Kluwer Trademark Blog

Trademark case: Brooklyn Brewery Corp. v. Brooklyn Brew Shop LLC, USA

Brian Craig (Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory US) · Wednesday, November 24th, 2021

The Board erred by failing to consider whether the registered BROOKLYN BREW SHOP mark has acquired distinctiveness for beer-making kits.

In an effort by the owners of the mark BROOKLYN BREWERY to cancel registration of the mark BROOKLYN BREW SHOP, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has held that the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board erred by failing to consider whether the BROOKLYN BREW SHOP mark has acquired distinctiveness involving beer-making kits. While the Federal Circuit largely affirmed the Board's decision denying the petition for cancellation under the likelihood of confusion test because of laches and acquiescence with a four-year delay, the Federal Circuit vacated the Board's decision, in part, because the Board erred in its acquired distinctiveness analysis (Brooklyn Brewery Corp. v. Brooklyn Brew Shop, LLC, October 27, 2021, Dyk, T.).

Case date: 27 October 2021 Case number: No: 20-2277 Court: United States Court of Appeals, Federal 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 Wednesday, November 24th, 2021 at 3:00 pm and is filed under cancellation, Case law, Distinctiveness, 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.