

Index

ABANDONMENT OF TRADE DRESS

Defense to claim, **16:9**

ABERCROMBIE & FITCH STORES, INC. v. AMERICAN EAGLE OUTFITTERS, INC.

Appellant's brief, **47:4**

ACCU-SYSTEMS v. B & C INSTRUMENT PARTS, INC.

Generally, **42:9**

ACTUAL CONFUSION

Likelihood of

actual "actual confusion," **7:7**

projected "actual confusion," surveys, **7:8**

Secondary meaning (requirement and proof), **13:16**

ADMISSIONS

Discovery issue: interrogatories and requests for, **21:1**

Mother's Nutritional Center, Inc. v. Mommy's Nutritional Center, first set of requests for admissions, **43:1**

ADVERTISING

False, see **False advertising claims**

Insurance coverage, **29:2**

Proof of secondary meaning

amount spent as a factor, **13:7**

image advertising, **13:8**

State laws on false, related claims in trade dress cases, **10:8**

AESTHETIC FUNCTIONALITY

Defined, **17:3**

AFFILIATION

Confusion of sponsorship or, **7:12**

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Functionality element as, **6:2**

functionality as element of plaintiff's case in chief, **6:3**

statutory resolution of the split of authority as to functionality, **6:4**

AIRPLANE COLORS

Figure, **30:12**

AMENDMENTS

Effect on and applicability to functionality, **17:16**

AMERICAN AIRLINE PLANE COLORS

Figure, **30:12**

ANTI-MOLDING STATUTES

State, and trade dress cases, **10:15**

APPAREL

Protection for sporting goods and, **11:6**

APPEALS

See **Appellate review**

APPELLATE REVIEW

Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc. v. American Eagle Outfitters, Inc., **47:4**

Amicus brief, motion for leave to file, Conopco, Inc. v. May Dept. Stores Co., **47:7**

Appellant's brief

Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc. v. American Eagle Outfitters, Inc., **47:4**

Hansen's appeal brief in Hansen Beverage Co. v. Thunderbolt Beverage Co., **47:3**

TraffFix's brief in Supreme Court TraffFix case, **47:2**

Conopco, Inc. v. May Dept. Stores Co., motion for leave to file amicus brief and brief amicus curiae, **47:7**

Functionality and, **17:10**

Hansen's appeal brief in Hansen Beverage Co. v. Thunderbolt Beverage Co., **47:3**

Jury verdicts, **22:7**

Lanard Toys, Inc. v. General Motors Corp, reply brief for writ of certiorari, **47:6**

Likelihood of confusion and standards of, **7:10**

Of preliminary injunction orders, **20:16**

Oral argument, Mercado Latino Inc. v. Indio Products, Inc., **47:8**

Procedural issue of, of trade dress rulings, **19:4**

Reply brief, Lanard Toys, Inc. v. General Motors Corp, **47:6**

Standard of review, **12:7, 22:8**

Supreme Court trade dress decisions, **35:1-35:11**

TraffFix's brief in Supreme Court TraffFix case, **47:2**

Writ of certiorari, reply brief for, Lanard Toys, Inc. v. General Motors Corp, **47:6**

APPLICATION

Defenses to preliminary injunction, delay in, **20:18**

Petition for writ of mandamus and application for stay of transfer order: Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **41:2**

Protection in PTO and mechanics of trade dress application

drawing, trade dress description, trade dress specimens, **26:11**

ARBITRATION

Procedural issues, **19:13**

ASSETS

Relief for infringement, order freezing defendant's assets during litigation, **15:22**

ATTORNEY/CLIENT PRIVILEGE

Intentional copying and, advice of counsel, **14:17**

ATTORNEYS

Fees of, see **Attorneys' fees**

Finding of trade dress, in foreign countries, **27:2**

Insurance coverage, independent or "cumis" counsel, **29:7**

ATTORNEYS' FEES

Intentional copying and effect on, **14:9**

Relief for infringement and overview, **15:9**

right to jury trial

counterclaims, **15:18**

damages or equitable relief sought, **15:16**

waiver of jury trial right, **15:17**

section 35 of Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.S. § 1117(a)

application to section 43(a), **15:11**

attempted parody intent, **15:14**

exceptional circumstances, **15:13**

issues presented, **15:12**

unusual financial hardship to the defendant, **15:15**

AUDITS

Protection overview, **3:9**

AUTHORITY

Split of, on various issues of functionality, **17:11**

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Protection for, **11:13**

BEALL CORP.

Fed. Reg. No. 1,622,363, file history of, truck trailer design, **33:3**

BEER BOTTLE

Figure, **30:8**

BENCH TRIALS

Generally, **22:4**

B & F SYSTEM, INC. v. LEBLANC

Memorandum in support of preliminary injunction, **41:5**

BOND

Preliminary injunction, issues related to injunction bond, **20:13**

BONITO BOATS, INC. v. THUNDER CRAFT BOATS, INC.

Text of Supreme Court opinion, **35:7**

BOOK

Introduction to

generally, **1:1**

scope of book, **1:3**

BOOK—Cont'd

Introduction to—Cont'd
use of book, **1:2**

BOTTLES

Protection for, **11:4**

BRIGHTON COLLECTIBLES, INC. v. RK TEXAS LEATHER MFG., INC.

Defendants' motions in limine to prohibit pictures in lieu of actual products, **44:8**

Second amended complaint, **40:5.70**

Trials, final judgments, briefs, **45:11**

BRITISH SEAGULL CASE

Generally, **26:7**

BROADNESS

See also **Protection overview**

Of trade dress, **2:2**

Too broad or too strong, **3:4**

Trade dress as hidden fortress, **3:3**

BURDEN OF PROOF

Functionality, **17:8**

Lanham Act, 1999 amendment to section 43(a) of Lanham Act to clarify burden of proof in trade dress cases, **8:2**

BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS

Tort claims under state law and, **10:11**

BUYERS

Notification of, of infringing products, intentional copying and effect on, **14:11**

CALIFORNIA

Business & Professions Code, **31:6**

California case law, **9:3**

Model State Trademark Law, **31:7**

Professions and Occupations Code, 2007 excerpts from, **31:7**

Protection under statutes of, **9:2**

CANCELLATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) protection, **26:21**

CANDY BAR

Figure, **30:3**

CANDY IN SHAPE OF DIAMOND RING

Fed. Reg. No. 1,846,873, file history of, Topps Company, **33:2**

CANS

Protection for, **11:4**

CAR-FRESHNER CORP v. D & J DISTRIBUTING

Jury trial instructions, **45:8.70**

Jury verdicts, **45:6.70**

CAROL CABLE CO. v. GRAND AUTO, INC.

Generally, **42:1**

INDEX

CASE LAW

See specific matter

CEASE AND DESIST LETTERS

Samples, 39:1-39:3

CGS INDUSTRIES, INC. v. THE CHARTER OAK FIRE INSURANCE, CO.

Memorandum in support of judgment on the pleadings, F.R.C.P. 12(c), 41:6

CHECKLIST

Of possible defenses to claims, 16:2

CHRISTIAN LOUBOUTIN S.A. v. YVES SAINT LAURENT AMERICA, INC.

Answer to amended complaint from Christian Louboutin S.A. v. Yves Saint Laurent America, Inc., 40:7

CIRCUITS

Obtaining preliminary injunction in different, 20:8

CLAIM ELEMENTS

Actual confusion not required element, 6:7

Application by the courts of, 6:9

Consistency of trade dress, 6:11

Description of trade dress, requirement of sufficiently specific, 6:10

Domestic use of trade dress, 6:12

Functionality element as

affirmative defense, 6:2

functionality as element of plaintiff's case in chief, 6:3

statutory resolution of the split of authority as to functionality, 6:4

Intent not required element, 6:6

Overview of essential, 6:1

Ownership element of the trade dress, 6:5

Reputation of trade dress, 6:12

Secondary meaning for product configuration when required, 6:8

CLAIM PRECLUSION

Protection in PTO, 26:20

CLAIMS

Assertion of state court unfair competition claims in federal court under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1338(a), 8:5

Insurance. **Insurance coverage**

Misrepresentation of source under section 14(3) of Lanham Act, 10:17

Nonapplicability of Sears-Comco defense to federal trademark, 18:3

Patent protection, defining trade dress with reference to patent claim, 25:7

Procedural issue in trade dress cases, motion to dismiss or remand to state court, supplemental state action, 19:6

PTO protection, claim preclusion, 26:20

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Related, in trade dress cases

dilution, 10:1

conflicts on different issues, 10:3

Federal law, 10:2

model state trademark bill version of dilution, 10:4

particular cases, 10:5

Federal false advertising claims, 10:14

misappropriation, 10:10

miscellaneous tort claims under state law

interference with business relationships, 10:11

trade libel or disparagement, 10:12

misrepresentation of source under section 14(3) of Lanham Act, 10:17

patent and copyright claims, 10:13

State anti-molding statutes, 10:15

State common law trade dress infringement, 10:9

state unfair and deceptive trade practices laws generally, 10:6

state false advertising laws, 10:8

state unfair competition laws, 10:7

theft of trade secrets, 10:16

State court or state law protection, subject matter jurisdiction over federal claims, 9:8

Subject matter jurisdiction over federal claims, 9:8

Trade dress and copyright, in same lawsuit for same subject matter, 24:2

CLIFFORD MILLER v. CHESEBOROUGH PONDS CO. USA

Notice of removal from state court to federal court, 41:1

COATS v. MERRICK THREAD CO.

