
Kluwer Trademark Blog

Trademark case: FocusVision Worldwide Inc. v. Information Builders Inc., USA

Cheryl Beise (Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory US) · Friday, October 8th, 2021

Substantial evidence supported the Board's likelihood of confusion finding.

Substantial evidence supported the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board's finding that registration of the mark FOCUSVISION for software and data management services was likely to cause confusion with previously registered marks FOCUS for software and database management services, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has determined. The opposer's FOCUS mark was commercially strong, the parties' marks were similar, and would be used on overlapping services. Evidence of third-party use of similar marks was "thin" (FocusVision Worldwide, Inc. v. Information Builders, Inc., June 14, 2021, Taranto, R.).

Case date: 14 June 2021

Case number: No. 20-2054

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 Friday, October 8th, 2021 at 6:11 pm and is filed under [Case law](#), [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.