

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>xvii</i>
PART I. INTRODUCTION	1
1 INTRODUCTION TO TRADE DRESS AND DESIGN LAW	3
A. INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS DESIGN?	4
• Alice Rawsthorn, What Defies Defining, but Exists Everywhere?	5
• Graeme B. Dinwoodie, Federalized Functionalism: The Future of Design Protection in the European Union	6
• Robert C. Denicola, Applied Art And Industrial Design: A Suggested Approach to Copyright in Useful Articles	9
• Orit Fischman Afori, Reconceptualizing Property in Designs	11
Notes and Questions	13
B. THE MODERN LEGISLATIVE LANDSCAPE FOR TRADE DRESS AND DESIGN PROTECTION	15
1. The International Intellectual Property Law of Design	16
a. TRIPS	16
b. The Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs	16
2. U.S. Intellectual Property Laws Regarding Design	17
a. Trademark and Unfair Competition Protection	17
b. Patent Protection	18
c. Copyright Protection	19

3. European Union Design Law	20
Notes and Questions	20
C. THE “CUMULATION/PREEMPTION” PROBLEM IN DESIGN LAW	24
• <i>Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co.</i>	24
Notes and Questions	27
• <i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.</i>	28
Notes and Questions	36

PART II. TRADE DRESS 39

2 DISTINCTIVENESS 41

A. TRADE DRESS AND DESIGNS AS PROTECTABLE SUBJECT MATTER UNDER TRADEMARK AND UNFAIR COMPETITION PRINCIPLES	41
• <i>Flagg Mfg. Co. v. Holway</i>	42
• <i>George G. Fox Co. v. Hathaway</i>	43
• <i>Enterprise Mfg. Co. v. Landers, Frary & Clark</i>	45
• <i>Crescent Tool Co. v. Kilborn & Bishop Co.</i>	46
Notes and Questions	47
• <i>Lanham Act, Section 45</i>	48
• <i>Kohler Co. v. Moen Inc.</i>	48
Notes and Questions	63

B. THE SUPREME COURT’S FRAMEWORK FOR DISTINCTIVENESS IN TRADE DRESS AND DESIGN CASES	64
--	----

1. Fundamentals of Distinctiveness: The <i>Abercrombie</i> Spectrum	64
2. The <i>Seabrook</i> Analysis	67
3. The Supreme Court’s Framework for Trade Dress Distinctiveness	67
• <i>Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc.</i>	68
Notes and Questions	76
• <i>Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Products Co., Inc.</i>	78
Notes and Questions	84
• <i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Brothers, Inc.</i>	85
Notes and Questions	90

C. TRADE DRESS AND DESIGN DISTINCTIVENESS AFTER WAL-MART	92
--	----

1. Product Design v. Product Packaging	92
• <i>In re Slokevage</i>	92
Notes and Questions	95

2. Secondary Meaning	96
• Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition (1995) Section 13, Comment (e)	96
• <i>Yankee Candle Co., Inc. v. Bridgewater Candle Co., LLC</i>	98
Notes and Questions	103

3 FUNCTIONALITY 107

A. INTRODUCTION TO THE CONCEPT OF FUNCTIONALITY 107

- *Kellogg Co. v. National Biscuit Co.* 108
- Notes and Questions 111

B. THE SCOPE OF THE FUNCTIONALITY DOCTRINE 112

1. Utilitarian Features 112

- *In re Morton-Norwich Products, Inc.* 112
- Notes and Questions 122

2. Aesthetic Features 123

- *Wallace Int'l Silversmiths, Inc. v. Godinger Silver Art Co., Inc.* 124
- *Brunswick Corp. v. British Seagull Ltd.* 129
- Notes and Questions 131

C. THE MODERN APPROACH TO FUNCTIONALITY 132

1. The U.S. Supreme Court Framework 132

- *Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Prods. Co., Inc.* 133
- *TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc.* 135
- Notes and Questions 141