Text of Supreme Court opinion, 35:1

COLOR

Functionality of color coding, 17:12

Likelihood of confusion and confusion of shade or, 7:13

Packaging, as trade dress example

generally, 5:1

color in combination with other elements, 5:3

color per se, 5:2

Particular problem of functionality in, 17:4

Per se, as protectable, 2:3

Protection in PTO of, as trade dress

before the Lanham Act, 26:2

British Seagull case, 26:7

burden in registering color, 26:4

color depletion theory, 26:5

current status, 26:9

de jure functionality test, 26:6

Owens-Corning case, 26:3

shade confusion and color specification, 26:8

COMMON LAW TRADE DRESS INFRINGEMENTState, related claims in trade dress cases, **10:9****COMPARISONS**Likelihood of confusion, use of slogan “If You Like X, You’ll Love Y” and similar, **7:14**

Likelihood of confusion and trade dress

overall impression, **7:6**side by side comparison may be proper, **7:5**side by side comparison not proper, **7:4****COMPCO CORP. v. DAY-BRITE LIGHTING, INC.**Text of Supreme Court opinion, **35:5****COMPUTER PRODUCTS**Protection for, **11:9****CONDIMENT CONTAINER**Figure, **30:9****CONFIGURATION (OR SHAPE)**Applicability of Sears-Compco defense to product configuration trade dress, **18:4**Application of inherent distinctiveness to product configuration trade dress, **12:6**As trade dress example, **5:5**Secondary meaning for product, when required for claim, **6:8****CONFLICTS**Dilution claims and, on different issues, **10:3****CONFUSION**Actual, not a required element to claim, **6:7**Intentional copying and likelihood of, **14:6**

Likelihood of

generally, **7:1**effect of disclaimers on likelihood of confusion, **7:16**effect of intent on likelihood of confusion, **7:17**effect of use of defendant’s own marks or labels on likelihood of confusion, **7:15**

expert witness report and declaration by Henry R.

Hidell III as to likelihood of confusion of trade dress of Monster energy drink can, **49:1**likelihood of confusion analysis in combined trademark/trade dress cases, **7:18**likelihood of confusion in related state claims, **7:19**likelihood of confusion on irreparable injury requirement for an injunction, **7:20**packaging survey on, **34:1**post-sale confusion, **7:21**sophistication of the purchasers, **7:9**standards of appellate review, **7:10**

Likelihood of actual confusion

actual “actual confusion,” **7:7**projected “actual confusion” surveys, **7:8**

Likelihood of overall test for

standards for different types of trade dress, **7:3**tests in different circuits, **7:2****CONFUSION—Cont’d**

Likelihood of similarity of the trade dress

overall impression, **7:6**side by side comparison may be proper, **7:5**side by side comparison not proper, **7:4**

Likelihood of special cases

colors or shade confusion, **7:13**use of slogan “If You Like X, You’ll Love Y” and similar comparisons, **7:14**

Likelihood of types of confusion

confusion of source, **7:11**confusion of sponsorship or affiliation, **7:12**Obtaining preliminary injunction, no actual confusion required, **20:7**Protection of color as trade dress in PTO, color specification and shade, **26:8**Secondary meaning (requirement and proof), actual confusion, **13:16****CONOPCO, INC. v. MAY DEPT. STORES CO.**Appellate review, motion for leave to file amicus brief and brief amicus curiae, **47:7****CONSISTENCY**Claim element, **6:11****CONTAINERS**As trade dress example, **5:4**Condiment containers, figure, **30:9**Energy drink. **Hansen Beverage Co. v. National Beverage Corp.****CONTEMPT**Post-hearing issues related to injunction, **20:14**Remedies for infringement, **15:27****CONTINUING ACTS**Insurance coverage of continuing acts of infringement, **29:14****COPYING INTENTIONS**See **Intentional copying****COPYRIGHT PROTECTION (RELATIONSHIP TO TRADE DRESS)**Brief summary of copyright infringement elements, **24:1**Differences between copyright and trade dress protection, **24:4**Potential conflict of “useful articles” limitation under 17 U.S.C. § 101 for product designs, **24:5**Similarities between copyright and trade dress protection, **24:3**Trade dress and copyright claims in same lawsuit for same subject matter, **24:2****COPYRIGHT STATUTES**17 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 501, 502, 503, 504, 506, 509, **31:1**

COSTS

Relief for infringement and litigation, **15:19**

COSTUMES

Entertainment and sports, as trade dress examples, **5:6**

COUNTERCLAIMS, ANSWERS AND DEFENSES

Attorneys' fees, relief for infringement and right to jury trial and, **15:18**

Document Excerpts from Selected Trade Dress Cases (this index)

COUNTERFEITING REMEDIES

For infringement, **15:26**

COURT DOCKET

Deere and Co. v. FIMCO Inc., **50:2**

Hansen Beverage Co. v. National Beverage Corp., **50:1**

CUSTOMER DEMAND

Particular problem of functionality in, **17:5**

CUSTOMER LETTERS

Proof of secondary meaning, **13:12**

CUSTOMS RECORDING NOTICE

Materials from proceedings, **48:1**

DAMAGES

Effect of good faith intent on, **14:4**

For fraudulent registration of trade dress, **15:24**

Intentional copying and effect on, **14:8**

Obtaining preliminary injunction, money damages cannot be adequate relief, **20:9**

Seeking, and attorneys' fees, relief for infringement, and right to jury trial, **15:16**

Taco Cabana Int'l, Inc. v. Two Pesos, Inc. final judgment order (App. B Two Pesos Supreme Court decision), **45:10**

DECEPTIVE TRADE PRACTICES LAWS

State under, see **State unfair and deceptive trade practices laws**

DECLARATIONS

Proof of secondary meaning, **13:10**

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ACTIONS

Insurance coverage, actions to establish, **29:8**

Procedural issue in trade dress cases, **19:8**

DECOR AND DESIGN

Protection for restaurant, **11:2**

DEERE AND CO.

Fed. Reg. No. 78572285, file history of, tractors, green and yellow color combination, **33:4**

DEERE AND CO. v. FIMCO INC.

Exclude witnesses

memorandum in support, motion to, **44:9**

opposition, motion to, **44:10**

Memorandum in support, motion to exclude witnesses, **44:9**

DEERE AND CO. v. FIMCO INC.—Cont'd

Opinions/dockets, related, **50:2**

Opposition, motion to exclude witnesses, **44:10**

DEFAULT JUDGMENTS

Procedural issue in trade dress cases, **19:14**

DEFENDANT

Effect of intent to change trade dress, injunctive relief and, **15:6**

DEFENDANT'S OWN ADMISSIONS

Direct evidence of intentional copying, **14:12**

DEFENSES

See also **Affirmative defense; Defenses to claims; Sears-Compco defense**

Insurance coverage and duty of defense, **29:13**

Overview of available, **16:1**

Preliminary injunction

adequate monetary relief available, **20:19**

delay in bringing motion or application, **20:18**

other defenses, **20:20**

Temporary restraining order, other defenses, **20:20**

DEFENSES TO CLAIMS

Checklist of possible, **16:2**

Fair use, **16:5**

First Amendment defense, **16:3**

Functionality as a former defense, **16:10**

Insurance coverage and duty to defend, **29:13**

Monopolization or attempt to monopolize defense, **16:4**

Other traditional trademark defenses

abandonment of trade dress, **16:9**

fraud, **16:8**

laches or estoppel, **16:7**

parody defense, **16:6**

DEFINITION OF TRADE DRESS

Broadness of trade dress, **2:2**

Color per se as protectable, **2:3**

Literal definitions of, **2:1**

What is not trade dress, **2:4**

DE JURE FUNCTIONALITY TEST

Protection of color as trade dress in PTO, **26:6**

DELAY

Excessive, and laches, filing motion for preliminary injunction and, **20:4**

Preliminary injunction, delay in bringing motion or application, **20:18**

DESCRIPTION

Claim element, **6:10**

Protection in PTO and mechanics of trade dress application, **26:11**

DESIGN PATENTS

And trade dress

elements of design patent law, **25:3**

DESIGN PATENTS—Cont'd

And trade dress—Cont'd
 nature of protection, **25:2**
 overlap of trade dress with design patent protection,
25:1
 product designs as trade dress, **25:4**

DESTRUCTION OF INFRINGING GOODS

Relief for infringement in, **15:21**

DILUTION CLAIMS

Generally, **10:1**
 Conflicts on different issues, **10:3**
 Federal law, **10:2**
 Model state trademark bill version of dilution, **10:4**
 Particular cases, **10:5**

DILUTION LAWS

Model state trademark bill version of dilution, **10:4**
 State, **9:5**

DIRECT EVIDENCE

See **Evidence**

DISCLAIMERS

Effect of, on likelihood of confusion, **7:16**

DISCOVERY

Reynolds Consumer Products, Inc. v. Handi-Foil Corp.,
 agreed joint discovery plan, **43:4**

DISCOVERY ISSUES

Admissions requests, **21:1, 43:1**
 Interrogatories, **21:1, 43:3**
 Into venue or jurisdictional issues, **21:4**
 Prior to preliminary injunction hearing and other
 interim relief, **21:5**
 Prior to summary judgment hearings, **21:6**
 Procedural issues (trade dress cases), **19:15**
 Production of documents and things requests, **21:2,**
43:2
 Request for entry onto property or to view, **21:3**

DISMISS, MOTIONS TO

Memorandum in support of, **41:4**
 Motion to dismiss or remand supplemental state claims
 to state court, **19:6**
 Procedural issue of, in trade dress cases, **19:1, 19:1.50**

DISMISSAL

Order to show cause regarding dismissal of
 supplemental claims, Ellison Educational Equipment,
 Inc. v. GM Marketing, **42:6**
 Stipulation for dismissal, The Black & Decker Corp. v.
 Positec USA Inc., **42:5.50**

