
Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>List of contributors</i> | xix |
| <i>List of abbreviations</i> | xxi |
| <i>Introduction to the Research Handbook on Design Law</i> <i>Henning Hartwig</i> | xxiv |
| PART I FOUNDATIONS | |
| 1. Requirements for Design Protection: Global Commonalities <i>Bernard Volken</i> | 2 |
| I. Law and design | 2 |
| 1. Design: what's that? | 2 |
| 2. Design law: balance of interests? | 3 |
| 3. Review of interests | 4 |
| II. Fundamental principles of design protection | 5 |
| 1. Subject matter of design protection | 5 |
| a) Definition of a design | 5 |
| b) Representation of a design | 7 |
| c) Interpretation of a design | 9 |
| 2. Priority claim ('the same') | 10 |
| 3. Test for validity | 11 |
| a) Novelty | 12 |
| b) Individual character | 15 |
| c) Non-obviousness | 16 |
| 4. Test for infringement | 17 |
| 5. Exclusion from protection | 17 |
| 6. Defences to infringement | 19 |
| III. Registration versus use | 19 |
| 1. Concept of registration | 19 |
| 2. Concept of use | 19 |
| 3. Similarities and differences | 20 |
| IV. Design versus patent versus copyright approach | 20 |
| 1. Patent approach | 20 |
| 2. Copyright approach | 21 |
| 3. Design approach | 23 |
| V. The international legal environment: past and present | 23 |
| 1. History of origin | 23 |
| a) TRIPS Agreement | 23 |
| b) Paris Convention | 24 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| c) | Geneva Act of the Hague Agreement | 24 |
| d) | Locarno Agreement | 25 |
| 2. | Status quo | 25 |
| a) | Harmonisation in terms of formalities | 25 |
| b) | Non-harmonisation in terms of substantive law | 28 |
| 2. | Trends in Functionality Jurisprudence: U.S. and E.U. Design Law <i>Jason J. Du Mont and Mark D. Janis</i> | 30 |
| I. | Introduction | 30 |
| II. | Functionality in U.S. design patent law: critical trends | 31 |
| 1. | Emergence of a bifurcated approach: validity versus scope functionality | 31 |
| 2. | Applying validity functionality doctrine | 34 |
| a) | Predominance of 'alternative designs' evidence | 35 |
| b) | Assessing what constitutes an alternative design | 37 |
| c) | The alternative designs analysis for standard-essential designs | 38 |
| d) | Limiting the role of ornamentality tests | 39 |
| 3. | Applying scope functionality doctrine | 40 |
| a) | Scope functionality in the claim construction analysis | 40 |
| aa) | Process considerations after <i>Teva</i> | 40 |
| bb) | Functionality and the abstractions problem | 42 |
| b) | Tempering the <i>Richardson</i> 'factoring' analysis | 43 |
| III. | Functionality in Community design law | 49 |
| 1. | The exclusions | 50 |
| a) | Functionality exclusions | 50 |
| aa) | Features solely dictated by technical function | 50 |
| bb) | Features required for connectivity | 61 |
| b) | Visibility requirement for component parts | 63 |
| 2. | Individual character and infringement doctrines | 68 |
| a) | Impressing the informed user | 69 |
| b) | The degree of freedom | 73 |
| IV. | Conclusion | 76 |
| 3. | Easier to See than to Say: Catching the Elusive Spirit of Design in a Net of Words <i>David Musker</i> | 77 |
| I. | Introduction | 77 |
| II. | Imprecisions in decisions | 77 |
| 1. | Verbalising and vocabularising: gaining words and losing meaning | 79 |
| 2. | Of generality and granularity | 81 |
| III. | Overall impression and the test person: realistic or legalistic? | 82 |
| IV. | Separating two questions: essence and similarity | 83 |
| 1. | The nature of the first question: the design | 83 |
| 2. | Like-with-like comparison | 84 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 3. | Determination of an unregistered design | 84 |
| 4. | Construction of a registered design | 85 |
| 5. | The nature of the second question: the visual comparison | 87 |
| V. | Europe's 'overall impression' test | 88 |
| VI. | Dissecting the <i>Gestalt</i> | 89 |
| 1. | Purposes of dissection: filtration, weighting and short-cuts | 90 |
| 2. | Feature filtration | 90 |
| a) | Feature filtration: essential and inessential | 90 |
| b) | Feature filtration: old and new | 92 |
