

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PINTEREST, INC.,  
Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant,  
v.  
PINTRIPS, INC.,  
Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff.

Case No. 13-cv-04608-HSG

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

In this case, Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant Pinterest, Inc. (“Pinterest”) alleges that its rights to its “Pinterest,” “Pin,” and “Pin It” word marks are infringed by the “Pintrips” and “Pin” word marks used by Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff Pintrips, Inc. (“Pintrips”). Pinterest asserts five causes of action: (1) federal trademark infringement under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114; (2) false designation of origin under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a); (3) trademark dilution under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c); (4) unfair competition under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200; and (5) trademark dilution under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247. Pinterest asks the Court to permanently enjoin Pintrips from using the Pintrips and pin marks. For its part, Pintrips seeks a declaration from the Court that its use of the Pintrips and pin marks does not infringe, as well as an order cancelling Pinterest’s pin registrations (at least in part) if those registrations are construed to prohibit the manner in which Pintrips uses the term.

This matter was tried to the Court, sitting without a jury, from May 18, 2015 to May 27, 2015. On July 3, 2015, the parties submitted post-trial briefs, see Dkt. Nos. 251 (“Pl. Br.”) and 248 (“Def. Br.”), and Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, see Dkt. Nos. 250 (“Pl. FFCL”) and 249 (“Def. FFCL”). The parties filed reply briefs three weeks later. See Dkt. Nos. 254 (“Pl. Reply Br.”) and 253 (“Def. Reply Br.”). Closing arguments were heard August 28,

1 2015. The Court has carefully considered the evidence presented at trial, the exhibits admitted  
2 into evidence, the parties' briefs, and the arguments of counsel. This memorandum opinion will  
3 constitute the Court's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

4 **II. JURISDICTION**

5 The Court has original jurisdiction under 15 U.S.C. § 1121 (claims arising under the  
6 Lanham Act), as well as 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and 1367(a). Venue is proper in this district  
7 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the parties reside in this judicial district and a substantial  
8 portion of the events giving rise to this action occurred here.

9 **III. BACKGROUND**

10 **A. Pinterest**

11 Launched in March of 2010, the Pinterest website permits its users to view, post, and  
12 organize content in which they are interested by creating pins on their virtual Pinterest "Pinboard."  
13 Pins are pieces of digital content that are shaped like a vertical rectangular box, and contain a  
14 photo, caption, and various action buttons. To create a pin, users can either go to a different  
15 website and transfer content by clicking on a "Pin It" action button, or browse content others have  
16 already pinned on Pinterest and "re-pin" that content to their Pinboard. Some pins, called "rich  
17 pins," are associated with a particular product offered by one of Pinterest's partners. For example,  
18 a rich pin of a pair of sandals from a shoe retailer's website will automatically show the current  
19 price of the sandal and whether it is in stock.

20 Pinterest permits its users to create multiple Pinboards with different subject matters.  
21 Some of the most popular areas about which Pinterest users create pins on Pinterest are recipes,  
22 fashion, home décor, and travel. Regardless of its subject matter, each Pinboard a Pinterest user  
23 creates is viewable by all other Pinterest users by default. Pinterest users have the option to  
24 change the default by creating "secret" boards that only they and their specifically invited friends  
25 can see. In November of 2013, Pinterest launched a particular type of Pinboard called a "Place  
26 Board," which allows Pinterest users to add location information to certain pins. Many Pinterest  
27 users use these Place Boards as part of their vacation and travel-related research on Pinterest.

28 Pinterest owns two federal trademark registrations for the word mark "PINTEREST," see

1 Trial Exhibit (“TX”) 23; TX24, and two federal trademark registrations for the word mark “PIN,”  
2 see TX25; TX26. It does not have a federal trademark registration for the word mark “PIN IT.”  
3 Pinterest has used each of the Pinterest, Pin, and Pin It word marks since March of 2010.

4 **B. Pintrips**

5 Pintrips is a website-based travel planning service that enables users to monitor the price  
6 fluctuations of airline flights. Co-founder and CEO Stephen Gotlieb came up with the concept of  
7 Pintrips (initially called Flightrax) in 2010 and created a mockup for the service as part of a class  
8 project for his MBA program in January of 2011. In order to use the Pintrips service, users must  
9 create an account on the Pintrips website and download a Google Chrome browser extension.  
10 Once installed, the Chrome browser extension inserts Pintrips’ pin button next to airline itineraries  
11 when the user visits certain third-party travel websites. When a Pintrips user clicks on the pin  
12 button next to an itinerary, that itinerary is automatically “pinned” to that user’s “Tripboard” on  
13 the Pintrips website. Once pinned, the price displayed next to the itinerary on the user’s Tripboard  
14 will update to reflect the flight’s real-time pricing and availability. Pintrips users may return to the  
15 Tripboard at any time to see if their pinned flights have changed in price and to compare their  
16 pinned travel options side-by-side. When a Pintrips user decides to purchase a flight, he or she  
17 may click on the pinned itinerary, which redirects the user to the website from which the flight  
18 was originally pinned.