2. Applying the Modern Supreme Court Framework after *TrafFix* 143

a. Utilitarian Features 143

- *Valu Engineering, Inc. v. Rexnord Corp.* 143
- *Eppendorf-Netheler-Hinz GmbH v. Ritter GmbH* 147
- *Fuji Kogyo Co., Ltd. v. Pacific Bay Int'l, Inc.* 149
- Notes and Questions 156

b. Aesthetic Features 160

- *Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc. v. American Eagle Outfitters* 160
- *Au-Tomotive Gold, Inc. v. Volkswagen of America, Inc.* 165
- Notes and Questions 169

c. The Relationship between the Tests 171

Notes and Questions 173

3. Functionality in the European Union 174

- *Koninklijke Philips Electronics NV v. Remington Consumer Products Ltd* 174

• <i>Case C-48/09 P, Lego Juris A/S v. Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market</i>	177
• <i>Benetton Group Spa v. G-Star International BV 2007 E.C.R. I-07709 (ECJ 2007)</i>	181
Notes and Questions	184
D. BEYOND FUNCTIONALITY?	185
• <i>Vornado Air Circulation Sys., Inc. v. Duracraft Corp.</i>	186
Notes and Questions	197
• <i>Bretford Mfg., Inc. v. Smith System Mfg. Corp.</i>	204
Notes and Questions	208
4 ENFORCEMENT AND DEFENSES	211
A. TRADE DRESS INFRINGEMENT — LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION	211
• Figure 4-1: Likelihood of Confusion Factor Tests	214
1. Applying the Multifactor Confusion Test in Trade Dress Cases	219
a. Product Packaging	219
• <i>Ambrit, Inc. v. Kraft, Inc.</i>	219
Notes and Questions	228
Problem 4-1: Likelihood of Confusion in Private-Label Goods Cases	235
b. Product Design	239
• <i>Versa Products Company, Inc. v. Bifold Company (Manufacturing) Ltd.</i>	239
Notes and Questions	252
2. Confusion away from the Point of Sale	255
• <i>Ferrari S.P.A. Esercizio Fabriche Automobili e Corse v. Roberts</i>	255
Notes and Questions	260
• <i>Gibson Guitar Corp. v. Paul Reed Smith Guitars, LP</i>	262
Notes and Questions	269
B. TRADE DRESS DILUTION AND OTHER NON-CONFUSION-BASED THEORIES	270
1. Protection against Dilution	271
• Lanham Act Section 43(c)	271
Notes and Questions	273
2. Protection against Counterfeiting	276
C. PERMISSIBLE USE OF ANOTHER’S TRADE DRESS	277
• <i>Herman Miller, Inc. v. A. Studio S.R.L.</i>	277
Notes and Questions	281

• <i>Mattel Inc. v. Walking Mountain Productions</i>	284
Notes and Questions	291
D. REMEDIES	292
PART III. DESIGN PATENTS	295
5 SECURING RIGHTS	297
• Patent and Trademark Office Manual of Patent Examining Procedure	300
A. WHAT IS A “DESIGN FOR AN ARTICLE OF MANUFACTURE”?	301
• <i>Hoop v. Hoop</i>	301
Notes and Questions	304
Problem 5-1: Computer-Generated Icons	312
B. ORNAMENTALITY AND FUNCTIONALITY	312
• <i>In re Webb</i>	312
Notes and Questions	315
• <i>Best Lock Corp. v. Ilco Unican Corp.</i>	320
• <i>PHG Technologies, LLC v. St. John Companies, Inc.</i>	325
Notes and Questions	330
C. NOVELTY AND NONOBVIOUSNESS	335
• <i>Door-Master Corp. v. Yorktowne, Inc.</i>	335
Notes and Questions	339
• <i>International Seaway Trading Corp. v. Walgreens Corp.</i>	341
Notes and Questions	351
Problem 5-2: The Middle Finger Design	352
Problem 5-3: Experimenting with Designs	352
• <i>Durling v. Spectrum Furniture Co., Inc.</i>	355
Notes and Questions	359
Problem 5-4: The Football Helmet Birdhouse	363
Problem 5-5: Priority	364
• Appendix A: U.S. Design Patent No. 543,681	367
• Appendix B: U.S. Design Patent No. 367,440	373
6 ENFORCING RIGHTS	381
A. THE INFRINGEMENT ANALYSIS	381
1. The <i>Gorham</i> “Substantial Similarity” Test	382
• <i>Gorham Co. v. White</i>	382
Notes and Questions	386
2. Substantial Similarity Under <i>Egyptian Goddess</i>	391
• <i>Egyptian Goddess, Inc. v. Swisa, Inc.</i>	392