| c) | Feature filtration: functional, visible or ornamental | 93 |
| d) | Mixed-mode filtration | 95 |
| e) | Of babies and bathwater: the dangers of filtration | 98 |
| 3. | Short-circuiting the comparison | 99 |
| a) | Omission of essential or dominant features | 100 |
| b) | Point of novelty | 100 |
| 4. | Weighting and synthesis | 101 |
| a) | Weighting in relation to the prior art | 102 |
| b) | Distance from the prior art | 102 |
| c) | The 'least distance rule' | 103 |
| d) | Density of prior art | 105 |
| e) | Design freedom | 105 |
| f) | Other factors | 106 |
| VII. | Comparing overall impressions: 'structured approaches' | 106 |
| VIII. | Comparing similarities and differences at feature level | 108 |
| 1. | The <i>Eredu</i> approach: weighting the comparisons | 109 |
| 2. | Distortions caused by concentration on similarities | 111 |
| 3. | Distortions caused by concentration on differences | 111 |
| 4. | Difference in overall impression, or overall impression of difference? | 111 |
| 5. | Expert overshadowing | 113 |
| 6. | Trial fatigue and mind's eye strain | 114 |
| IX. | Conclusion: some palliatives | 114 |

PART II METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 4. | Reciprocity in European Design Law | 119 |
| | <i>Henning Hartwig</i> | |
| I. | The concept of reciprocity | 119 |
| 1. | The notion of reciprocity | 120 |
| 2. | Interaction between prior art and validity | 121 |
| 3. | Interaction between prior art and scope of protection | 125 |
| 4. | Interaction between scope of protection and infringement | 126 |
| 5. | Interaction between validity, scope of protection and infringement? | 128 |
| 6. | Interaction between prior art, scope of protection and infringement | 131 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 7. Static scope of protection (date of reciprocity) | 132 |
| 8. Degree of freedom of the designer of earlier or later design? | 133 |
| II. Other fields of reciprocity | 134 |
| 1. Subject matter of earlier and later design | 134 |
| 2. Different views of earlier and later design (partial designs) | 136 |
| 3. Use of solid and broken lines in earlier and later design | 139 |
| 4. The feature of colour in earlier and later design | 140 |
| 5. Description of earlier or later design | 142 |
| 6. The relevant prior art when testing validity and infringement | 144 |
| 7. Use of earlier and later design in the course of trade | 146 |
| 8. Informed user of earlier and later design | 148 |
| 9. Designer of earlier and later design | 150 |
| 10. No protection for the design of living plants or against its use | 150 |
| III. Variations over time | 151 |
| 1. Re-design, facelift and rumours | 151 |
| 2. Eased conditions for finding validity? | 156 |
| 3. No discrimination of selected industries, sectors or categories | 160 |
| IV. Reciprocity in European trade mark, trade dress and copyright law | 163 |
| 1. Reciprocity in trade mark law | 164 |
| 2. Reciprocity in trade dress law | 165 |
| 3. Reciprocity in copyright law | 166 |
| V. Conclusions | 167 |
| 5. Design Rights and Designer's Rights in the EU | 169 |
| <i>Anna Tischner</i> | |
| I. Introduction | 169 |
| II. Authorship and ownership | 170 |
| 1. Designer's personal interests (designer's right of paternity) | 170 |
| 2. Ownership | 174 |
| a) Initial entitlement ('designer doctrine') | 174 |
| b) The notion of the 'designer' | 175 |
| c) Joint designership | 177 |
| aa) Plurality of designers | 178 |
| bb) The notion of 'jointly developed' | 179 |
| cc) Changes to the original design | 180 |
| dd) Degree of contribution | 181 |
| d) The notion of the 'successor in title' | 184 |
| e) Designs developed by an employee | 184 |
| aa) Original allocation of rights | 184 |
| bb) Variations under national law | 186 |
| cc) The employment relationship | 186 |
| dd) 'Developed by an employee in the execution of his duties' | 188 |
| ee) 'Following the instructions given by the employer' | 189 |
| f) Designs developed pursuant to a commission | 190 |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| g) | The nature and protection of the right to the design | 192 |