19 Pintrips’ default configuration permits only individual users to access and view the trip  
20 information stored on each Pintrips user’s Tripboard. Access to this information may be shared  
21 with other Pintrips users only when the Pintrips user grants authorization to an individual email  
22 address to view his or her Tripboard. Email addresses may only be invited one at a time; Pintrips  
23 does not allow users to share their Tripboards with all other Pintrips users or any subset of Pintrips  
24 users. Users can communicate with each other through a Pintrips chat feature once they are  
25 invited to collaborate on the same Tripboard.

26 Pintrips does not own any federal trademark registrations. Its current application for  
27 registration of the “PINTRIPS” mark has been administratively stayed pending the outcome of this  
28 case.

1     **IV.   DISCUSSION**

2             The Court was presented with three primary questions at trial: (1) does Pintrips’ use of the  
3     “Pintrips” mark infringe Pinterest’s rights to its registered “Pinterest” mark; (2) does Pintrips’ use  
4     of the term “Pin” infringe Pinterest’s rights to its registered “Pin” and/or unregistered “Pin It”  
5     marks; and (3) was Pinterest sufficiently famous at the time Pintrips first used its marks in  
6     commerce to support a trademark dilution claim. The Court resolves each question below.

7             **A.   “Pinterest” vs. “Pintrips”**

8             The Lanham Act prohibits the “use[ ] in commerce [of] any word, term, name, symbol, or  
9     device, or any combination thereof, or any false designation of origin” that “is likely to cause  
10    confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of  
11    such person with another person, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of his or her goods.”  
12    15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(A). To establish trademark infringement under the Lanham Act, a plaintiff  
13    must demonstrate that (1) it has a valid, protectable ownership interest in a mark, (2) its mark is  
14    the senior mark, and (3) the defendant’s mark is likely to cause consumer confusion in the  
15    marketplace. *Rearden LLC v. Rearden Commerce, Inc.*, 683 F.3d 1190, 1202-03 (9th Cir. 2012);  
16    see also *Brookfield Commc’ns, Inc. v. W. Coast Entm’t Corp.*, 174 F.3d 1036, 1046-47 (9th Cir.  
17    1999).

18            In this case, Pinterest asserts that Pintrips’ name infringes its registered Pinterest word  
19    mark. There is no dispute that Pinterest has a valid, protectable ownership interest in the Pinterest  
20    mark, and that the Pinterest mark is senior to the Pintrips mark. Pinterest’s trademark registration  
21    is prima facie evidence of the validity of its marks. 15 U.S.C. § 1057(b). Accordingly, the  
22    resolution of this infringement claim turns on whether the Pintrips mark is likely to cause  
23    consumer confusion in the marketplace. Specifically, the question is whether consumers are likely  
24    to mistakenly believe that Pintrips is “somehow affiliated with or sponsored by” Pinterest. *Cohn*  
25    *v. Petsmart, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2002); see also *Dreamwerks Prod. Grp., Inc. v. SKG*  
26    *Studio*, 142 F.3d 1127, 1130 (9th Cir. 1998) (“[T]he question here is whether a reasonable  
27    consumer attending a [convention sponsored by the plaintiff] might do so believing that it is a  
28    convention sponsored by [the defendant].”).

1 To answer this question, the Court applies the eight-factor test articulated by the Ninth  
2 Circuit in *AMF Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats*, 599 F.2d 341, 348-49 (9th Cir. 1979). The “Sleekcraft  
3 factors” include: (1) the strength of the allegedly infringed mark; (2) the proximity of the parties’  
4 goods; (3) the similarity of the parties’ marks; (4) the extent to which there is evidence of actual  
5 confusion; (5) the marketing channels used by the parties; (6) the degree of care likely to be  
6 exercised by the purchasers of the parties’ products; (7) the alleged infringer’s intent in selecting  
7 its marks; and (8) the likelihood of expansion of the parties’ product lines. *Id.*

8 The courts’ application of the eight Sleekcraft factors in determining the likelihood of  
9 confusion is supposed to be “pliant,” and the Ninth Circuit has warned against “excessive rigidity”  
10 in their application. *Jada Toys, Inc. v. Mattel, Inc.*, 518 F.3d 628, 632 (9th Cir. 2008). Instead,  
11 “[t]he test is a fluid one and the plaintiff need not satisfy every factor, provided that strong  
12 showings are made with respect to some of them.” *Survivor Media, Inc. v. Survivor Prods.*, 406  
13 F.3d 625, 631 (9th Cir. 2005); see also *Dreamwerks*, 142 F.3d at 1129-32 (allowing case to  
14 proceed past summary judgment where the plaintiff overwhelmingly satisfied three Sleekcraft  
15 factors). Courts have extensive discretion in determining how much weight to accord each factor  
16 based on the circumstances of the case. See *Interstellar Starship Servs., Ltd. v. Epix, Inc.*, 304  
17 F.3d 936, 941 (9th Cir. 2002).

