

- ADMIRALTY & MARITIME
- ANTITRUST & TRADE REGULATION
- AVIATION
- APPELLATE LITIGATION
- BANKING, RESTRUCTURING & CREDITORS-DEBTORS RIGHTS
- BUSINESS & COMMERCIAL LITIGATION
- COMMERCIAL LENDING & FINANCE
- CONSTRUCTION
- CORPORATE & SECURITIES
- EMPLOYEE BENEFITS, ERISA, & EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION
- ENERGY
- ENVIRONMENTAL & TOXIC TORTS
- ERISA, LIFE, HEALTH & DISABILITY INSURANCE
- LITIGATION
- GAMING
- GOVERNMENT RELATIONS
- HEALTH CARE LITIGATION, TRANSACTIONS & REGULATION
- INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & E-COMMERCE
- INTERNATIONAL
- LABOR RELATIONS & EMPLOYMENT
- MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL & HOSPITAL LIABILITY
- MERGERS & ACQUISITIONS
- PRODUCTS LIABILITY
- PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY
- PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & FINANCE
- PUBLIC FINANCE
- REAL ESTATE: LAND USE, DEVELOPMENT & FINANCE
- TAX (INTERNATIONAL, FEDERAL AND STATE)
- TELECOMMUNICATIONS & UTILITIES
- TRUSTS, ESATES & PERSONAL PLANNING
- VENTURE CAPITAL & EMERGING COMPANIES

Supreme Court's Discouraging Words About Trade Dress Actions

The Supreme Court recently reiterated the “strong presumption” that claims in utility patents prevent trade-dress protection for those features, regardless of competitive effect or secondary-meaning. In *TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc.*, No. 99-1571 (U.S. March 20, 2001), the Court held that prior utility-patent claims involving the springs supporting wind-proof road-side signs were “strong evidence” of “vital significance” supporting the “great weight” of the statutory presumption of functionality. The Court reversed the Sixth Circuit, effectively reinstating the trial-court’s defense summary-judgment.

The Court took the case to resolve a circuit split over an expired utility patent forecloses trade-dress protection for the product’s design. The 5th, 6th, 7th and Fed. Circuits had held it did not, while the 10th Circuit held it did. *Compare Sunbeam Prods, Inc. v. West Bend Co.*, 123 F. 3d 246 (5th Cir. 1997) (not foreclosed), *TrafFix*, 200 F.2d 929 (6th Cir. 1999)(not), *Thomas & Betts Corp. v. Panduit Corp.*, 138 F. 3d 277 (7th Cir. 1998)(not), and *Midwest Indus., Inc. v. Karavan Trailers, Inc.*, 175 F. 3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999)(not) with *Vornado Air Circulation Sys., Inc. v. Duracraft Corp.*, 58 F. 3d 1498, 1500 (10th Cir. 1995)(foreclosed).

While the Court’s language arguably fell just short of establishing a *per se* bar, its holding was clear that the features claimed in a prior utility patent (and any similar features previously asserted as infringing under the doctrine of equivalents) prevent a claimant from carrying the heavy burden “of overcoming the strong evidentiary inference of functionality based on the disclosure” in the patents.

The Court also clarified that a feature is functional (and not protectable) -- without further inquiry -- if (a) essential to the product’s use or purpose *or* (b) it affects the product’s cost or quality. The second-step “competitive effect” analysis [whether exclusive use puts competitors at significant non-reputation-related disadvantage] is required only in cases of aesthetic functionality. Similarly, secondary-meaning cannot “save” trade-dress claims for an otherwise functional attribute.

Intellectual Property & E-Commerce

www.joneswalker.com

ip@joneswalker.com

Together with the Court's decision from last term in *Wal-Mart v. Samara Brothers*, 529 U.S. 205 (March 22, 2000) (designs aren't inherently distinctive, thus unregistered dress is protectable *only* on showing of secondary meaning), *TraFFix* indicates a concerted effort to restrain the expansion of trade-dress claims for unregistered product designs and configurations.

Remember that these legal principles may change and vary widely in their application to specific factual circumstances. You should consult with counsel about your individual circumstances. For further information regarding these issues, contact:

Thomas K. Potter, III
Jones Walker
201 St. Charles Ave., 49th Fl.
New Orleans, LA 70170-5100
ph. 504.582.8358
fax 504.589.8358
email tpotter@joneswalker.com

ADMIRALTY & MARITIME
ANTITRUST & TRADE REGULATION
AVIATION
APPELLATE LITIGATION
BANKING, RESTRUCTURING & CREDITORS-DEBTORS RIGHTS
BUSINESS & COMMERCIAL LITIGATION
COMMERCIAL LENDING & FINANCE
CONSTRUCTION
CORPORATE & SECURITIES
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS, ERISA, & EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION
ENERGY
ENVIRONMENTAL & TOXIC TORTS
ERISA, LIFE, HEALTH & DISABILITY INSURANCE
LITIGATION
GAMING
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS
HEALTH CARE LITIGATION, TRANSACTIONS & REGULATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & E-COMMERCE
INTERNATIONAL
LABOR RELATIONS & EMPLOYMENT
MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL & HOSPITAL LIABILITY
MERGERS & ACQUISITIONS
PRODUCTS LIABILITY
PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & FINANCE
PUBLIC FINANCE
REAL ESTATE: LAND USE, DEVELOPMENT & FINANCE
TAX (INTERNATIONAL, FEDERAL AND STATE)
TELECOMMUNICATIONS & UTILITIES
TRUSTS, ESATES & PERSONAL PLANNING
VENTURE CAPITAL & EMERGING COMPANIES