| h) | Procedural issues under Article 17 CDR | 195 |
| 3. | Dealings with Community designs as objects of property | 196 |
| a) | Community designs as national rights (Article 27 CDR) | 196 |
| b) | Transfer (Article 30 CDR) | 197 |
| c) | Licensing (Article 32 CDR) | 197 |
| d) | Entry in the register | 201 |
| 4. | Design contract law | 202 |
| III. | Conclusions and future challenges | 205 |
| 6. | Enablement and Indefiniteness in U.S. Design Patents after <i>In re Maatita</i> and <i>Ex parte Kaufman</i> <i>Margaret Polson</i> | 207 |
| I. | Introduction | 207 |
| II. | Background | 208 |
| 1. | The enablement and indefiniteness requirement | 208 |
| 2. | Subject matter of the design and scope of the claim | 210 |
| 3. | Views of all sides of a three-dimensional object required? | 210 |
| III. | <i>Ex parte Kaufman</i> | 211 |
| 1. | The findings of the USPTO's examiner | 211 |
| 2. | The findings of the PTAB | 212 |
| IV. | <i>In re Maatita</i> | 212 |
| 1. | The findings of the USPTO's examiner | 213 |
| 2. | The findings of the PTAB | 215 |
| 3. | The findings of the Federal Circuit | 216 |
| V. | Applying <i>In re Maatita</i> to examples | 217 |
| VI. | Some distinct criticism | 222 |
| VII. | A supplementary view from Europe | 224 |
| 1. | Determining the subject matter of a partial design | 224 |
| 2. | Written text or context irrelevant | 225 |
| 3. | Testing infringement of a partial design | 227 |
| 4. | Testing validity of a partial design | 228 |
| VIII. | Concluding remarks | 229 |
| PART III ESTABLISHING AND ENFORCING PROTECTION | | |
| 7. | Protection of Designs on the Basis of Use <i>Estelle Derclaye</i> | 232 |
| I. | Introduction | 232 |
| II. | Unregistered design rights in the EU and elsewhere | 233 |
| 1. | Unregistered Community design rights | 233 |
| 2. | National unregistered design rights or similar protection in Europe and elsewhere | 233 |
| III. | Establishing unregistered design rights in the EU and U.K.: nature of establishing acts and territorial link | 234 |
| 1. | European Union | 234 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| a) | Territorial aspects when establishing unregistered Community design rights | 234 |
| b) | Nature of acts establishing unregistered Community design rights | 235 |
| c) | Ownership of an unregistered Community design right | 237 |
| 2. | United Kingdom | 237 |
| a) | Nature of the U.K. unregistered design right | 237 |
| b) | Requirement of a 'qualifying design' | 239 |
| IV. | Proof of copying and remedies in case of an infringement of unregistered design rights | 241 |
| V. | Disadvantages for non-EU entities? | 242 |
| VI. | Comparison with 'neighbouring' rights | 244 |
| 1. | Copyright law | 244 |
| 2. | Trade mark law | 244 |
| 3. | Unfair competition and passing off | 245 |
| a) | Passing off | 245 |
| b) | Unfair competition | 246 |
| VII. | Conclusion | 248 |
| 8. | Claiming Priority under the Community Design Scheme | 250 |
| | <i>Henning Hartwig</i> | |
| I. | Priority requirements under international design law | 251 |
| II. | Interaction between patent and design law | 253 |
| III. | Who decides on a valid priority claim | 256 |
| 1. | When is the EUIPO called to examine priority? | 256 |
| 2. | When are infringement courts called to examine priority? | 258 |
| IV. | What to decide: same subject matter, same design and date of priority | 260 |
| 1. | Same subject matter under the Paris Convention | 260 |
| 2. | Same design under the Community design scheme | 261 |
| 3. | Date of priority | 262 |
| V. | Claiming priority: how to decide | 263 |
| 1. | Differences between priority claim and subsequent Community design | 263 |
| 2. | Differences between priority claim and asserted Community design | 265 |
| 3. | A test for reciprocity | 267 |
| VI. | Multiple and partial priorities | 269 |
| VII. | Internal priority | 277 |
| VIII. | Conclusions | 281 |
| 9. | Enforcing Design Rights throughout Europe | 283 |
| | <i>Annette Kur</i> | |
| I. | Introduction | 283 |
| II. | Sanctions for design infringement | 284 |
