click



Click to visit www.MusicLawAttorney.com
Offices in Ft Lauderdale and Nashville Call 954.523.6160

The Florida Bar Entertainment, Arts and Sports Law Section

Welcome Guest!

Wednesday, November 09, 2011

Home Account Search Articles Events Links Rules Directory Contact

# Share

### EASL

#### L*F*

## My EASL

- Home
- My Account
- Submit News
- View Latest Articles
- View Latest Web Link
- View Latest Web Links

View Upcoming Events

## **EASL Membership**

- Member Profiles
- Member Application
- Affiliate Application

#### **EASL Bylaws**

\* EASL Bylaws (Current)

#### **EASL Resources**

- \* EASL Index of Articles
- EASL Articles by Topic
- EASL Research Links
- \* EASL Document Archives

## **EASL Officers**

EASL Executive Council

## **EASL History**

- Past Officers
- Past Events Before 6/4
- View All Events Past 6/4

## **EASL Media**

- EASL Photo Gallery
- EASL ListServs

\* EASL JukeBox

#### LASE LISTSC

- Section Members
- Executive CouncilListServ FAQs

#### **EASL Sponsors**

- List of Sponsors
- Sponsor Application

## View In Your Language



## Online

There are 19 unregistered users and 0 registered users on-line.

You can log-in or register for a user account here.

## Noncommercial Use Of Trademark As Domain Name Legal

on Wednesday, June 01, 2005 - 04:35 PM - 6154 Reads



HAIR TODAY, GONE TOMORROW: NONCOMMERCIAL USE OF A TRADEMARK AS A DOMAIN NAME IS NOT INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE U.S. TRADEMARK (LANHAM) ACT

By David R. Ellis, Attorney at Law Largo, Florida

In April 2005, a federal appeals court in California ruled that the noncommercial use of a trademark as the domain name of an Internet website is not actionable under the U.S. Trademark (Lanham) Act, where the website contained consumer commentary about the products and services represented by the mark. Bosley Medical Institute, Inc. v. Bosley Medical Group, No. 04-55962 (9th Cir. Apr. 4, 2005). The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the district court's dismissal of the trademark owner's trademark infringement and dilution claims, concluding that the consumer's use of the mark was not "in connection with the sale of goods or services" and therefore was "noncommercial."

The court rejected the argument that the commercial use requirement was established because the website was aimed at preventing other consumers from obtaining or using the plaintiff's goods and services, expressly rejecting the reasoning of the Fourth Circuit in People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals v. Doughney, 263 F.2d 359 (4th Cir. 2001). The court did, however, restore the plaintiff's claim under the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act for further adjudication.

The plaintiff, Bosley Medical, is in the business of providing surgical hair transplantation, restoration, and replacement services to the public. Bosley owned the registered trademark BOSLEY MEDICAL, having used the mark since 1992, and registered it with the United States Patent and Trademark Office in January 2001. Since its adoption of the trademark, Bosley had spent millions of dollars on advertising and promotion throughout the United States and the rest of the world.

The defendant, Michael Kremer was a dissatisfied former patient of Bosley. Unhappy with the results of a hair replacement procedure performed by a Bosley physician, he sued Bosley for medical malpractice but the suit was eventually dismissed. In January 2000, "in a bald-faced effort to get even," Kremer purchased the domain name www.BosleyMedical.com and started a website that was highly uncomplimentary of the plaintiff. Bosley then sued Kremer for trademark infringement, dilution, unfair competition, cybersquatting, and various state law claims, plus a libel claim that was eventually settled.

In his defense to the trademark claims, Kremer argued that his use of the Bosley Medical name was noncommercial and thus not actionable as infringement under the Lanham Act. The appeals court agreed, ruling that the noncommercial use of a trademark as the domain name of a website — the subject of which is consumer commentary about the products and services represented by the mark — does not constitute infringement under the Lanham Act.

In an earlier case in the Second Circuit, it was held that the "use in connection with the sale of goods and services" requirement of the Lanham Act does not require any actual sale of goods and services. United We Stand America, Inc. v. United We Stand, America New York, Inc., 128 F.3d 86 (2d Cir. 1997). Thus, the proper inquiry was whether Kremer offered competing services to the public. Kremer was not Bosley's competitor; he was their critic. Therefore, his use of Bosley's mark was not in connection with a sale of goods or services — it was in connection with the expression of his opinion about Bosley's goods and services.

The court said that the Lanham Act was expressly enacted to be applied in commercial contexts, but it does not prohibit all unauthorized uses of a trademark. Kremer's use of the Bosley mark would not mislead consumers into buying a competing product, nor was Kremer capitalizing on the good will Bosley had established in its mark. Any harm to Bosley would arise not from a competitor's sale of a similar product under Bosley's mark, but from Kremer's criticism of their services. The court said that Bosley could not use the Lanham Act either as a shield from Kremer's criticism, or as a sword to shut him up.

As to the plaintiff's cybersquatting claim under the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, however, the court said that this raised a different issue, namely whether Kremer had a "bad faith intent to profit" from the use of the plaintiff's trademark in his domain name, such as by making an extortionate offer to sell the BosleyMedical.com name and website site to the plaintiff. Because discovery regarding that claim had not been completed, and the issue itself was not within the scope of the summary judgment motions, the appeals court said that the district court had erred in granting summary judgment to Kremer as to cybersquatting.

Copyright (c) 2005 David R. Ellis

## All rights reserved

David Ellis is a Largo, Florida attorney practicing computer and cyberspace law; copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets, patents, and intellectual property law; business, entertainment and arts law; and franchise, licensing and contract law. A graduate of M.I.T. and Harvard Law School, he is a registered patent attorney and the author of the book, A Computer Law Primer. He has taught Intellectual Property and Computer Law as an Adjunct Professor at the Law Schools of the University of Florida and Stetson University.

Please direct comments to ellislaw@alum.mit.edu

http://www.lawyers.com/davidrellis

Home Account Search Articles Events Links Rules Directory Contact

Nothing in this web site should be construed as legal advice to you and does not establish an attorney client relationship between us. You should not rely upon any information contained herein without separate independent legal counsel, research and advice. We are under no obligation to respond to correspondence, including, without limitation, email. Nothing contained herein should be construed as an endorsement of any and all products or services contained herein or accessible herethrough. By using this web site you agree to abide by our Terms of Use and Privacy Policy.

Our Designated Agent Under 17 U.S.C. 512(c)(2) to Receive Notification of Claimed Copyright Infringement and Registered Agent to Accept Service of Process is: Angela Froelich, Section Administrator, The Florida Bar, 651 E. Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-2300, Tel: (850) 561-5633, Fax: (850) 561-5825, Email: afroelic@flabar.org.

You may use our RSS newsfeed RSS to display our news at your website.

EASL Web Site Created, Programmed and Maintained by Elliot Zimmerman, Esq., EASL WebMaster at legal@cyberlaw.info or at http://cyberlaw.info.

Copyright 1998-Present The Florida Bar Entertainment, Arts & Sports Law Section Logo & The Florida Bar Entertainment, Arts & Sports Law Section™ All Rights Reserved



Page 1

tv

Related links

More about Intellectual PropertyNews by ellislaw

Most-read story in Intellectual Property: Don't Play With Barbie!