Study Objective in this writing is sociologies yuridis in registration of brand application. Before there is decision to accept or refuse registration of brand application, the examiner of brand conduct inspection by substantive by giving attention to section 4 section 5 and section 6 UU No.15 Years 2001 About Brand. Application of registration of elementary brand deduction is section 6.

In this research of writer take problems regarding how mechanism inspection of brand in registration of brand application in office Directorate General Intellectual Equity and how legal efforts conducted by applicant of refused brand. This research aim to know mechanism inspection of brand in registration of brand application in office Directorate General Intellectual Equity and to know legal efforts conducted by applicant of refused brand.

Approach method which is used in the research is Yuridis Sociologies that is by collecting primary data and data of secondary. Technique data collecting of primary is by interview with resource person exists in Directorate Brand Directorate General Intellectual Equity of Tangerang. While data collecting of secondary obtained from literature, documentation, law and regulation and others.

Pursuant to result of research got by 2 mechanism phase inspection of brand in registration of brand application. First mechanism is inspection formally that is inspection to equipment conditions of registration of brand application which have been fulfilled by applicant and have been determined on the date of its acceptance; second Mechanism is inspection by substantive that is inspection to registration of brand application, is the brand can registered in Dirjen HKI or do not have equation with brand which have enlisted in Dirjen HKI, owning equation with famous brand both for enlisting and also do not enlist in Dirjen HKI. And that mechanism in the reality in registration of brand application in inspection of substantive influencing is section 6 UU No.15 Years 2001 About Brand that is section 6 article 1 a, about having equation in the first place with brand property of other party which have enlisted in advance for goods of a kind, section 6 article 1 b about having equation in the first place with brand which have famous property of other party for goods of a kind. Section 6 articles 1 c about having equation in the first place with geographical indication which has been recognized and section 6 articles 2 about having equation in the first place with brand which have famous property of other party for goods do not of a kind. Caused by the section 6 hence registration of brand application refused.

One of the refused by brand case registration of brand application is brand of SABA raised by company of AMMANN & SOHNE GMBH & CO.KG. This Brand is refused by its registration because having equation in the first place with brand which in advance enlist in Dirjen HKI that is with brand of SABA of company of PT. Endless Sragen of Textile. Legal effort able to be conducted by refused applicant is its registration by raising objection and raise to compare to Commission Compare Brand. Both of the efforts have been conducted by
brand of SABA of company of AMMANN & SOHNE GMBH & CO.KG. Because of commission compare brand refused, later; then brand of SABA of company of AMMANN & SOHNE GMBH & CO.KG bring a lawsuit to the court to Justice of Commercial and given by decision result Justice of Commercial is to accept plaintiff demand. In This Case Commission Compare Brand do not accept decision of the justice and raise Kasasi to Appellate Court and in application of raised Kasasi is refused by judge.

Its conclusion, from that mechanism in the reality in registration of brand application in inspection of substantive influencing is section 6 UU No.15 Year 2001 About Brand that is section 6 article 1 a, section 6 article 1 b, section 6 article 1 c and section 6 sentence 2. While at legal effort in Director General of HKI see at section 6 article 1 that is having equation in the first place with brand property of other party which has enlisted in advance for goods of a kind. While Justice of Commercial till Appellate Court do not see or consider section 6 article 1 a. accepted of decision of Appellate Court in Director General of HKI there is 2 same brand which have been accepted by its registration. Suggestion, require to be improved again performance examiner of brand so that do not happened registration overlap.