| 1. | The Enforcement Directive | 284 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 2. | Overview on the implementation of the Enforcement Directive in the Member States | 285 |
| a) | Injunctions | 285 |
| b) | Damages | 286 |
| c) | Rendering of accounts | 288 |
| d) | Disclosure of information | 289 |
| e) | Corrective measures | 290 |
| f) | Publication of judgments | 291 |
| 3. | Commonalities and divergences | 291 |
| III. | International jurisdiction in case of design infringement | 291 |
| 1. | The Brussels I Regulation and the Community Designs Regulation | 291 |
| 2. | Recognition and enforcement of decisions under the Brussels I Regulation | 295 |
| 3. | Claims against multiple defendants under the Brussels I Regulation | 296 |
| a) | Requirements for joinder of parties | 296 |
| b) | Extent of international jurisdiction | 297 |
| IV. | Applicable substantive law | 299 |
| V. | Concluding remarks | 301 |

PART IV CRITICAL ISSUES

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 10. | Protection of Spare Parts in Design Law: A Comparative Law Analysis | 304 |
| | <i>Annette Kur and Ádám György</i> | |
| I. | Introduction | 304 |
| II. | European Union | 305 |
| 1. | Spare part protection under design law | 305 |
| a) | Specific requirements for component parts | 305 |
| b) | 'Must-fit' and 'must-match' features | 306 |
| c) | 'Freeze-plus' and the withdrawn European Commission proposal | 306 |
| d) | The Community Designs Regulation | 307 |
| e) | The situation in the European Union (before 1 January 2021) | 310 |
| aa) | Community and national design law | 310 |
| bb) | Overlap with other IP rights | 311 |
| 2. | Competition law | 313 |
| 3. | New (or envisaged) legislation in Germany and France | 314 |
| 4. | Further harmonisation? | 316 |
| a) | The Economic Review | 317 |
| b) | The Legal Review | 318 |
| c) | ECTA | 319 |
| III. | Other jurisdictions | 320 |
| 1. | United States | 320 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| a) | Overview | 320 |
| b) | Requirements for protection: ornamentality versus functionality | 321 |
| c) | Design patent exhaustion and the right to repair | 322 |
| d) | The proposed 'repair clause' | 324 |
| e) | Antitrust considerations | 326 |
| 2. | Brazil | 327 |
| 3. | South Africa | 331 |
| 4. | Japan | 333 |
| 5. | Turkey | 334 |
| 6. | Australia | 335 |
| IV. | International design law | 338 |
| 1. | Overview | 338 |
| 2. | Exclusion of spare parts from design protection | 338 |
| 3. | Repair clauses and the three-step test | 339 |
| V. | Conclusions | 341 |
| 1. | Comparative summary | 341 |
| 2. | Summary of possible solutions | 343 |
| 11. | Design Protection for Graphical User Interfaces | 345 |
| | <i>Tracy-Gene G. Durkin</i> | |
| I. | Introduction | 345 |
| II. | GUI protection through different IP rights and in different jurisdictions | 349 |
| III. | United States | 351 |
| 1. | History of design patent protection for GUI | 351 |
| 2. | Protecting GUI under design patent law | 352 |
| 3. | Enforcing GUI design patents | 355 |
| IV. | China | 359 |
| 1. | History of design patent protection for GUI | 359 |
| 2. | Protecting GUI under Chinese design patent law | 360 |
| 3. | Enforcing GUI design patents | 362 |
| V. | Japan | 364 |
| 1. | History of design protection for GUI | 364 |
| 2. | Protecting GUI under Japanese design law | 365 |
| 3. | Recent legislative developments | 370 |
| VI. | Australia | 370 |
| 1. | History of design protection for GUI | 370 |
| 2. | Protecting GUI under Australian design law | 373 |
| 3. | Recent legislative developments | 374 |
| VII. | Conclusion | 375 |
| 12. | 'Mast-Jägermeister' before the Court of Justice of the EU: What the Outcome Really Means | 378 |
| | <i>Henning Hartwig</i> | |
| I. | Introduction | 378 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| II. | Subject matter of the designs at issue | 380 |
| III. | Legal context and law | 385 |
| IV. | Mast-Jägermeister's arguments and sole ground of appeal before the CJEU | 385 |
| V. | The judgment in <i>Mast-Jägermeister</i> | 388 |
| VI. | Inconsistency or ambiguity of views? | 388 |
| VII. | Inconsistency between views and product indication? | 390 |
