TRADEMARK

Booking.com high court win marks ‘victory’ for trademark, domain owners

By Patrick H.J. Hughes

Booking.com BV can federally register its name as a trademark after the U.S. Supreme Court concluded that consumers understand the travel reservation company’s name is not merely a generic phrase referring to hotel “booking” companies in general.


In an 8-1 decision, the justices on June 30 rejected the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office’s “nearly per se rule” that a generic word combined with a generic top-level domain, or gTLD, results in a generic term.

The PTO had appealed a 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision to set aside a trademark examining attorney’s refusal to register a “Booking.com” trademark pursuant to Section 2(e)(1) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.A.
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“We decline a rule ... that would largely disallow registration of ‘generic.com’ terms and open the door to cancellation of scores of currently registered marks,” Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg wrote for the majority.

ATTORNEYS REFLECT ON DOMAIN NAME HOLDERS’ ‘VICTORY’

Debevoise & Plimpton LLP attorney David Bernstein, who acted as co-counsel on Booking.com’s behalf, said the decision was “a victory for countless brand owners that have invested significant resources in building their brands.”

Booking.com attorney David Bernstein said the decision was “a victory for countless brand owners that have invested significant resources in building their brands.”

Dorsey & Whitney LLP attorney Fara Sunderji said the court “got it right.”

As owners of registered marks, these domain name owners will be able to take advantage of the in rem jurisdiction elements of the U.S. anti-cyberpiracy law,” he said. “Cyberpirates targeting such marks will no longer be beyond the reach of U.S. courts once these marks are registered.”

Dorsey & Whitney LLP attorney Fara Sunderji said the court “got it right” when it said registration eligibility turns on a mark’s capacity to distinguish goods.

“While I do think we will see an uptick in applications being filed for generic.com trademarks, I do not think we will see an avalanche of litigation or enforcement actions following a new crop of generic.com registrations,” she said.

Brett Heavner of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner LLP said the decision will provide “significant advantages” to holders of previously unregistrable domain names.

Brett Heavner of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner LLP said the decision will provide “significant advantages” to holders of previously unregistrable domain names seeking protection from internet pirates and counterfeiters.

Dykema attorney Eric T. Fingerhut said the Supreme Court made “a sound decision.”

“In my opinion, companies lucky enough to own generic.com domains who have built up enough goodwill in their marks are often sophisticated enough to understand that rights in descriptive marks are somewhat limited.”

Dykema attorney Eric T. Fingerhut said the Supreme Court made “a sound decision.” He also said it was “a good day for owners of generic.com brands and domainers sitting on stockpiles of generic domain names.”

“My hope following this decision, though certainly not an expectation, is the PTO will realize it is in the business of registering marks rather than denying them,” he said. “Trademark lawyers need to be able to advise their clients, but the current and often inconsistent practice of the PTO on all sorts of important issues such as distinctiveness and likelihood of confusion makes doing so very difficult.”

Mandelbaum Salsburg PC attorney Joel G. MacMull disagreed, saying the high court “got this one wrong.”

“There’s no question that Booking.com is not generic based on the evidence presented beyond the reach of U.S. courts once these marks are registered.”
below, but these were highly specific facts that should not have upended the rational policy that undergirded the PTO’s determination,” he said.

Among its many arguments, the PTO said that adding “.com” was the equivalent of adding the word “company” to a generic term, a combination that remains generic according to Supreme Court precedent established more than a century ago in Goodyear’s India Rubber Glove Manufacturing Co. v. Goodyear Rubber Co., 128 U.S. 598 (1888).

Justice Ginsburg distinguished the examples, noting that there can be only one registrant of a particular “.com” per domain globally. In contrast, many firms around the world can adopt a name with the word “company” attached, she wrote.

Baker Donelson attorney Susan A. Russell said the decision was a “surprise” given the tough questions the justices asked during oral argument.

She also downplayed arguments that registering the Booking.com mark would give the company a monopoly on the word “booking.”

Only the whole name of the firm would be protected and it would be “weak” protection, she said. As a result, “because its mark is one of many ‘similarly worded marks,’ Booking.com accepts that close variations are unlikely to infringe.”

NEW GTLDS?

Justice Breyer said “the Goodyear principle is sound as a matter of law and logic” and he failed to recognize the distinction between “.com” and “company.”

The addition of a corporate designation does not “magically transform” a generic name to give someone a right to exclude others, he said.

He added that this logic might not apply to marks using the new gTLDs, such as “.guru,” “.club” or “.vip.” The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, the nonprofit that maintains addresses on the internet, has introduced these relatively new extensions for domains over the past eight years.

In contrast to generic words that might be combined with those terms to create distinctive trademarks, “Booking.com” conveys only a website associated with booking, he said.
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