DISPARAGEMENT

Tort claims under state law and, **10:12**

DISTINCTIVE TRADE DRESS

Inherently, see **Inherently distinctive trade dress**

DOCKET OF COURT

See **Court Docket**

**DOCUMENT EXCERPTS FROM SELECTED
 TRADE DRESS CASES**

Appendix B to Taco Cabana Int'l, Inc. v Two Pesos,
 Inc., **45:10**

Application for stay of transfer order, Ellison
 Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc.,
41:2

Bottle infringement, complaint in federal court, S.
 Martinelli & Co v. Hi-Country Foods Corp., **40:1**
 Brief in support of motion to dismiss complaint or for
 more definite statement in Millennium Laboratories,
 Inc. v. Ameritex, Ltd., **41:3**

Can infringement, first amended complaint in federal
 court, Hansen Beverage Co. v. National Beverage
 Corp., **40:2**

Cease and desist letters, **39:1-39:3**

Complaints in state court
 amended complaint, Innovations Ventures, LLC v.
 N2G Distributing, Inc., **40:5.30**

Performance Machine, Inc. v. Custom Chrome, Inc.,
40:5

second amended complaint, Brighton Collectibles,
 Inc. v. RK Texas Leather Mfg., Inc., **40:5.70**

Counterclaim, answers and defenses
 answer to amended complaint from Christian
 Louboutin S.A. v. Yves Saint Laurent America,
 Inc., **40:7**

answer to first amended counterclaims from Perine
 Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., **40:6**

declaratory judgment complaint for duty to defend
 underlying complaint, from Professional Product
 Research, Inc. v. General Star Indemnity
 Co., **40:8**

Hansen Beverage Co. v. National Beverage Co., **40:9**

Mother's Nutritional Center, Inc. v. Mommy's
 Nutritional Center, **40:10**

Reynolds Consumer Products, Inc. v. Hand-Foil
 Corp, **40:11**

Findings of fact and conclusions of law, Accu-Systems
 v. B & C Instrument Parts, Inc., **42:9**

Floor lamp trade dress, cease and desist letters, **39:1**

Letter stamping machine, cease and desist letter, **39:3**

Memoranda in support of motions

attorney's fees, Nutrivila, Inc. v. VBS, **46:3**

dismissal of plaintiff's amended complaint, Urban
 Group Exercise Consultants, Ltd. v. Dick's
 Sporting Goods, Inc., **41:4**

exclude witnesses, Deere and Co. v. FIMCO Inc.,
44:9

judgment on the pleadings, F.R.C.P. 12(c), CGS
 Industries, Inc. v. The Charter Oak Fire Insurance,
 Co., **41:6**

preliminary injunction, The B & F System, Inc. v.
 LeBlanc, **41:5**

**DOCUMENT EXCERPTS FROM SELECTED
TRADE DRESS CASES—Cont'd**

Notice of removal from state court to federal court, Clifford Miller v. Cheseborough Ponds Co., **41:1**
Opposition to motion to exclude witnesses, Deere and Co. v. FIMCO Inc., **44:10**
Order denying preliminary injunction, Muller Mfg. Co. v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:4**
Order granting preliminary injunction, Douglass Carr v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:2**
Order to show cause regarding dismissal of supplemental claims, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. GM Marketing, **42:6**
Petition for writ of mandamus and application for stay of transfer order, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **41:2**
Preliminary injunctions
 memorandum opinion, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **42:3**
 order denying, Muller Mfg. Co. v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:4**
 order granting preliminary injunction, Douglass Carr v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:2**
 order granting preliminary injunction, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **42:3**
Show cause order re: dismissal of supplemental claims, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. GM Marketing, **42:6**
Stays and transfers of case, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **41:2**
Store trade dress infringement, complaint in federal court, Mother's Nutritional Center, Inc. v. Mommy's Nutritional Center, **40:4**
Temporary restraining order and order to show cause why preliminary injunction should not issue, Carol Cable Co. v. Grand Auto, Inc., **42:1**
Toy trade dress infringement, complaint in federal court, Lanard Toys Ltd. v. Novelty, Inc., **40:3**
Whimsical sculptures called PLANT HEADS, cease and desist letter, **39:2**

DOMESTIC PROTECTION

International protection versus, **27:4**

DOMESTIC USE

Claim element, **6:12**

DRAWING

See **Illustrations**

DRY CLEANING PRESS PAD

Qualitex's Fed. Reg. No. 1,633,711 on color green-gold for—file history of case, **33:1**

DURATION

Unlimited, of protection, **3:2**

DUTY OF DEFENSE

Generally, **29:4**

Tender of duty to insurer, **29:3**

E & J GALLO v. PROXIMO SPIRITS, INC.

Expert witness report and declaration, **49:4**

**ELLISON EDUCATIONAL EQUIPMENT, INC. v.
GM MARKETING**

Letter stamping machine, cease and desist letter (soft to GM Marketing, **39:3**
Order to show cause regarding dismissal of supplemental claims, **42:6**

**ELLISON EDUCATIONAL EQUIPMENT, INC. v.
TEKSERVICES, INC.**

Application for stay of transfer order, **41:2**
Petition for writ of mandamus and application for stay of transfer order, **41:2**
Preliminary injunctions
 memorandum opinion, **42:3**
 order granting preliminary injunction, **42:3**
Stays and transfers of case, **41:2**

ENTERTAINMENT FEATURES/UNIFORMS AND COSTUMES

As trade dress example, **5:6**

ENTRY

Discovery issue, request for entry onto property to view, **21:3**

EQUITABLE RELIEF

Seeking, and attorneys' fees, relief for infringement, and right to jury trial, **15:16**

ESSENTIAL CLAIM ELEMENTS

Overview of, **16:1**
 see also **Claim elements, 16:1**

ESTOPPEL

Defense to claims, **16:7**

EVIDENCE

Direct, of intentional copying
 defendant's own admissions, **14:12**
 use of private investigators, **14:13**
Indirect, of intentional copying
 expert testimony, **14:15**
 similarities of the trade dress itself, **14:14**
Of functionality or other issues, proof of secondary meaning, **13:13**
Proof of secondary meaning and types of generally, **13:5**
 amount of evidence necessary, **13:6**

EVIDENTIARY PRESUMPTIONS

Intentional copying and, **14:16**

EXAMPLES

Configuration or shape, **5:5**
Containers, **5:4**
Entertainment features/uniforms and costumes, **5:6**
Flavors, **5:13**
Functionality, **17:17**

EXAMPLES—Cont'd

- Illustrations of trade dress, **5:11**
- Inherently distinctive trade dress, **12:4, 12:5**
- Miscellaneous other examples, **5:7**
- Not protected by courts, **5:10**
- Packaging
 - generally, **5:1**
 - color in combination with other elements, **5:3**
 - color per se, **5:2**
- Protected trade dress, **5:9**
- Service businesses, **5:12**
- Sounds, **5:8**
- Sports features/uniforms and costumes, **5:6**

EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

- Relief for infringement and attorneys' fees, **15:13**

EXCLUSIONS

- Insurance coverage and duty of defense, **29:13**
- Patent design, letter stamping machine, **37:1**

EXPERT TESTIMONY

- Indirect evidence of intentional copying, **14:15**
- Motion in limine to exclude experts in Gucci America, Inc./Plaintiff, v. Guess, inc., Marc Fisher Footwear LLC, the Max Leather Group/Cipriani A Accessories, Inc., Sequel AG, K&M Associates L.P., Viva Optique, Inc., Signal Products, Inc. and Swank, Inc., Defendants, **44:7**

EXPERT WITNESS REPORT AND DECLARATION

- 1800 tequila bottle, E & J Gallo v. Proximo Spirits, Inc., **49:4**
- Challenge of survey done by another survey expert on Redbull energy drink can, Sandra R. Cogan, **49:2**
- Likelihood of confusion of trade dress of Monster energy drink can, Henry R. Hidell III, **49:1**
- Trade dress of toys, survey expert Marylander Marketing Research, **49:3**

EXTRAORDINARY WRITS

- Procedural issue of, in trade dress cases, **19:5**

EXTRATERRITORIAL REACH OF U.S. LAWS

- International protection and, **27:5**

FACTUAL ISSUE

- Secondary meaning, **13:19**

FAIR USE

- Defense to claims, **16:5**

FALSE ADVERTISING CLAIMS

- Related federal, in trade dress cases, **10:14**
- State, related claims in trade dress cases, **10:8**

FEDERAL COURT

- Removal of state court actions to, procedural issue, **19:9**

FEDERAL FALSE ADVERTISING CLAIMS

- Related claims in trade dress cases, **10:14**

FEDERAL LAW

- Dilution claims, **10:2**
- Protection under
 - assertion of state court unfair competition claims in federal court under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1338(a), **8:5**
 - references to trade dress in federal statutes, **8:6**
 - section 14(3) of Lanham Act, misrepresentation of source of goods, **10:17**
 - section 32 of Lanham Act, federally registered trade dress
 - availability of federal registration for trade dress, **8:3**
 - effect of registration of trade dress, **8:4**
 - section 43(a)(1) of Lanham Act, unregistered marks and unfair competition generally, **8:1**
 - 1999 amendment to section 43(a) of Act to clarify burden of proof in trade dress cases, **8:2**

FEDERAL REGISTRATION

- See **Registration**

15 U.S.C.

- § 1052, **31:3**
- § 1053, **31:3**
- § 1117(a), relief for infringement and, see **Attorneys' fees**

FILING

- Of motion for preliminary injunction, see **Preliminary injunction**

FINAL JUDGMENTS

- Briefs, Brighton Collectibles, Inc. v. RK Texas Leather Mfg., Inc., **45:11**
- Order from Taco Cabana, International, Inc. v. Two Pesos, Inc. (App. B to Two Pesos Supreme Court decision), **45:10**

FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

- Relief for infringement and attorneys' fees and unusual, to the defendant, **15:15**

FINDINGS OF FACT

- And conclusions of law, Accu-Systems v. B & C Instrument Parts, Inc., **42:9**

FIRST AMENDMENT

- Defense to claims based on, **16:3**

FLAVOR

- As trade dress example, **5:13**
- Particular problem of functionality in, **17:5.50**

FLOOR LAMP TRADE DRESS

- Cease and desist letter to American Lighting from Be-Yang Industrial Co., **39:1**

FOOD PRODUCTS

Protection for, 11:3

FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Finding trade dress lawyer in, 27:2

FRAUD

Damages for fraudulent registration of trade dress, 15:24

Defense to claims, 16:8

FRITO-LAY NORTH AMERICA, INC. v. MEDALLION FOODS, INC.