| VIII. | Remedies in case of deficiencies? | 396 |
| IX. | The German applications filed by Mast-Jägermeister | 397 |
| X. | Conclusions | 400 |

PART V TRANSNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE DIMENSIONS

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 13. | International Design Law Policies: Present and Future | 405 |
| | <i>Robert Mirko Stutz</i> | |
| I. | Status and prospects of the Hague Agreement | 405 |
| 1. | History of origin | 405 |
| 2. | Advantages of design rights acquired through the Hague Agreement | 406 |
| 3. | Status quo | 407 |
| 4. | Complicated coexistence of different regimes | 408 |
| 5. | Goals of the Geneva Act: deposition of declarations | 408 |
| a) | Declarations to be deposited by Contracting Parties with an examining office | 409 |
| b) | Declarations to be deposited by any Contracting Party | 409 |
| 6. | New countries joining the Geneva Act: what to expect? | 411 |
| a) | Republic of Korea | 412 |
| b) | United States | 414 |
| c) | Japan | 416 |
| d) | Russian Federation | 418 |
| e) | United Kingdom and Northern Ireland | 420 |
| f) | Canada | 420 |
| g) | Mexico | 422 |
| h) | People's Republic of China | 423 |
| i) | Appraising the enlargement of the geographical scope | 424 |
| 7. | The Hague Working Group: its aims and goals | 426 |
| a) | Meetings held in 2011 and 2012 | 426 |
| b) | Meetings held in 2013 and 2014 | 427 |
| c) | Fifth meeting held in 2015 | 428 |
| d) | Sixth meeting held in 2017 | 429 |
| e) | Seventh meeting held in 2018 | 430 |
| II. | Status and improvement of the Locarno Classification | 430 |
| 1. | History of origin and status quo | 430 |
| 2. | Prospects: still waiting for a new search system | 431 |
| III. | Proposal for a Design Law Treaty | 434 |
| 1. | History of origin | 435 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 2. | Status quo | 437 |
| 3. | Goals of the Design Law Treaty | 439 |
| 4. | Relationship between the Design Law Treaty and the Hague Agreement | 440 |
| 14. | Three-Dimensional Trade Marks and Designs: Comparison and Conflict <i>Alexander von Mühlendahl</i> | 441 |
| I. | Introduction | 441 |
| II. | Comparison | 443 |
| 1. | Registrability/protectability | 443 |
| a) | Trade marks | 443 |
| aa) | Representation: clarity and precision | 443 |
| bb) | Absolute grounds: distinctiveness | 443 |
| cc) | Earlier rights | 445 |
| b) | Designs | 446 |
| aa) | Clarity and precision: single design | 446 |
| bb) | Novelty and individual character | 447 |
| c) | Comparison | 449 |
| 2. | Absolute exclusions | 449 |
| a) | Trade marks | 449 |
| aa) | Shape resulting from the goods themselves | 450 |
| bb) | Shape necessary to obtain a technical result | 451 |
| cc) | Shape giving substantial value to the goods | 452 |
| b) | Designs | 456 |
| c) | Comparison | 457 |
| III. | Conflicts between trade marks and designs | 461 |
| 1. | Earlier design and later trade mark | 461 |
| a) | Infringement of a design by the use of a trade mark | 461 |
| b) | Defences | 463 |
| c) | Invalidity | 463 |
| 2. | Earlier trade mark and later design | 464 |
| a) | Infringement of a trade mark by the use of a design | 464 |
| aa) | Trade mark use of a design | 464 |
| bb) | Conflict situations | 465 |
| cc) | Identity or similarity of the mark and the design | 466 |
| dd) | Similarity of goods | 466 |
| ee) | Infringing use | 467 |
| b) | Defences | 467 |
| c) | Invalidity | 469 |
| aa) | Distinctive sign | 470 |
| bb) | Trade mark use | 470 |
| cc) | Identical or similar signs | 471 |
| dd) | Similarity of goods or services | 471 |
| ee) | Contesting the validity of the earlier trade mark | 472 |
| ff) | Cases | 473 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| gg) | Earlier distinctive sign as part of the relevant design corpus | 476 |
| hh) | Maintenance in modified form | 477 |
| d) | Conclusions | 478 |
| 3. | Comparison | 479 |
| IV. | Summary | 480 |
| 15. | Cross-border Copyright Protection in Europe | 482 |
| | <i>Uma Suthersanen</i> | |
| I. | Introduction: harmonisation and free movement | 482 |
| II. | The EU 'principle of cumulation': a historical legacy | 485 |
