

Trademark Clearance Reports

Like many other law firms, Fish & Richardson performs and analyzes the results of trademark searches. Clients use searches to evaluate the risks of adopting a particular mark. The consequences of an adverse result in litigation or a proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office can differ drastically from case to case.

The two primary types of searches Fish offers are (i) in-house “knockout” searches and (ii) “full” searches using an outside vendor. An in-house “knockout” search covers registrations and applications pending before the USPTO and U.S. state registrations, whereas a “full” search covers both of those sources as well as hundreds of databases of unregistered common law marks, the use of which may potentially create a conflict with the mark searched. Thus, an in-house search is less comprehensive, albeit less costly, than a full search.

Our clearance reports are not formal opinions of the firm. Formal opinion letters require painstaking preparation and thorough peer review. We are willing to offer such formal opinions as to any possible conflict disclosed by a search at the client’s request, but we do not undertake such letters as a matter of routine.

Any search report from Fish, or anyone else, is also subject to the following qualifications:

- (1) Database integrity:** The databases we and our outside vendors rely upon, while generally current, inherently suffer from some delay in data entry into the database. We can remedy this to some extent by updating a search two to three months later, but by then there will be other data that has not yet found its way into the database. In addition, while the integrity of the data in the databases we use is high, it is not necessarily perfect. Similarly, our outside search firms’ analysis that goes into the preparation of their reports is generally good, but not always perfect. For these reasons, in the most important cases, we suggest obtaining additional searches from different outside search firms to minimize the risk of omissions.
- (2) Conflicts based on meaning of marks:** The USPTO may reject an application for trademark registration if it finds that the proposed mark is confusingly similar to another mark. For example, marks such as LONDON FOG and SMOG, JELLIBEANS and LOLLYPOPS, PLEDGE and PROMISE, and CYCLONE and TORNADO have been held to be too similar to coexist on the basis of meaning. There is no search methodology that is particularly well-designed to find such conflicts.
- (3) Conflicts based on dilution of “famous” marks:** U.S. trademark law permits oppositions to applications, petitions to cancel registrations, and infringement suits to be brought against a mark that dilutes a “famous” mark. There is no separate registry of “famous” marks, making it difficult to assess in a search whether a proposed mark would cause such dilution (i.e., the lessening of the capacity of the “famous” mark to identify and distinguish goods or services, even in the absence of competition between the mark owners or the likelihood of confusion between the marks).
- (4) Design and trade dress searches:** It is not possible to search designs or trade dress with the same precision and thoroughness of searches for word marks. There also is a dearth of reliable libraries of design and trade dress marks.

- (5) Applications based on foreign priority:** Treaty obligations permit marks filed in scores of foreign countries to be filed in the U.S. within six months of their foreign filing date and to receive as a priority date their foreign filing date. There is no practical method of searching for such marks before an application is filed in the U.S.
- (6) Unregistered marks:** In the U.S., trademark rights arise from use, but there is no requirement that a trademark that is in use be registered or listed anywhere, so there can be no absolute assurance that a search will uncover a potentially troublesome mark.
- (7) Subjectivity of likelihood of confusion or dilution:** Evaluating whether one mark infringes or dilutes another is a subjective judgment based on a number of factors, not all of which can be assessed by normal trademark search methods. Reasonable minds may disagree, and there are no guarantees that use or registration of a “cleared” mark will not be challenged. The only definitive answer as to whether one mark infringes or dilutes another comes from litigation.

For more information on trademark clearance reports, contact your Fish attorney.



Atlanta
Austin
Boston

Dallas
Delaware
Houston

Minneapolis
Munich
New York

Orange County
San Diego
Shenzhen

Silicon Valley
Washington, D.C.