Jury trial instructions, proposed, 45:7

Jury verdict, 45:6

Proposed special verdict, 45:5

FRUIT BEVERAGE CONTAINER

Figure, 30:7

FUNCTIONAL FEATURES

Intent to copy, 14:5

FUNCTIONALITY

Appellate review, 17:10

Burden of proof, 17:8

Color coding, 17:12

Defenses to claims, functionality as a former defense, 16:10

Definitions and tests of, 17:6

De jure test, protection of color as trade dress in PTO, 26:6

Element of

as affirmative defense, 6:2

functionality as element of plaintiff's case in chief, 6:3

statutory resolution of the split of authority as to functionality, 6:4

Evidence of, proof of secondary meaning, 13:13

Examples, specific, 17:17

Factors to consider, 17:9

Overview, 17:1

Particular problems

color, 17:4

customer demand, 17:5

scent and flavor, 17:5.50

Patent and Trademark Office's view of, 26:19

Patent protection, relationship to trade dress, 25:6

Pharmaceuticals, 17:7

Proof of non-functionality or, 17:15

Relationship to genericness, 17:14

Relationship to patent law, 17:13

Split of authority on various issues of, 17:11

Statutory amendments, effect and applicability, 17:16

Tests of, 17:6

Types of

aesthetic functionality, 17:3

utilitarian functionality, 17:2

GAMES

Protection for, 11:5

GENERICNESS

Relationship of functionality to, 17:14

GOOD FAITH INTENT

Effect on damages, 14:4

HANSEN BEVERAGE CO. v. NATIONAL BEVERAGE CORP.

Can infringement, first amended complaint in federal court, 40:2

Counterclaim, answer and defenses, 40:9

Court docket, 50:1

Likelihood of confusion of trade dress of Monster energy drink can, Henry R. Hidell III's expert witness report and declaration, 49:1

Sample survey, packaging and likelihood of confusion, 34:1

HANSEN BEVERAGE CO. v. THUNDERBOLT BEVERAGE CO.

Appellant's brief, Hansen's appeal brief in Ninth Circuit, 47:3

HEALTH CARE PRODUCTS

Protection for, 11:8

HEARING

Discovery prior to summary judgment, 21:6

Preliminary injunction, 20:12

Preparing for, filing motion for preliminary injunction and, 20:5

Temporary restraining order, 20:12

HENRY R. HIDELL III

Expert witness report and declaration, likelihood of confusion of trade dress of Monster energy drink can, Hansen Beverage Co. v. National Beverage Corp., 49:1

HISTORY OF TRADE DRESS

Generally, 1:5

ILLUSTRATIONS

Of trade dress

generally, 5:11

airline plane colors, 30:12

beer bottle, 30:8

candy bar, 30:3

condiment container, 30:9

fruit beverage container, 30:7

Levi Strauss pants with side tabs, 30:2

plane colors, 30:12

Rolls-Royce grill, 30:5

surveyor's reel, 30:4

sweater design, 30:1

tire, 30:11

water hose nozzle, 30:10

Whirlpool jet for bathtubs, 30:6

ILLUSTRATIONS—Cont'd

Patent design, letter stamping machine, **37:1**

IMAGE ADVERTISING

Proof of secondary meaning, **13:8**

IMMORAL TRADE DRESS

Protection in PTO and registration of, **26:13**

INDIRECT EVIDENCE

See **Evidence**

INFRINGEMENT

See also **Copyright protection**

Brief summary of copyright infringement elements, **24:1**

Expedited PTO registration if trade dress, **26:14**

Relief for. See **Relief for infringement**

State common law trade dress, related claims in trade dress cases, **10:9**

Trade dress may contribute to trademark, **23:2**

INFRINGEMENT PRODUCTS

Notification of buyers of, intentional copying and effect on, **14:11**

INHERENTLY DISTINCTIVE TRADE DRESS

Generally, **12:1**

Application of inherent distinctiveness to product configuration trade dress, **12:6**

Definition of, **12:2**

Effect of federal registration on inherent distinctiveness, **12:9**

Effect of section 2(f) claim on inherent distinctiveness, **12:8**

Examples of, **12:4**

Examples of non-, **12:5**

In the PTO, **26:18**

Standards of review, **12:7**

Tests for determining, **12:3**

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Brothers, Inc., **12:10**

INJUNCTIONS

Likelihood of confusion on irreparable injury requirement for an, **7:20**

Notification to customers of infringement or, **15:23**

Preliminary, see **Preliminary injunctions**

Relief, see **Injunctive relief**

Terms, **20:22**

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

See also **Preliminary injunctions**

For infringement

generally, **15:1**

cases where injunction denied, **15:5**

cases where injunction entered, **15:4**

effect of defendant's intent to change trade dress, **15:6**

effect of plaintiff's delay in seeking injunction, **15:7**

statutory basis for injunctions, **15:2**

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF—Cont'd

For infringement—Cont'd
test for permanent injunctions, **15:3**

INJURY REQUIREMENT

Likelihood of confusion on irreparable, for an injunction, **7:20**

INNOVATION VENTURES, LLC. v. N2G DISTRIBUTING, INC.

Complaints in state court, amended, **40:5.30**
Jury trial instructions, agreed, **45:8**

INSURANCE COVERAGE

Advertising, **29:2**

Continuing acts of infringement, coverage, **29:14**

Coverage of misappropriation claims, **10:10**

“Cumis” counsel, **29:8**

Declaratory judgment actions to establish coverage, **29:10**

Defenses to coverage and duty to defend, **29:13**

Duty of defense

generally, **29:4**

defenses and exclusions to, **29:13**

tender to insurer, **29:3**

Exclusions to coverage and duty to defend, **29:13**

Independent counsel, **29:8**

Infringement, continuing acts, **29:14**

Overview, **29:1**

Related cases, **29:7**

Settlement of claims, aspects, **29:12**

Specific cases, **29:6**

Summary judgment motions to establish coverage of claims, **29:10**

Tender of defense to insurer, **29:3**

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY EXPERT WITNESS FILINGS DATABASE [IP-EW-DOCS] ON WESTLAW

Search for trade dress cases, **51:2**

INTENT

Effect of defendant's intent to change trade dress, **15:6**

Effect of intent to change trade dress, injunctive relief and, **15:6**

Effect on likelihood of confusion, **7:17**

Not a required claim element, **6:6**

To copy, see **Intentional copying**

INTENTIONAL COPYING (EFFECT AND PROOF)

Attorney/client privilege and advice of counsel, **14:17**

Direct evidence of intentional copying
defendant's own admissions, **14:12**

use of private investigators, **14:13**

Effect in general, **14:1**

Effect on damages, attorneys' fees, and other relief
attorneys' fees, **14:9**

damages, **14:8**

notification to buyers of infringing products, **14:11**

INDEX

INTENTIONAL COPYING (EFFECT AND PROOF)

—Cont'd

- Effect on damages, attorneys' fees, and other relief
 - Cont'd
 - recall of products, **14:10**
- Effect on likelihood of confusion, **14:6**
- Effect on secondary meaning, **14:7**
- Evidentiary presumptions, **14:16**
- Indirect evidence
 - expert testimony, **14:15**
 - similarities of the trade dress itself, **14:14**
- Proof of secondary meaning and, **13:14**
- Types of intent
 - generally, **14:2**
 - effect of good faith on intent on damages, **14:4**
 - intent to copy as a parody, **14:3**
 - intent to copy functional features, **14:5**

INTERFERENCE

- With business relationships, tort claims under state law and, **10:11**

INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION

- Generally, **27:1**
- Domestic protection versus, **27:4**
- Extraterritorial reach of U.S. laws, **27:5**
- Finding trade dress lawyer in foreign countries, **27:2**
- ITC, see **International Trade Commission protection**
- Sources of international trade dress law, **27:3**

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION (ITC) PROTECTION

- Effect of decision, **27:7**
- Examples of trade dress cases decided by, **27:10**
- Jurisdiction of, **27:8**
- Proceedings of, and their initiation, **27:6**
- Research materials for cases before, **27:9**

INTERNATIONAL TRADE DRESS LAW

- Sources of, **27:3**

INTERNET

- Generally, **1:7**
- Protection for web sites, **11:14**

INTERROGATORIES

- Discovery issue, interrogatories and requests for admissions, **21:1**
- Mother's Nutritional Center, Inc. v. Mommy's Nutritional Center, **43:3**

INTRODUCTION

- Continuing controversy on multiple legal issues, **1:6**
- Definition of, see **Definition of trade dress**
- Examples of, see **Trade dress examples**
- Historical background of, **1:5**
- Internet, trade dress and, **1:7**
- Introduction to
 - generally, **1:1**
 - scope of book, **1:3**

INTRODUCTION—Cont'd

- Introduction to—Cont'd
 - use of book, **1:2**
- Overview of, **1:4**
- Proposed federal law, **8:7**
- Registration rate acceleration, **1:6**

INVESTIGATORS

- Direct evidence of intentional copying, use of private, **14:13**
- Filing motion for preliminary injunction and use of professional, **20:6**

INWOOD LABORATORIES, INC. v. IVES LABORATORIES, INC.