| 1. | Comparative legal antecedents | 485 |
| 2. | Genesis of Article 17 Designs Directive | 487 |
| III. | The EU 'principle of cumulation': modern interpretations | 490 |
| 1. | Genesis of EU policy in <i>Flos</i> | 490 |
| 2. | The dark horse: originality as interpreted in <i>Cofemel</i> and <i>Brompton</i> | 492 |
| 3. | National approaches within the EU | 493 |
| a) | United Kingdom: abandoning the duration exception | 493 |
| b) | Germany: abandoning the <i>Stufentheorie</i> approach | 495 |
| c) | Italy: abandoning 'artistic value' | 498 |
| d) | France: <i>Vive l'unité de l'art!</i> | 500 |
| IV. | Conclusions | 502 |
| 1. | Pre-emption of national sovereignty | 502 |
| 2. | Changing socio-legal context | 504 |
| 16. | How Different is Different? Modern Neuroscience and its Impact on Design Law | 507 |
| | <i>Charles Lee Mauro and Christopher Daniel Morley</i> | |
| I. | The changing business value of visual design and design intellectual property | 507 |
| II. | Data-driven decision-making in the modern world | 509 |
| III. | Emerging applications of neuroscience in law: neuroaesthetics | 511 |
| IV. | Why the finder of fact needs support from research data to better inform their design patent infringement decisions | 513 |
| 1. | Inadequate training of judge and jury related to shape perception science | 513 |
| 2. | Expert witnesses | 515 |
| V. | How we perceive shapes in the real world | 516 |
| 1. | Overview of vision science and shape perception | 516 |
| 2. | Information processing for shape perception and object recognition | 516 |
| a) | Bottom-up processing | 517 |
| b) | Top-down processing | 518 |
| 3. | Critical principles related to shape perception and object recognition | 520 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| a) | Cognitive minimisation | 520 |
| b) | Canonical view | 521 |
| c) | <i>Gestalt</i> principles of perception | 521 |
| d) | Salience of parts of objects | 522 |
| 4. | Perceptual biases impact shape perception | 523 |
| 5. | Transformations of shapes do not impact shape perception | 525 |
| 6. | Impact of branding on shape perception | 528 |
| 7. | Individual differences in design sensitivity | 530 |
| VI. | An empirical ordinary observer test | 530 |
| VII. | Determining damages in a changing design patent litigation landscape | 533 |
| 1. | <i>Apple v Samsung</i> : a big win for defendants in design patent matters | 534 |
| 2. | Current summary judgment practices | 534 |
| 3. | How damages are calculated based on the recent <i>Apple v Samsung</i> ruling | 535 |
| VIII. | The damages phase of design patent cases | 536 |
| 1. | What SCOTUS and the litigating parties missed | 536 |
| 2. | The criticality of component part patents | 537 |
| 3. | The use of canonical parts in product design and design patents | 537 |
| 4. | Why are there so few component part patent suits? | 539 |
| IX. | The DOJ 4-Factor test | 539 |
| 1. | Making the DOJ framework workable in the context of design patent damages | 540 |
| 2. | Lack of factor prioritisation and logical flow model | 540 |
| 3. | Prioritisation is possible and supportable | 541 |
| 4. | Why the second DOJ Factor is the gating function: the brand extension test | 541 |
| 5. | The canonical-view test | 542 |
| 6. | Automatic override of the Factor 3 test (conceptually distinct) | 542 |
| 7. | Elimination of Factors 1 and 4 | 542 |
| 8. | Application of Rule 289 (full profits) | 543 |
| 9. | The slippery slope of less than full profits under Rule 289 | 543 |
| 10. | DOJ defines one step but leaves second step open | 543 |
| 11. | The use of DOJ Factors 1, 3 and 4 | 544 |
| 12. | In utility patent cases, the courts set a high bar for apportionment and calculation of damages | 544 |
| 13. | In utility patent cases, supportable damage calculations often require consumer/user research | 545 |
| 14. | Apportionment research in a design patent case is not like apportionment research in a utility patent case | 545 |
| X. | Advanced design research methods that generate reliable data on the value of visual design in product success | 546 |
| XI. | Conclusion | 548 |