [Riikka Palmos](#), senior partner and director, and European trademark attorney, at [Papula-Nevinpat](#) in Helsinki, Finland; [Oleg Klymchuk](#), partner at [Sayenko Kharenko](#); and [Oleh Karpenko](#), head of office at [CWB](#).

WIPR: What prompted the Ukrainian Parliament to take this action?

Riikka Palmos: The repeal of the wartime IP provisions signals a strategic shift toward legal normalisation and stability. While the conflict continues, the decision appears to be intended as a message that Ukraine has the administrative capacity to resume normal legal procedures, and that there is political will to align national systems with international norms.

Whether this perceived capacity fully reflects reality is another matter, but the symbolic value of the decision is clear: to demonstrate resilience, continuity, and a commitment to the rule of law under difficult conditions.

Suspended applications, delayed procedures, and uncertain rights benefit no one. Reinstating normal procedures helps to avoid the risk of systemic paralysis. For example, there are currently many pending applications awaiting confirmation on whether earlier-cited prior rights will ultimately be renewed.

Moreover, almost no rights are legally secure at the moment, since opposition periods can be restored. This legal ambiguity complicates both the IP strategy of rights holders and the functioning of the system as a whole.

The return to standard deadlines provides an opportunity to re-establish clarity and predictability. It enables rights holders to make informed decisions about which rights to maintain, and it allows authorities to start processing backlogs more efficiently.

Over time, this transition will be critical to rebuilding trust and ensuring that Ukraine's IP system can support post-war recovery, economic resilience, and international engagement.

Oleg Klymchuk: For practitioners, it was a bit unexpectedly adopted. Initially, it was aimed to improve the IP deadlines regulation with respect to patents. Then, at the very last moment (voting during the second hearing), it turned to a resumption of all IP deadlines.

We think it was promoted by IP industry institutions, [and] we suppose that it is caused by two things.

First, an increasing backlog for the IP office [the UANIPIO] because many rights holders rely on the suspension of IP deadlines.

For example, according to the latest data from the IP office, there are currently 11,250 trademark applications awaiting payment in the documentation processing division. Of these, 10,169 trademark applications (90.17% of the total) have missed the payment deadline (a six-month grace period during which the applicant could restore their expired IP rights).

And second, the desire of the IP office to increase the collection of official fees (in order to raise funds for its operation).

Oleh Karpenko: Previously, the law stipulated that IP deadlines in Ukraine would resume only after the lifting of martial law, with a 90-day grace period for rights holders to take necessary actions. This suspension was tied to the ongoing martial law, which has been extended in 90-day increments since February 24, 2022.

In my view, this dependency prompted Parliament to adopt a new law. Given the obvious uncertainty surrounding the end of the war and the lifting of martial law, and considering that the IP office is fully operational and most communications/filing can be handled online, the Parliament decided to decouple IP deadlines from martial law.

WIPR: How has the war and the wartime pause on deadlines impacted IP in Ukraine?

Riikka Palmos: While much of the recent discussion around Ukraine's IP framework has focused on the reinstatement of suspended deadlines, I see that the broader implications of the war include a significant increase in counterfeiting, weakened enforcement, and long-term risks to the stability of the IP system itself.

The disruption of customs oversight, border control, and judicial operations has made it easier for infringers to exploit the system. Many enforcement mechanisms have been reoriented toward national security needs, leaving IP-related crimes with reduced visibility and response capacity.

As a result, both domestic and foreign rights holders have faced practical challenges in protecting their rights during wartime. In some cases, counterfeit goods—instead of being destroyed—have even been redirected for military use.

While such decisions may reflect wartime pragmatism, they highlight the blurred boundaries between IP enforcement and broader public interest under exceptional conditions.

Although the UANIPIO has continued to operate under difficult conditions, actual enforcement remains uneven, particularly in contested regions or where cross-border issues arise.

This gap between formal rights and practical enforceability raises key strategic questions for businesses: which rights are worth maintaining in the short term, and which may hold more value as part of a long-term recovery strategy?

***WIPR:* What does the new law mean in practical terms for rights holders, both in Ukraine and in countries that do business with Ukraine?**

Riikka Palmos: All previously suspended or extended deadlines—for renewals, oppositions, responses, and other procedural actions—are now reinstated.

For rights holders in Ukraine, this reintroduces the obligation to actively monitor and manage their IP rights under standard timelines. For international companies doing business with or in Ukraine, it signals a return to a more predictable legal environment, which is important for investment and trade.

Oleg Klymchuk: For rights holders and IP professionals, it means returning to regular routines and keeping a closer eye on timelines and formalities despite ongoing martial law.

Oleh Karpenko: Rights holders who wish to preserve their IP rights should promptly review their portfolios to identify any cases where deadlines were suspended or missed, and take action by submitting postponed filings and paying the relevant fees.

While there is currently ample time to address these matters, it is strongly recommended not to delay.

***WIPR:* Will IP practitioners and the UANIPIO cope with tackling the backlog?**

Riikka Palmos: The UANIPIO has shown commendable resilience throughout the conflict, maintaining core functions despite the challenges. That said, a backlog is almost inevitable as paused applications and delayed oppositions come back into the system at once.

Staffing shortages and resource constraints may further slow processing. Still, with international cooperation and prioritisation of cases, it's reasonable to expect that the backlog will be managed over time, although rights holders should be prepared for delays in the short term.

Oleg Klymchuk: We think that will be a challenging period for the IP office and those IP practitioners who relied on the suspension of IP deadlines.

That's why we usually advise rights holders to continue adhering to the IP deadlines. This ensures that IP cases remain well-organised and prevent any missed deadlines once the martial law is lifted or the suspended IP deadlines are reinstated.

For those applicants who will not be able to rely on the provisions of the adopted law and are granted the 75-day grace period, the IP office remains open to consider **force majeure** circumstances on a case-by-case basis.

Oleh Karpenko: We do not anticipate any issues arising from an increased workload, as all suspended cases for our clients have been carefully docketed and are being closely monitored. Clients have also been kept informed about the recent legislative changes.

Moreover, we consistently advised clients not to rely heavily on the martial law suspension and, where feasible, to meet deadlines and avoid unnecessary delays in taking action or paying fees.

WIPR: How difficult is it to continue to practice while the war is ongoing?

Riikka Palmos: Practising law in wartime conditions presents real challenges—from power outages and displaced staff to psychological strain. Yet many Ukrainian IP professionals have adapted remarkably, using remote tools and flexible work structures to maintain operations.

Still, unpredictability remains a factor, and practitioners must balance client responsibilities with personal and logistical constraints. Overall, the determination and adaptability shown by the Ukrainian IP community have been impressive under the circumstances.

Oleg Klymchuk: Frankly, it's difficult. But [we] must keep moving. We believe that, among others, it is important to show non-Ukrainian rights holders that the IP industry is sufficiently functioning. Protecting IP rights in Ukraine remains important, including paying annuities and renewal fees.

Oleh Karpenko: We resumed normal operations shortly after the initial shock of the invasion subsided in 2022. Our IP office has also remained largely operational, as have the courts and other governmental institutions, contributing to a sense of [normality].

Naturally, missile attacks and power outages have affected everyone at various times, including us, but we have continued to deliver high-quality services to our clients. Today, it feels as though nothing can stand in the way of our ability to keep doing our work.

<https://www.worldipreview.com/patent/nothing-can-stand-in-the-way-of-our-work-ukraine-resumes-ip-system>