- Text of Supreme Court opinion, **35:6**

IRREPARABLE INJURY REQUIREMENT

- Likelihood of confusion on, for an injunction, **7:20**

ITC

- See **International Trade Commission protection**

JURISDICTION

- 28 U.S.C. §§ 1330, 1331, 1332, 1338, 1339, 1340, 1367, 1368, 1391, 1392, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1401, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405, **31:5**
- Discovery into issue of, **21:4**
- ITC, **27:8**
- Procedural issue of personal, in trade dress cases, **19:3**
- State courts or state law protection and personal, and venue
 - generally, **9:7**
 - subject matter jurisdiction over federal claims, **9:8**

JURY TRIALS

- Generally, **22:1**
- Attorneys' fees, relief for infringement and right to counterclaims, **15:18**
- damages or equitable relief sought, **15:16**
- waiver of jury trial right, **15:17**
- Examples of trade dress jury cases, **22:2**
- Instructions
 - generally, **22:6**
 - agreed, Innovations Ventures, LLC v. N2G Distributing, Inc., **45:8**
- Car-Freshner Corp v. D & J Distributing, **45:8.70**
- proposed, Frito-Law North America, Inc. v. Medalion Foods, Inc., **45:7**
- The Black & Decker Corp. v. Positec USA Inc., **45:8.50**
- Jury's perception of trade dress, **22:3**
- Overview, **22:1**
- Special verdict from Yurman case, **45:3**
- Special Verdicts (this index)

KELLOGG CO. v. NATIONAL BISCUIT CO.

- Text of Supreme Court opinion, **35:3**

KREATION JUICERY INC. v. EIRMAN SHEKARCHI

Post trial materials, consent decrees and permanent injunctions, consent judgment and permanent injunction, **46:2**

LABELS

Effect of use of defendant's own, on likelihood of confusion, **7:15**

LACHES

Defense to claims, **16:7**

Excessive delay and, and filing motion for preliminary injunction, **20:4**

LANARD TOYS, INC. v. GENERAL MOTORS CORP

Reply brief for writ of certiorari, **47:6**

LANARD TOYS LTD. v. NOVELTY, INC.

Complaint in federal court for toy trade dress infringement, **40:3**

Expert witness report and declaration of survey expert Marylander Marketing Research involving trade dress of Lanard toys and competitor's toys, **49:3**

LANHAM ACT

Circumstances when secondary meaning is required, section 2(f) of, **13:1**

Effect of section 2(f) claim on inherent distinctiveness, **12:8**

Inherently distinctive trade dress, effect of section 2(f) claim, **12:8**

Misrepresentation of source under section 14(3), **10:17**
1999 amendment to section 43(a) of Lanham Act to clarify burden of proof in trade dress cases, **8:2**

Protection of color as trade dress in PTO, **26:2**

Protection under, see **Federal law**

Relief for infringement, and attorneys' fees, and see **Attorneys' fees**

LAW

See specific matter

LETTER STAMPING MACHINE

Cease and desist letter (soft) to GM Marketing from Ellison Educational, **39:3**

Patent design, **37:1**

LEVI STRAUSS PANTS

Figure, **30:2**

LIBEL

Tort claims under state law and, **10:12**

LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

Actual "actual confusion," **7:7**

Expert witness report and declaration by Henry R. Hidell III as to likelihood of confusion of trade dress of Monster energy drink can, **49:1**

Projected "actual confusion," surveys, **7:8**

LITERAL DEFINITIONS

Of trade dress, **2:1**

LITIGATION

Relief for infringement, order freezing defendant's assets during, **15:22**

MANDAMUS, WRIT OF

Petition for, and application for stay of transfer order, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **41:2**

MARKETING CONCEPTS

Comparison to protectable sales techniques, **2:4**
Limitation on protection of marketing concepts, **3:5**

MARKS

Effect of use of defendant's own, on likelihood of confusion, **7:15**

MARYLANDER MARKETING RESEARCH

Expert witness report and declaration involving trade dress of toys, **49:3**

MATERIALS FROM PROCEEDINGS

Customs recording notice, **48:1**

MEDIA COVERAGE

Proof of secondary meaning and unsolicited, **13:15**

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Non-infringement of alleged block trade dress, support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., **44:6**

Non-infringement of alleged packaging trade dress, support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., **44:3**

MERCADO LATINO INC. v. INDIO PRODUCTS, INC.

Appellate review, oral argument, **47:8**

MILLENNIUM LABORATORIES, INC. v. AMERITEX, LTD

Brief in support of motion to dismiss complaint or for more definite statement, **41:3**

MISAPPROPRIATION CLAIMS

Related, in trade dress cases, **10:10**

MISREPRESENTATION OF SOURCE OF GOODS

Related claims in trade dress cases, **10:17**

MODEL STATE TRADEMARK BILL

Generally, **9:4**

Version of dilution in, **10:4**

MONETARY RELIEF

Availability of adequate

preliminary injunction, **20:19**
temporary restraining order, **20:19**

For infringement, **15:8**

Obtaining preliminary injunction, money damages cannot be adequate relief, **20:9**

MONOPOLIZATION

Or attempt to monopolize defense, **16:4**

MOTHER'S NUTRITIONAL CENTER, INC. v. MOMMY'S NUTRITIONAL CENTER

Counterclaim, answer and defenses, **40:10**
Interrogatories, **43:3**
Requests for admissions, **43:1**
Requests for production of documents, **43:2**
Store trade dress infringement, complaint in federal court, **40:4**

MOTIONS

Defenses to preliminary injunction, delay in bringing motion, **20:18**
Excessive delay and laches, **20:4**
Memoranda in support of motions. **Document Excerpts From Selected Trade Dress Cases** (this index)
Motions in Limine (this index)
Post-hearing issues related to injunction, motions to narrow or broaden scope or otherwise modify the injunction, **20:15**
Preliminary Injunction (this index)
Preparing for a hearing, **20:5**
Procedural issues in trade dress cases
 motions for summary judgment, **19:2**
 motions to dismiss or to strike, **19:1, 19:1.50**
 motion to dismiss or remand supplemental state claims to state court, **19:6**
 personal jurisdiction, venue, and other motions, **19:3**
Summary judgment. **Summary judgment motions**
Use of professional investigators, **20:6**

MOTIONS IN LIMINE

Generally, **44:7, 44:8**
Defendants 8217, expert witness on likelihood of confusion, The Black & Decker Corp. v. Positec USA Inc., **44:8.50**
Exclusion of experts in Gucci America, Inc./Plaintiff, v. Guess, inc., Marc Fisher Footwear LLC, the Max Leather Group/Cipriani A Accessories, Inc., Sequel AG, K&M Associates L.P., Viva Optique, Inc., Signal Products, Inc. and Swank, Inc., Defendants, **44:7**
Pictures in lieu of actual products, Brighton Collectibles, Inc. v. RK Texas Leather Mfg., Inc., **44:8**

NONAPPLICABILITY

Of Sears-Compco defense to federal trademark claims, **18:3**

NON-FUNCTIONALITY

Proof of functionality or, **17:15**

NON-INHERENTLY DISTINCTIVE TRADE DRESS

Examples of, **12:5**

NOTIFICATION

Removal from state court to federal court, Clifford Miller v. Cheseborough Ponds Co., **41:1**

NOTIFICATION—Cont'd

To customers of infringement or injunction, **15:23**
To distributors relief for infringement, **15:20**

NUTRIVITA, INC. v. VBS

Attorney's fees, motion in support of, **46:3**

ORDER(S)

Appellate review of preliminary injunction, **20:16**
Denying preliminary injunction, Muller Mfg. Co. v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:4**
Granting preliminary injunction, Douglas Carr v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:2**
Petition for writ of mandamus and application for stay of transfer order, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **41:2**
Relief for infringement, order freezing defendant's assets during litigation, **15:22**
Temporary restraining, see **Temporary restraining orders**
To show cause regarding dismissal of supplemental claims, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. GM Marketing, **42:6**

OWENS-CORNING CASE

Protection of color as trade dress in PTO, **26:3**

OWNERSHIP ELEMENT

Of the trade dress, claim and, **6:5**

PACKAGING

Color in combination with other elements, **5:3**
Color per se, **5:2**
Likelihood of confusion, sample survey, **34:1**
Trade dress example in, **5:1**

PARODY

Attempted intent at, relief for infringement and attorneys' fees, **15:14**
Defense to claims, **16:6**
Intent to copy as a, **14:3**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO) PROTECTION

Cancellation proceedings, **26:21**
Examples of registered trade dress, **26:15**
Examples of trade dress where registration was refused, **26:16**
Expedited registration if trade dress is being infringed, **26:14**
Functionality, PTO's view of, **26:19**
Introduction to, **26:1**
Mechanics of trade dress application
 drawing, trade dress description, trade dress specimens, **26:11**
 problems in registration process, **26:12**
Protection of color as trade dress in
 before the Lanham Act, **26:2**
 British Seagull case, **26:7**
 burden in registering color, **26:4**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO) PROTECTION—Cont'd

Protection of color as trade dress in—Cont'd
 color depletion theory, 26:5
 current status, 26:9
 de jure functionality test, 26:6
 Owens-Corning case, 26:3
 shade confusion and color specification, 26:8
 Registration of immoral or scandalous trade dress,
 26:13
 Trial in, 22:5
 Upon showing of secondary meaning, 26:10

PATENT CLAIMS

Related, in trade dress cases, 10:13

PATENT DESIGN

Letter stamping machine exhibits, 37:1

PATENT LAW

Relationship of functionality to, 17:13
 Statutes, 31:2

PATENT PROTECTION (RELATIONSHIP TO TRADE DRESS)

Design patents and trade dress
 elements of design patent law, 25:3
 nature of protection, 25:2
 overlap of trade dress with design patent protection,
 25:1
 product designs as trade dress, 25:4
 Effect of defining trade dress with reference to a patent,
 its claim or drawing, 25:7
 Existence of patent as creating a presumption of
 functionality or non-functionality, 25:6
 Utility patents and trade dress, 25:5

PATENT STATUTES

35 U.S.C. §§ 100, 101, 102, 103, 112, 117, 31:2

PEPPER, SALT, AND OTHER CONDIMENT CONTAINER

Figure, 30:9

PERINE LOWE, INC. v. DOLLY, INC.

