Kluwer Trademark Blog

Trademark case: Select Comfort Corp. v. Baxter, USA

Linda O'Brien (CCH) · Monday, August 2nd, 2021

The summary judgment finding by the district court which rejected an air mattress company's theory of initial-interest confusion and the accompanying jury instruction that a likelihood of confusion must exist at the time of purchase to support a trademark infringement claim was erroneous.

In a suit by bedding manufacturer Select Comfort against a competitor for trademark infringement, trademark dilution, unfair competition, and false advertising, the district court's summary judgment finding that the company's theory of initial-interest confusion on the trademark infringement claim could not apply and accompanying jury instruction was an error, the U.S. Court of Appeals in St. Louis has ruled. Thus, the judgment on the trademark infringement and false advertising claims were reversed and the case remanded (Select Comfort Corp. v. Baxter, May 11, 2021, Melloy, M.).

Case date: 11 May 2021 Case number: No. 19-1077 Court: United States Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit

A full summary of this case has been published on Kluwer IP Law.

Kluwer IP Law

The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future?

Learn how Kluwer IP Law can support you.

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Trademark Blog, please subscribe here.

79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

Drive change with Kluwer IP Law. The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.





2022 SURVEY REPORT The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer Leading change



This entry was posted on Monday, August 2nd, 2021 at 5:17 pm and is filed under Case law, Infringement, Likelihood of confusion, United States

You can follow any responses to this entry through the Comments (RSS) feed. You can leave a response, or trackback from your own site.