

ITC Ltd. v. Punchgini, Inc.

880 N.E.2d 852 (N.Y. 2007)

Read, J.

....

II.

Certified Question No. 1

“Does New York common law permit the owner of a famous mark or trade dress to assert property rights therein by virtue of the owner’s prior use of the mark or dress in a foreign country?”

The Second Circuit’s first certified question calls upon us to define property rights in the context of a common-law unfair competition claim grounded on a theory of misappropriation. Thus, we must consider whether a famous foreign mark constitutes property or a commercial advantage protected from unfair competition under New York law.

We have long recognized two theories of common-law unfair competition: palming off and misappropriation (*see Electrolux Corp. v Val-Worth, Inc.*, 6 NY2d 556, 567-568 [1959] {discussing the acceptance of these theories of unfair competition in New York courts and collecting cases}). “Palming off”—that is, the sale of the goods of one manufacturer as those of another—was the first theory of unfair competition endorsed by New York courts, and “has been extended . . . to situations where the parties are not even in competition” (*Electrolux*, 6 NY2d at 567).

After the United States Supreme Court sanctioned the misappropriation theory of unfair competition in *International News Service v Associated Press* (248 US 215 [1918]), “[t]he principle that one may not misappropriate the results of the skill, expenditures and labors of a competitor has . . . often been implemented in [New York] courts” (*Electrolux*, 6 NY2d at 567). Indeed, the New York cases cited by the District Court and the Second Circuit as embodying the famous or well-known marks doctrine in New York common law—*Prunier* and *Vaudable*—were, in fact, decided wholly on misappropriation theories.

In *Prunier*, the plaintiff operated celebrated haute cuisine restaurants in Paris and London, but none in the United States. The defendants opened a restaurant in New York and

“appropriated to themselves the plaintiff’s name. . . . Indeed, it was admitted . . . that the name was intentionally selected because of plaintiff’s well-known reputation and good will which has been built up as the result of decades of honest business effort.

“The defendants den[ied], however, that they ever held themselves out as being Prunier’s of Paris” (159 Misc at 553).

The court upheld the legal viability of an unfair competition claim by the plaintiff—even though the two restaurants were not in direct competition—so long as “plaintiff[’s] conten[tion] that its reputation extends far beyond the territorial limits of Paris and London and that it has a substantial following in *New York city* and in other parts of the world” was proved (*id.* at 559 [emphasis added]).

In *Vaudable*, the plaintiff’s restaurant in Paris—Maxim’s—was internationally famous “in the high-class restaurant field” (20 Misc 2d at 758-759). The defendants “appropriate[d] the good will plaintiffs [had] created in the name Maxim’s as a restaurant,” and were therefore held liable for unfair competition based on misappropriation even though the parties were “not in present actual competition” (*id.* at 759). “The trend of the law, both statutory and decisional,” the court opined, “has been to extend the scope of the doctrine of unfair competition, whose basic principle is that commercial unfairness should be restrained whenever it appears that there has been a misappropriation, for the advantage of one person, of a property right belonging to another” (*id.* at 759 [citations omitted]; *see also Roy Export Co. v Columbia Broadcasting Sys.*, 672 F2d 1095, 1105 [2d Cir 1982] [with decline of general federal common law after inception of misappropriation branch of unfair competition tort in *International News Service*, “the doctrine was developed by the states, New York in particular; there it has flourished in a variety of factual settings”]).

While expositors of the famous marks doctrine point to *Prunier* and *Vaudable* (*see* 5 McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition § 29:4 n 2 [4th ed 2007] [citing *Prunier* and *Vaudable* as “(p)erhaps the most famous examples” of the “well known” marks doctrine]), *Prunier* and *Vaudable* themselves in no way explain or proclaim—let alone rely on—any famous or well-known marks doctrine for their holdings. Instead, *Prunier* and *Vaudable* fit logically and squarely within our time-honored misappropriation theory, which prohibits a defendant from using a plaintiff’s property right or commercial advantage—in *Prunier* and *Vaudable*, the goodwill attached to a famous name—to compete unfairly against the plaintiff in New York.

Under New York law, “[a]n unfair competition claim involving misappropriation usually concerns the taking and use of the plaintiff’s property to compete against the plaintiff’s own use of the same property” (*Roy Export*, 672 F2d at 1105). The term “commercial advantage” has been used interchangeably with “property” within the meaning of the misappropriation theory (*see Flexitized, Inc. v National Flexitized Corp.*, 335 F2d 774, 781-782 [2d Cir 1964]). What *Prunier* and *Vaudable* stand for, then, is the proposition that for certain kinds of businesses (particularly cachet goods/services with highly mobile clienteles), goodwill can, and does, cross state and national boundary lines.

Accordingly, while we answer “Yes” to the first certified question, we are not thereby recognizing the famous or well-known marks doctrine, or any other new theory of liability under the New York law of unfair competition. Instead, we simply reaffirm that when a business, through renown in New York, possesses goodwill constituting property or a commercial advantage in this state, that goodwill is protected from misappropriation under New York unfair competition law. This is so whether the business is domestic or foreign.

III.

Certified Question No. 2

“How famous must a foreign mark or trade dress be to permit its owner to sue for unfair competition?”

Protection from misappropriation of a famous foreign mark presupposes the existence of actual goodwill in New York (*see e.g. Roy Export*, 672 F2d at 1105 [misappropriation under New York law usually requires use in state of plaintiff’s property or commercial advantage to compete against plaintiff]). If a foreign plaintiff has no goodwill in this state to appropriate, there can be no viable claim for unfair competition under a theory of misappropriation. At the very least, a plaintiff’s mark, when used in New York, must call to mind its goodwill. Otherwise, a plaintiff’s property right or commercial advantage based on the goodwill associated with its mark is not appropriated in this state when its unregistered mark is used here. Thus, at a minimum, consumers of the good or service provided under a certain mark by a defendant in New York must primarily associate the mark with the foreign plaintiff (*cf. Allied Maintenance Corp. v Allied Mech. Trades*, 42 NY2d 538, 545 [1977]).

Whether consumers of a defendant’s goods or services primarily associate such goods or services with those provided by a foreign plaintiff is an inquiry that will, of necessity, vary with the facts of each case. Accordingly, we cannot—and do not—provide an exhaustive list of the factors relevant to such an inquiry. That said, some factors that would be relevant include evidence that the defendant intentionally associated its goods with those of the foreign plaintiff in the minds of the public, such as public statements or advertising stating or implying a connection with the foreign plaintiff; direct evidence, such as consumer surveys, indicating that consumers of defendant’s goods or services believe them to be associated with the plaintiff; and evidence of actual overlap between customers of the New York defendant and the foreign plaintiff.

If the customers of a New York defendant do not identify a mark with the foreign plaintiff, then no use is being made of the plaintiff’s goodwill, and no cause of action lies under New York common law for unfair competition. As a result, to prevail against defendants on an unfair competition theory under New York law, ITC would have to show first, as an independent prerequisite, that defendants

appropriated (i.e., deliberately copied), ITC's Bukhara mark or dress for their New York restaurants. If they successfully make this showing, plaintiffs would then have to establish that the relevant consumer market for New York's Bukhara restaurant primarily associates the Bukhara mark or dress with those Bukhara restaurants owned and operated by ITC.

Accordingly, the certified questions should be answered in accordance with this opinion.