Answer to first amended counterclaims from Perine
 Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 40:6
 Non-infringement of alleged block trade dress
 memorandum of points and authorities in support of
 motion for summary judgment, 44:6
 non-confidential exhibits and supporting declara-
 tions, memorandum of points and authorities in
 support of motion for summary judgment, 44:6
 notice of motion and motion for summary judgment,
 Perine Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:4
 statement of uncontested facts and conclusions of
 law in support of motion for summary judg-
 ment, 44:5

PERINE LOWE, INC. v. DOLLY, INC.—Cont'd

Non-infringement of alleged packaging trade dress
 memorandum of points and authorities in support of
 motion for summary judgment (with non-
 confidential exhibits and supporting declara-
 tions), 44:3
 notice of motion and motion for summary judgment,
 44:1
 statement of uncontested facts and conclusions of
 law in support of motion for summary judg-
 ment, 44:2

PERSONAL JURISDICTION

And venue, state courts or state law protection and, 9:7
 Procedural issue of, in trade dress cases, 19:3

PETITION

For removal of civil action, Clifford Miller v.
 Cheseborough Ponds Co., USA, 41:1

For writ of mandamus and application for stay of
 transfer order, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc.
 v. Tekservices, Inc., 41:2

PHARMACEUTICALS

Functionality and, 17:7
 Protection for, 11:12

PLAINTIFF

Effect of delay of, in seeking injunction, 15:7

PLANT HEADS

Cease and desist letter to Home Base from The Fringe
 Gallery, 39:2

POST-HEARING

Issues related to injunction
 contempt, 20:14
 motions to narrow or broaden scope or otherwise
 modify the injunction, 20:15

POST-SALE CONFUSION

Likelihood of confusion, 7:21

POST TRIAL MATERIALS

Attorney's fees, motion in support of, Nutrivita, Inc. v.
 VBS, 46:3
 Consent decrees and permanent injunctions, consent
 judgment and permanent injunction, Kreation
 Juicery Inc. v. Eirman Shekarchi, 46:2
 Contempt proceedings, petition for contempt order
 (template) for trade dress consent judgment from
 15B Fed. Proc. Forms 64:626, 46:1

PRE-EMPTION DEFENSE

See Sears-Compco defense

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS

Appellate review of orders, 20:16
 Availability of adequate monetary relief, 20:19
 Before filing motion of
 generally, 20:3
 excessive delay and laches, 20:4

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS—Cont'd

- Before filing motion of—Cont'd
 - preparing for a hearing, **20:5**
 - use of professional investigators, **20:6**
- Defenses to, delay in bringing motion or application, **20:18**
- Denial of injunction
 - generally, **20:16.70**
 - examples of cases, **20:17**
 - order denying preliminary injunction, Muller Mfg. Co. v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:4**
- Discovery prior to hearing for, and other interim relief, **21:5**
- Examples of cases where injunctions were granted or denied, **20:17**
- Grant of injunction
 - generally, **20:16.30**
 - examples of cases, **20:17**
 - order granting preliminary injunction, Douglass Carr v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:2**
- Hearing, **20:12**
- Issues related to injunction bond, **20:13**
- Memorandum in support of, The B & F System, Inc. v. LeBlanc, **41:5**
- Memorandum opinion and, Ellison Educational Equip., Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **42:3**
- Obtaining
 - different circuits, **20:8**
 - money damages cannot be adequate relief, **20:9**
 - no actual confusion required, **20:7**
- Order denying, Muller Mfg. Co. v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:4**
- Order granting, Douglass Carr v. Hawkshead, Inc., **42:2**
- Other defenses, **20:20**
- Post-hearing issues related to injunction
 - contempt, **20:14**
 - motions to narrow or broaden scope or otherwise modify the injunction, **20:15**
- Procedure for obtaining, **20:10**
- Statutory basis for, **20:21**
- Temporary restraining order and order to show cause
 - why preliminary injunction should not issue, Carol Cable Co. v. Grand Auto, Inc., **42:1**
- Terms, **20:22**
- When not to seek, **20:2**
- Why seek, **20:1**

PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS

- Direct evidence of intentional copying, use of, **14:13**

PROCEDURAL ISSUES (TRADE DRESS CASES)

- Appeals of trade dress rulings, **19:4**
- Arbitration, **19:13**
- Declaratory judgment actions, **19:8**
- Default judgments, **19:14**
- Discovery and discovery remedies, **19:15**
- Extraordinary writs, **19:5**
- Motions for summary judgment, **19:2**

PROCEDURAL ISSUES (TRADE DRESS CASES)**—Cont'd**

- Motions to dismiss or remand to state court, supplemental state claims, **19:6**
- Motions to dismiss or to strike, **19:1, 19:1.50**
- Personal jurisdiction, venue, and other motions, **19:3**
- Removal of state court actions to federal court, **19:9**
- Rule 11 sanctions, **19:10**
- Stays, **19:7**
- Subject matter jurisdiction, **19:12**
- Surveys, **19:11**

PROCEEDINGS

- Claim preclusion, **26:20**
- ITC protection and proceedings of, and their initiation, **27:6**
- Opposition proceedings involving trade dress rights, **26:17**
- Res judicata, **26:20**

PRODUCT CONFIGURATION

See **Configuration**

PRODUCT OF DOCUMENTS

- Mother's Nutritional Center, Inc. v. Mommy's Nutritional Center, first set of requests, **43:2**

PROFESSIONAL INVESTIGATORS

- Filing motion for preliminary injunction and use of, **20:6**

PROFESSIONAL PRODUCT RESEARCH, INC. v. GENERAL STAR INDEMNITY CO.

- Counterclaim, declaratory judgment complaint for duty to defend underlying complaint, from Professional Product Research, Inc. v. General Star Indemnity Co., **40:8**

PROOF

- See also **Secondary meaning**
- Burden of, functionality and, **17:8**
- Of functionality or non-functionality, **17:15**

PROPERTY

- Discovery issue, request for entry onto property or to view, **21:3**

PROTECTION

- Burden of proof, 1999 amendment to section 43(a) of Lanham Act to clarify burden of proof in trade dress cases, **8:2**

Color per se, **2:3**

Copyright, see **Copyright protection**

Design patents and trade dress and nature of, **25:2**

Examples

see also **Trade dress examples**

not protected by courts, **5:10**

protected trade dress, **5:9**

In state courts or under state law

California case law, **9:3**

California statutes, **9:2**

PROTECTION—Cont'd

In state courts or under state law—Cont'd
 overview of state court protection, **9:1**
 personal jurisdiction and venue, **9:7**
 removal and remand issues, **9:9**
 statutory law in states other than California
 case law, **9:6**
 dilution laws, **9:5**
 model state trademark bill, **9:4**
 subject matter jurisdiction over federal claims, **9:8**
 International law, see **International protection**
 1999 amendment to section 43(a) of Lanham Act to
 clarify burden of proof in trade dress cases, **8:2**
 Overview of, see **Protection overview**
 Particular types of
 automotive industry, **11:13**
 bottles, **11:4**
 cans, **11:4**
 computer products, **11:9**
 food products, **11:3**
 health care products, **11:8**
 miscellaneous other products, **11:10**
 overview, **11:1**
 pharmaceuticals, **11:12**
 publications, **11:7**
 restaurant decor and designs, **11:2**
 service businesses, **11:11**
 sporting goods and apparel, **11:6**
 toys and games, **11:5**
 web sites, **11:14**

Patent, see Patent protection**Patent and Trademark Office, see Patent and Trademark Office protection****Under federal law**

assertion of state court unfair competition claims in
 federal court under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1338(a), **8:5**
 references to trade dress in federal statutes, **8:6**
 section 43(a)(1) of Lanham Act, unregistered marks
 and unfair competition, **8:1**
 Under federal law, section 32 of Lanham Act, federally
 registered trade dress
 availability of federal registration for trade dress, **8:3**
 effect of registration of trade dress, **8:4**

PROTECTION OVERVIEW

Audit desirability, **3:9**
 Brief summary of current state of law, **3:8**
 Limitations on overall strength of, **3:5**
 Particular features of trade dress, **3:7**
 Strength of
 generally, **3:1**
 limitations on overall strength, **3:5**
 particular types of trade dress, **3:6**
 Too broad or too strong, **3:4**
 Trade dress as hidden fortress, **3:3**
 Unlimited duration of, **3:2**

PTO

See **Patent and Trademark Office protection**

PUBLICATIONS

Protection for, **11:7**

QUALITEX CO. v. JACOBSON PRODUCTS CO.

