
Kluwer Trademark Blog

Trademark case: In re JC Hospitality LLC, USA

Linda O'Brien (CCH) · Monday, March 9th, 2020

Refusal of THE JOINT trademark application was affirmed on the grounds that the mark was merely descriptive of the applicant's hospitality business services and acquired distinctiveness was not demonstrated.

A hospitality services' applications to register the mark "THE JOINT" for two different classes of services were properly refused because the mark was merely descriptive of the applied-for restaurant and entertainment services and the applicant did not demonstrate acquired distinctiveness, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has determined. Thus, the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board's order refusing registration of both proposed marks was affirmed (In re JC Hospitality LLC, February 28, 2020, Prost, S.).

Case date: 28 February 2020

Case number: Nos. 2018-2048

Court: United States Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit

A full summary of this case has been published on [Kluwer IP Law](#).

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

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.


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



Experience how the renewed **Manual IP** enables you to work more efficiently



[Learn more →](#)



This entry was posted on Monday, March 9th, 2020 at 11:49 am and is filed under [Case law](#), [descriptive](#), [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.