

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**

TraFFix's brief in Supreme Court TraFFix 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**

TraFFix's brief in Supreme Court TraFFix 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-Compco 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 INFRINGEMENT

State, 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**

INDEX

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, Nutrivita, 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**

EXHIBITS

- See also **Illustrations**
- 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**

INDEX

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. HIDEELL 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**

INFRINGING 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**

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 declarations, 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 uncontroverted facts and conclusions of law in support of motion for summary judgment, **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 declarations), **44:3**
 - notice of motion and motion for summary judgment, **44:1**
 - statement of uncontroverted facts and conclusions of law in support of motion for summary judgment, **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**

PRODUCTION 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'd

Factual 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**

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'd

Use 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' 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-Compco 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**