Dry cleaning press pad, color green-gold for—file history of case, **33:1**
 Impact of, **4:4**
 Text of Supreme Court opinion, **35:9**

RECALL OF GOODS OR PRODUCTS

Intentional copying and effect on, **14:10**
 Relief for infringement, **15:20**

REDBULL ENERGY DRINK CAN

Expert witness report and declaration by Sandra R. Cogan challenging survey done by another survey expert on Redbull energy drink can, **49:2**

REGISTRATION

Accelerated rate, **1:6**
 Damages for fraudulent trade dress, **15:24**
 Effect on inherent distinctiveness, **12:9**
 Protection in PTO
 examples of dress where PTO registration was refused, **26:16**
 examples of registered trade dress, **26:15**
 expedited PTO registration if trade dress is infringed, **26:14**
 protection in PTO and mechanics of trade dress application registration process, **26:12**
 protection in PTO and registration of immoral or scandalous trade dress, **26:13**
 Protection of color as trade dress in PTO and burden of color, **26:4**

Protection under section 32 of Lanham Act
 availability of federal registration for trade dress, **8:3**
 effect of registration of trade dress, **8:4**

RELIEF

Discovery prior to hearing for preliminary injunction and other interim, **21:5**
 Infringement, see **Relief for infringement**
 Obtaining preliminary injunction, money damages cannot be adequate relief, **20:9**

RELIEF FOR INFRINGEMENT

Attorneys' fees
 overview, **15:9**
 right to jury trial
 counterclaims, **15:18**
 damages or equitable relief sought, **15:16**
 waiver of jury trial right, **15:17**
 section 35 of Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1117(a)
 generally, **15:10**
 application to Section 43(a) cases, **15:11**
 attempted parody intent, **15:14**
 exceptional circumstances, **15:13**

RELIEF FOR INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd
Attorneys' fees—Cont'd
 section 35 of Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1117(a)
 —Cont'd
 issues presented, 15:12
 unusual financial hardship to the defendant, 15:15
Contempt remedies, 15:27
Costs of litigation, 15:19
Counterfeiting remedies, 15:26
Damages for fraudulent registration of trade dress,
 15:24
Injunctive
 generally, 15:1
 cases where injunction denied, 15:5
 cases where injunction entered, 15:4
 effect of defendant's intent to change trade dress,
 15:6
 effect of plaintiff's delay in seeking injunction, 15:7
 statutory basis for injunctions, 15:2
 test for permanent injunction, 15:3
Monetary, 15:8
Notification to customers of infringement or injunction,
 15:23
Order freezing defendant's assets during litigation,
 15:22
Recall of goods or notification to distributors, 15:20
Seizure and destruction of infringing goods, 15:21
United States Customs, 15:25

REMAND ISSUES
State court or state law protection and, 9:9

REMOVAL ISSUES
State court or state law protection and, 9:9

REMOVAL OF ACTION
Notice of removal from state court to federal court,
 Clifford Miller v. Cheseborough Ponds Co., 41:1
State court or state law protection and removal issues,
 9:9

REPUTATION
Claim element, 6:12

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
Discovery issue, requests for production of things and,
 21:2
Mother's Nutritional Center, Inc. v. Mommy's
 Nutritional Center, first set, 43:2

REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS
Mother's Nutritional Center, Inc. v. Mommy's
 Nutritional Center, first set, 43:1

RESEARCHING TRADE DRESS
Guide to, 28:1

RESEARCH MATERIALS
For cases before ITC, 27:9

RES JUDICATA
Protection in PTO, 26:20

RESTAURANT DECOR AND DESIGN
Protection for, 11:2

RESTRaining ORDERS
Temporary, see **Temporary restraining orders**

REYNOLDS CONSUMER PRODUCTS, INC. v. HANDI-FOIL CORP.
Counterclaim, answers and defenses, 40:11
Discovery plans and stipulations, agreed joint
 discovery plan, 43:4
Special verdict, 45:4

ROLLS-ROYCE GRILL
Figure, 30:5

RULE 11 SANCTIONS
Procedural issue, 19:10

SALT, PEPPER, AND OTHER CONDIMENT CONTAINER
Figure, 30:9

SANDRA R. COGAN
Expert witness report and declaration, challenging
 survey done by another survey expert on Redbull
 energy drink can, 49:2

SCANDALOUS TRADE DRESS
Protection in PTO and registration of, 26:13

SCENT
Particular problem of functionality in, 17:5.50

SEARCHES
Functionality trade dress cases, search of West Key
 Number Digest on Westlaw, 51:1
Intellectual Property Expert Witness Filings database
 [IP-EW-DOCS] on Westlaw for trade dress cases,
 51:2
 Trade dress as hidden fortress, 3:3

SEARS, ROEBUCK & CO. v. STIFFEL CO.
Text of Supreme Court opinion, 35:4

SEARS-COMPCO DEFENSE
Applicability of the defense to product configuration
 trade dress, 18:4
Current status of, 18:2
Explanation of, 18:1
Non-applicability of the defense to federal trademark
 claims, 18:3

SECONDARY MEANING (REQUIREMENT AND PROOF)
Actual confusion, 13:16
Circumstances when secondary meaning is required,
 section 2(f) of Lanham Act, 13:1
Definition of, 13:2
Effect of intentional copying on, 14:7

SECONDARY MEANING (REQUIREMENT AND PROOF)—Cont'dFactual issue, **13:19**For product configuration when required, in claim, **6:8**
Length of time required for trade dress to acquire,**13:17**

Proof of

generally, **13:3**

advertising

amount spent as a factor, **13:7**image advertising, **13:8**amount of evidence necessary, **13:6**customer letters, **13:12**declarations, **13:10**evidence of functionality or other issues, **13:13**findings of other tribunals, **13:11**intentional copying, **13:14**stipulation, **13:4**surveys, **13:9**types of evidence, **13:5**unsolicited media coverage, **13:15**Protection in PTO upon showing of, **26:10**Secondary meaning in the making, **13:18****SEIZURE OF INFRINGING GOODS**Relief for infringement in, **15:21****SERVICE BUSINESSES**Protection for, **11:11****SETTLEMENT**Insurance aspects of settling claims, **29:12****17 U.S.C.**§§ 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 501, 502, 503, 504, 506, 509, **31:1****SHADE**See also **Color**Likelihood of confusion and confusion of color or, **7:13**Protection of color as trade dress in PTO, color specification and confusion of, **26:8****SHAPE**See **Configuration****SIMILARITIES**Between copyright and trade dress protection, **24:3**Between trademark and trade dress cases, **23:5**Indirect evidence of intentional copying, similarities of the trade dress itself, **14:14**

Likelihood of confusion and trade dress

misrepresentation of source under section 14(3) of Lanham Act, **10:17**overall impression, **7:6**side by side comparison may be proper, **7:5**side by side comparison not proper, **7:4****SINGER MANUF'G CO. v. JUNE MANUF'G CO.**Text of Supreme Court opinion, **35:2****SOPHISTICATION**Likelihood of confusion and purchaser, **7:9****SOUNDS**As trade dress example, **5:8****SOURCE**Confusion of, **7:11****SPECIAL VERDICTS**

Jury verdicts

Car-Freshner Corp v. D & J Distributing, **45:6.70**Frito-Lay North America, Inc. v. Medallion Foods, Inc., **45:6**The Black & Decker Corp. v. Positec USA Inc., **45:6.50**Yurman Design, Inc. v. PAJ, Inc., jury verdict, **45:3**Proposed, Frito-Lay North America, Inc. v. Medallion Foods, Inc., **45:5**Reynolds Consumer Products, Inc. v. Handi-Foil Corp., **45:4****SPECIMENS**Protection in PTO and mechanics of trade dress application, **26:11****SPONSORSHIP**Confusion of, or affiliation, **7:12****SPORTING GOODS AND APPAREL**Protection for, **11:6****SPORTS FEATURES/UNIFORMS AND COSTUMES**As trade dress example, **5:6****STANDARDS OF REVIEW**For inherently distinctive trade dress, **12:7**Trials of trade dress cases, **22:8****STATE ANTI-MOLDING STATUTES**Related claims in trade dress cases, **10:15****STATE CLAIMS**Likelihood of confusion in related, **7:19**Procedural issue in trade dress cases, motion to dismiss or remand to state court, supplemental, **19:6****STATE COMMON LAW TRADE DRESS INFRINGEMENT**Related claims in trade dress cases, **10:9****STATE COURTS**Assertion of state court unfair competition claims in federal court under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1338(a), **8:5**Complaints. **Document Excerpts From Selected Trade Dress Cases** (this index)Notice of removal from state court to federal court, Clifford Miller v. Cheseborough Ponds Co., **41:1**Procedural issue of state court actions in removal to federal court, **19:9**

Protection through state law or

California case law, **9:3**California statutes, **9:2**

INDEX

STATE COURTS—Cont'd

Protection through state law or—Cont'd
overview of state court protection, 9:1
personal jurisdiction and venue, 9:7
removal and remand issues, 9:9
statutory law in states other than California
case law, 9:6
dilution laws, 9:5
model state trademark bill, 9:4
subject matter jurisdiction over federal claims, 9:8

STATE LAW

Miscellaneous tort claims under state law
interference with business relationships, 10:11
trade libel or disparagement, 10:12
Protection through courts or, see **State courts**

