In the Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE; ANDREI IANCU, UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR, UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, PETITIONERS

v

BOOKING.COM B.V.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SARAH T. HARRIS
General Counsel
THOMAS W. KRAUSE
Solicitor
CHRISTINA J. HIEBER
Senior Counsel
MOLLY R. SILFEN
Associate Solicitor
United States Patent and
Trademark Office
Alexandria, Va. 22314

NOEL J. FRANCISCO
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
JOSEPH H. HUNT
Assistant Attorney General
MALCOLM L. STEWART
Deputy Solicitor General
ERICA L. ROSS
Assistant to the Solicitor
General
MARK R. FREEMAN
DANIEL TENNY
Attorneys

Department of Justice Washington, D.C. 20530-0001 SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov (202) 514-2217



QUESTION PRESENTED

Under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. 1051 *et seq.*, generic terms may not be registered as trademarks. The question presented is as follows:

Whether the addition by an online business of a generic top-level domain (".com") to an otherwise generic term can create a protectable trademark.



RELATED PROCEEDINGS

United States District Court (E.D. Va.):

Booking.com B.V. v. Matal, No. 16-cv-425 (Aug. 9, 2017) (order on summary judgment)

Booking.com B.V. v. Matal, No. 16-cv-425 (Oct. 26, 2017) (order on defendants' motion to amend judgment and motion for expenses)

United States Court of Appeals (4th Cir.):

Booking.com B.V. v. United States Patent & Trademark Office, No. 17-2458 (Feb. 4, 2019, amended Feb. 27, 2019), petition for reh'g denied, Apr. 5, 2019 (defendants' appeal of partial grant of summary judgment)

Booking.com B.V. v. United States Patent & Trademark Office, No. 17-2459 (Feb. 4, 2019, amended Feb. 27, 2019), petition for reh'g denied, Apr. 5, 2019 (plaintiff's cross-appeal on expenses)

Supreme Court of the United States:

Booking.com B.V. v. United States Patent & Trademark Office, petition for cert. pending, No. 18-1309 (filed Apr. 10, 2019)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
Opinions below
Jurisdiction2
Statutory provisions involved2
Statement
Reasons for granting the petition
A. The court of appeals' decision is wrong
B. The question presented warrants review
Conclusion27
Appendix A — Court of appeals opinion (Feb. 4, 2019,
amended Feb. 27, 2019) 1a
Appendix B — District court memorandum opinion on
summary judgment (Aug. 9, 2017) 46a
Appendix C — District court memorandum opinion on
motion to amend the judgment and
motion for expenses (Oct. 26, 2017) 108a
Appendix D — Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
opinion (Feb. 18, 2016)136a
Appendix E — Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
opinion (Feb. 18, 2016)182a
Appendix F — Court of appeals order denying
rehearing (Apr. 5, 2019)225a
Appendix G — Statutory provisions227a
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
Cases:
Abercrombie & Fitch Co. v. Hunting World, Inc.,
537 F.2d 4 (2d Cir. 1976)
Advertise.com, Inc. v. AOL Adver., Inc., 616 F.3d 974
(9th Cir. 2010)
America Online, Inc. v. AT & T Corp., 243 F.3d 812
(4th Cir.), cert. dismissed, 534 U.S. 946 (2001)22

(III)



Cases—Continued:	Page
B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc., 135 S. Ct. 1293 (2015)	7
Brookfield Commc'ns, Inc. v. West Coast Entm't Corp., 174 F.3d 1036 (9th Cir. 1999)	
CES Publ'g Corp. v. St. Regis Publ'ns, Inc.,	
531 F.2d 11 (2d Cir. 1975)	
Goodyear's India Rubber Glove Mfg. Co. v. Goodyear Rubber Co., 128 U.S. 598 (1888)	assim
Hotels.com, L.P., In re, 573 F.3d 1300 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	
Howe Scale Co. v. Wyckoff, Seamans & Benedict, 198 U.S. 118 (1905)	
Hunt Masters, Inc. v. Landry's Seafood Rest., Inc., 240 F.3d 251 (4th Cir. 2001)	
Inwood Labs., Inc. v. Ives Labs., Inc., 456 U.S. 844 (1982)	,
Keebler Co. v. Rovira Biscuit Corp., 624 F.2d 366 (1st Cir. 1980)	
Kellogg Co. v. National Biscuit Co., 305 U.S. 111 (1938)	
Matal v. Tam, 137 S. Ct. 1744 (2017)	
Mil-Mar Shoe Co. v. Shonac Corp., 75 F.3d 1153 (7th Cir. 1996)	4
Miller Brewing Co. v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 655 F.2d 5 (1st Cir. 1981)	
Miller Brewing Co. v. Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co., 605 F.2d 990 (7th Cir. 1979)	
1800Mattress.com IP, LLC, In re, 586 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	
Oppedahl & Larson LLP, In re, 373 F.3d 1171 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	
Pacer Tech., In re, 338 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	



DOCKET

Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

