Cooley

December 29, 2015

On December 22, 2015, the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, sitting *en banc*, overturned decades of case law by holding that a statute barring federal registration for trademarks that "may disparage" people, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols is unconstitutional under the First Amendment's protection of free speech.

The decision could have implications for a similar case involving a challenge to the Washington, DC football team's REDSKINS trademarks.

Background

In 2011, Simon Tam, front man of the Asian-American dance-rock band "The Slants," applied to register the band's name with the US Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) for "Entertainment in the nature of live performances by a musical band." The trademark examiner refused registration of the mark under Section 2(a) of the Lanham Trademark Act, finding it likely that the mark would be disparaging "to persons of Asian descent."

Although Tam stated his band chose the mark to "reappropriate" the disparaging term, the PTO examining attorney denied registration in light of the term's "long history of being used to deride" people of Asian descent, finding that a substantial composite of people of Asian descent would still find the term disparaging.

The Trademark Trial and Appeal Board affirmed the examiner's refusal, and a three-judge Federal Circuit affirmed the Board's determination that the mark is disparaging. Both tribunals rejected Tam's argument that Section 2(a) is an unconstitutional abridgment of free speech, citing a 1981 case, *In re McGinley*, 660 F.2d 481 (C.C.P.A. 1981), which held that because denial of registration does not bar *use* of the mark, "no tangible form of expression is suppressed."

Unconstitutionality under the first amendment

But then the full Federal Circuit, sitting *en banc*, decided it was time to revisit its predecessor court's decision in *McGinley*.

Content-based regulations of expression – those that target speech based on its communicative content – are presumptively invalid under the First Amendment. The court decided that because the statute allowed the PTO to discriminate against some trademarks but not others based on the "idea or message expressed," it is not content or viewpoint neutral. For example, it noted that the PTO allowed registration of marks laudatory of Asian-Americans like ASIAN EFFICIENCY but denied it for THE SLANTS.

The court also rejected the argument that a trademark is "commercial speech," for which the First Amendment tolerates some restrictions (such as against false advertising). It noted that although trademarks also identify who puts out a product, it is their "expressive character," not their commercial purpose that triggers a Section 2(a) rejection.

The court also rejected the government's arguments that denying registration does not violate the First Amendment: (1) because it does not "prohibit" speech at all; (2) because trademark registration is government speech; and (3) because Section 2(a) merely withholds a government subsidy.

Denying trademark registration can burden speech

The court observed that federal registration bestows "significant and financially valuable benefits upon markholders" (like procedural advantages in litigation and the ability to have Customs seize infringing goods), and that denial of those benefits creates serious disincentives to adopt marks the government may deem disparaging. The law's subjective nature –denying registration to marks that "*may* disparage" – further chills

speech because enforcement is uncertainty and unpredictable, the court held.

Trademark registration is not government speech

The court rejected the argument that a trademark registration is like a slogan on a license plate that is considered "government speech," noting there is "no basis for finding that consumers associate registered private trademarks with the government." The court concluded that processing trademark registrations "no more transforms private speech into government speech than when the government issues permits for street parades, copyright registration certificates, or, for that matter, grants … birth certificates."

Trademark registration is not a government subsidy program

Under the "constitutional conditions" doctrine, the government may not deny a benefit to a person on a basis that infringes their constitutionally protected interests – especially the interest in freedom of speech. But the court stated that trademark registration is not a subsidy because the benefits, "while valuable, are not monetary." Also, the PTO is funded by user fees, not taxes.

Implications for the REDSKINS trademarks

A group of Native Americans successfully challenged the Washington, DC football team's REDSKINS trademarks as disparaging under Section 2(a), winning a decision in a Virginia federal court over the team's argument that the statute is unconstitutional. But that court based its decision on the now-overruled *McGinley* decision. The case, *Pro-Football v. Blackhorse,* is now on appeal to the US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, which no doubt will be looking very closely at the decision in Simon Tam's case.

This content is provided for general informational purposes only, and your access or use of the content does not create an attorney-client relationship between you or your organization and Cooley LLP, Cooley (UK) LLP, or any other affiliated practice or entity (collectively referred to as "Cooley"). By accessing this content, you agree that the information provided does not constitute legal or other professional advice. This content is not a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your jurisdiction, and you should not act or refrain from acting based on this content. This content may be changed without notice. It is not guaranteed to be complete, correct or up to date, and it may not reflect the most current legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Do not send any confidential information to Cooley, as we do not have any duty to keep any information you provide to us confidential. When advising companies, our attorney-client relationship is with the company, not with any individual. This content may have been generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) in accordance with our AI Principles, may be considered Attorney Advertising and is subject to our legal notices.

Key Contacts

Brian Focarino Boston	bfocarino@cooley.com +1 617 937 2347

This information is a general description of the law; it is not intended to provide specific legal advice nor is it intended to create an attorney-client relationship with Cooley LLP. Before taking any action on this information you should seek professional counsel.

Copyright © 2023 Cooley LLP, 3175 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, CA 94304; Cooley (UK) LLP, 22 Bishopsgate, London, UK EC2N 4BQ. Permission is granted to make and redistribute, without charge, copies of this entire document provided that such copies are complete and unaltered and identify Cooley LLP as the author. All other rights reserved.