Notes and Questions	407
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. International Trade Commission</i>	410
<i>Richardson v. Stanley Works, Inc.</i>	417
Problem 6-1: Applying <i>Egyptian Goddess</i> : The Giant Stuff-A-Pumpkin	422
Problem 6-2: Design Patents and the Repair/Reconstruction Distinction	424
B. REMEDIES	425
• <i>Nike, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i>	425
Notes and Questions	429
 PART IV. COPYRIGHT	 431
7 COPYRIGHT	433
A. COPYRIGHTABILITY IN GENERAL	433
1. Originality	434
• <i>Yurman Studio, Inc. v. Castaneda</i>	434
Notes and Questions	436
2. The Section 102(b) Exclusions	437
• <i>Herbert Rosenthal Jewelry Corp. v. Kalpakian</i>	437
Notes and Questions	440
B. “PICTORIAL, GRAPHIC AND SCULPTURAL WORKS”: USEFUL ARTICLES AND THE SEPARABILITY DOCTRINE	440
1. Copyright Protection for Useful Articles	441
• <i>Mazer v. Stein</i>	441
Notes and Questions	444
2. The Separability Doctrine Under the 1976 Act	445
• <i>Pivot Point Int’l, Inc. v. Charlene Products, Inc.</i>	446
Notes and Questions	462
C. SCOPE OF COPYRIGHT PROTECTION	464
1. Copyright Infringement	465
• <i>Peter Pan Fabrics, Inc. v. Martin Weiner Corp.</i>	465
• <i>Ty, Inc. v. GMA Accessories, Inc.</i>	466
• <i>JCW Investments, Inc. v. Novelty, Inc.</i>	470
Notes and Questions	474
2. Fair Use	475
• <i>Mattel Inc. v. Walking Mountain Productions</i>	475
Notes and Questions	482

D. ARCHITECTURAL WORKS	483
• <i>T-Peg, Inc. v. Vermont Timber Works, Inc.</i>	483
Notes and Questions	490
• <i>Leicester v. Warner Brothers</i>	491
Notes and Questions	506
E. WORKS OF VISUAL ART	507
• <i>Martin v. City of Indianapolis</i>	507
• <i>Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art Foundation Inc. v. Büchel</i>	513
Notes and Questions	523

PART V. SUI GENERIS REGIMES

525

8 SUI GENERIS DESIGN PROTECTION

527

A. EUROPEAN DESIGN RIGHTS	528
• Community Design Regulation Article 7	533
• <i>Green Lane Products Ltd. v. PMS International Group Plc.</i>	534
• Community Design Regulation Articles 10 and 19(1)	543
• <i>Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Reckitt Benckiser (UK) Ltd</i>	544
• <i>J Choo (Jersey) Ltd v. Towerstone Ltd.</i>	556
Notes and Questions	560
B. SUI GENERIS REGIMES UNDER U.S. LAW	566
• Vessel Hull Design Protection Act	567
Notes and Questions	571
• Epilogue	572

<i>Table of Cases</i>	573
-----------------------	-----

<i>Index</i>	579
--------------	-----