STATEMENT OF UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Non-infringement of alleged block trade dress, support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:5
Non-infringement of alleged packaging trade dress, support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:2

STATE TRADEMARK BILL

Version of dilution in model, 10:4

STATE UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE TRADE PRACTICES LAW

Related claims in trade dress cases
generally, 10:6
state false advertising laws, 10:8
state unfair competition laws, 10:7

STATUTORY BASIS

Generally, 31:1-31:7
Amendments, effect on and applicability to functionality, 17:16
Copyright statutes, 31:1
Federal venue and jurisdiction, 31:5
For injunctions, 15:2
For preliminary injunctions, 20:21
For temporary restraining orders, 20:21
Patent statutes, 31:2
State materials, 31:6, 31:7
Trade dress H.R. 3163, 31:4
Trademark statutes, 31:3

STAYS

Petition for writ of mandamus and application for stay of transfer order, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., 41:2
Procedural issue of, in trade dress cases, 19:7

STIPULATION

Dismissal, The Black & Decker Corp. v. Positec USA Inc., 42:5.50
Proof of secondary meaning, 13:4

STRIKE, MOTIONS

Procedural issue of, in trade dress cases, 19:1, 19:1.50

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

Procedural issue of, in trade dress cases, 19:12
Scope of arbitration clauses, 19:13

SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTIONS

Discovery prior to hearing on, 21:6
Insurance coverage, motions to establish, 29:8
Non-infringement of alleged block trade dress
memorandum of points and authorities in support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:6
non-confidential exhibits and supporting declarations, memorandum of points and authorities in support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:6
notice of motion and motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:4
plaintiff8217s [insured8217s], Test Masters v. State Farm, 44:6.50
statement of uncontroverted facts and conclusions of law in support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe, Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:5
Non-infringement of alleged packaging trade dress
memorandum of points and authorities in support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:3
non-confidential exhibits and supporting declarations, memorandum of points and authorities in support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:3
notice of motion and motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:1
statement of controverted facts and conclusions of law in support of motion for summary judgment, Perine Lowe Inc. v. Dolly, Inc., 44:2
Procedural issues in trade dress cases, 19:2

SUPPLEMENTAL CLAIMS

Order to show cause regarding dismissal or supplemental, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. GM Marketing, 42:6
Procedural issue in trade dress cases, motion to dismiss or remand to state court, supplemental state claims, 19:6

SURVEYOR'S REEL

Figure, 30:4

SURVEYS

Expert witness report and declaration
Marylander Marketing Research, survey expert, involving trade dress of toys, 49:3
Sandra R. Cogan, challenge of survey done by another survey expert on Redbull energy drink can, 49:2
Proof of secondary meaning, 13:9
Sample in packaging case, 34:1

SURVEYS—Cont'dUse in trade dress cases, **19:11****SWEATER DESIGNS**Figure, **30:1****TACO CABANA INT'L, INC. v. TWO PESOS, INC.**Damages awarded, **45:10**

Effect of decision

discussion of case, **4:2**impact of case, **4:3**state of trade dress law at time of decision of case, **4:1**Final judgment order, **45:10**Text of Supreme Court opinion, **35:8****TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDERS**And order to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue, *Carol Cable Co. v. Grand Auto, Inc.*, **42:1**Availability of adequate monetary relief, **20:19***Carol Cable Co. v Grand Auto, Inc.*, **42:1**Defenses to, delay in bringing motion or application, **20:18**Examples of cases where restraining orders were granted or denied, **20:17**Hearing, **20:12**Other defenses, **20:20**Procedure for obtaining, **20:11**Statutory basis for, **20:21**Terms, **20:22****TENDER OF INSURANCE COVERAGE ISSUES**De jure test of functionality, protection of color as trade dress in PTO, **26:6**

Overall, on likelihood of confusion

standards for different types of trade dress, **7:3**tests in different circuits, **7:2****TESTS OF FUNCTIONALITY**Generally, **17:6****THE BLACK & DECKER CORP. v. POSITEC USA INC.**Defendants 8217 motion in limine to exclude expert witness on likelihood of confusion, **44:8.50**Jury trial instructions, **45:8.50**Jury verdict, **45:6.50****THEFT OF TRADE SECRETS**Related claims in trade dress cases, **10:16****35 U.S.C.**§§ 100, 101, 102, 103, 112, 117, **31:2****TIME**Length of, required for trade dress to acquire secondary meaning, **13:17****TIRE**Figure, **30:11****TOPPS COMPANY**Fed. Reg. No. 1,846,873, file history of, candy in shape of diamond ring, **33:2****TORT CLAIMS**Miscellaneous, under state law, see **State law****TOY TRADE DRESS**Expert witness report and declaration by survey expert *Marylander Marketing Research*, **49:3**Infringement, complaint in federal court, *Lanard Toys Ltd. v. Novelty, Inc.*, **40:3**Protection for, **11:5****TRACTORS, GREEN AND YELLOW COLOR COMBINATION**Fed. Reg. No. 78572285, file history of, *Deere and Co.*, **33:4****TRADE DISPARAGEMENT**Tort claims under state law and, **10:12****TRADE DRESS PROTECTION ACT**Generally, **31:4****TRADE DRESS SEARCHES**Color, **32:2**Design, **32:3**Product configuration, **32:1****TRADEMARK BILL**Version of dilution in model state, **10:4****TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE**Generally, **36:1**Section 1202.02, **36:1**Section 1202.16, **36:1****TRADEMARK PROTECTION (RELATIONSHIP TO TRADE DRESS)**Differences between trademark and trade dress cases, **23:4**Overview, **23:1**Similarities between trademark and trade dress cases, **23:5**Trade dress may contribute to trademark infringement, **23:2**"Witches brew" or "welter of miscellany" in combined trademark/trade dress cases, **23:3****TRADEMARK(S)**Defenses to claims and, see **Defenses to claims**Non-applicability of Sears-Comco defense to federal trademark claims, **18:3****TRADEMARK STATUTES**15 U.S.C. § 1052, **31:3**15 U.S.C. § 1053, **31:3****TRADEMARK/TRADE DRESS CASES**Likelihood of confusion analysis in combined, **7:18**

TRADE SECRETS

Theft of, as related claims in trade dress cases, **10:16**

TRAFFIX DEVICES, INC. v. MARKETING DISPLAYS, INC.

Appellant's brief, petitioner TrafFix's brief in Supreme Court TrafFix case, **47:2**

Supreme Court decision regarding, **4:6**

Text of Supreme Court opinion, **35:11**

TRANSFER ORDER

Petition for writ of mandamus and application for stay of transfer order, Ellison Educational Equipment, Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc., **41:2**

TRUCK TRAILER DESIGN

Fed. Reg. No. 1,622,363, file history of, Beall Corp., **33:3**

28 U.S.C.

§§ 1330, 1331, 1332, 1338, 1339, 1340, 1367, 1368, 1391, 1392, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1401, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405, **31:5**

§ 1338(a), assertion of state court unfair competition claims in federal court under, **8:5**

TWO PESOS

See **Taco Cabana Int'l, Inc. v. Two Pesos, Inc.**

UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE TRADE PRACTICES LAWS

State, see **State unfair and deceptive trade practices laws**

UNFAIR COMPETITION

Lanham Act protection and generally, **8:1**

assertion of state court unfair competition claims in federal court under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1338(a), **8:5**

State laws on, related claims in trade dress cases, **10:7**

UNIFORMS

Sports and entertainment, as trade dress examples, **5:6**

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS

Relief for infringement and, **15:25**

UNREGISTERED MARKS

Lanham Act protection and, **8:1**

UNSOLICITED MEDIA COVERAGE

Proof of secondary meaning and, **13:15**

UNUSUAL FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

Relief for infringement and attorneys' fees and, to the defendant, **15:15**

URBAN GROUP EXERCISE CONSULTANTS, LTD. v. DICK'S SPORTING GOODS, INC.

Memorandum in support of dismissing plaintiff's amended complaint, **41:4**

"USEFUL ARTICLES" LIMITATION

Copyright protection, relationship to trade dress, **24:5**

UTILITARIAN FUNCTIONALITY

Defined, **17:2**

UTILITY PATENTS

Trade dress and, **25:5**

VENUE

Discovery into issue of, **21:4**

Procedural issue of, in trade dress cases, **19:3**

State courts or state law protection and personal jurisdiction and, **9:7**

28 U.S.C. §§ 1330, 1331, 1332, 1338, 1339, 1340, 1367, 1368, 1391, 1392, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1401, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405, **31:5**

WAIVER

Attorneys' fees, relief for infringement and, of right to jury trial, **15:17**

WAL-MART STORES, INC. v. SAMARA BROTHERS, INC.

"Inherent distinctiveness" in light of decision, **12:10**

Supreme Court decision regarding, **4:5, 12:10**

Text of Supreme Court decision, **35:10**

WATER HOSE NOZZLE

Figure, **30:10**

WEB SITES

Protection for, **11:14**

WEST KEY NUMBER DIGEST ON WESTLAW

Search for functionality trade dress cases, **51:1**

WESTLAW

Intellectual Property Expert Witness Filings database [IP-EW-DOCS] for trade dress cases, **51:2**

West Key Number Digest, search for functionality trade dress cases, **51:1**

WHIMSICAL SCULPTURES

Cease and desist letter to Home Base from The Fringe Gallery, **39:2**

WHIRLPOOL JET FOR BATHTUBS

Figure, **30:6**

"WITCHES BREW" ("WELTER OF MISCELLANY")

In combined trademark/trade dress cases, **23:3**

YURMAN DESIGN, INC. v. PAJ, INC.

Special jury verdict, **45:3**