18 As will be discussed in more detail below, after considering each Sleekcraft factor and  
19 balancing them as a whole, the Court finds that the factors considered in their totality weigh  
20 against a finding that consumer confusion is likely.

21 **1. The “Pinterest” Mark is Suggestive**

22 The purpose of examining the strength of the plaintiff’s mark is to determine the scope of  
23 trademark protection to which the mark is entitled. *Entrepreneur Media, Inc. v. Smith*, 279 F.3d  
24 1135, 1141 (9th Cir. 2002). The strength of the senior mark determines the scope of trademark  
25 protection which applies. *Survivor Media*, 406 F.3d at 631 n.3. The strength of the junior mark,  
26 while important in cases of reverse infringement, is not relevant to the Court’s analysis outside of  
27 that context. See *La Quinta Worldwide LLC v. Q.R.T.M., S.A. de C.V.*, 762 F.3d 867, 875 (9th Cir.  
28 2014) (“This is not a reverse infringement case, and the district court should not have considered

1 the strength of [defendant’s] mark in determining what level of trademark protection to extend to  
2 [plaintiff’s] mark.”).

3 Trademarks are divided into five categories. The two strongest sets of marks are  
4 “arbitrary” and “fanciful” marks, which trigger the highest degree of trademark protection.  
5 Entrepreneur Media, 279 F.3d at 1141. The third category, “suggestive” marks, do not “describe  
6 the product’s features, but suggest[] them.” Kendall-Jackson Winery, Ltd. v. E. & J. Gallo  
7 Winery, 150 F.3d 1042, 1047 n.8 (9th Cir. 1998) (emphases omitted). Examples include  
8 “Slickcraft” boats, or “Air Care” for a service that maintains medical equipment for administering  
9 oxygen. Id.; see also Sleekcraft, 599 F.2d at 349. The fourth category of marks is referred to as  
10 “descriptive.” Kendall–Jackson Winery, 150 F.3d at 1047. An example of a descriptive mark is  
11 “Honey Roast” for nuts roasted with honey. Id. at 1047 n.8. Because these marks merely describe  
12 a characteristic of the product, they do not receive any trademark protection unless they acquire  
13 sufficient “secondary meaning” to create an association between the mark and the product. Id. at  
14 1047. The final category of marks consists of “generic” marks, which “describe the product in its  
15 entirety, and which are not entitled to trademark protection. Examples include ‘Liquid controls’  
16 for equipment that dispenses liquid, or ‘Multistate Bar Examination’ for a bar examination that  
17 may be taken across multiple states.” Surfivivor Media, 406 F.3d at 632 (citation omitted).

18 In this case, the parties agree that “Pinterest” is at least a suggestive mark, which entitles it  
19 to trademark protection without a showing of secondary meaning. Sleekcraft, 599 F.2d at 349  
20 (“Although less distinctive than an arbitrary or fanciful mark and therefore a comparatively weak  
21 mark, a suggestive mark will be protected without proof of secondary meaning.”). While Pinterest  
22 argues that the Pinterest mark may straddle the line between suggestive and arbitrary, Pl. Br. at 5,  
23 the Court finds that Pinterest is clearly a suggestive mark. Suggestive marks “subtly connote  
24 something about the products.” Sleekcraft, 599 F.2d at 349; see also *Zobmondo Entm’t, LLC v.*  
25 *Falls Media, LLC*, 602 F.3d 1108, 1114 (9th Cir. 2010) (“A suggestive mark is one for which ‘a  
26 consumer must use imagination or any type of multistage reasoning to understand the mark’s  
27 significance . . . the mark does not describe the product’s features, but suggests them.”)  
28 (emphases and citation omitted). Here, the Pinterest mark is a combination of the words “pin” and

1 “interest” mashed together to create a new word. Accordingly, while understanding the meaning  
2 of the “Pinterest” mark requires the public to employ the multistage reasoning that differentiates  
3 suggestive marks from those that are merely descriptive, the combination of “pin” and “interest”  
4 cannot reasonably be said to be arbitrary or fanciful. The Pinterest mark is a textbook example of  
5 a suggestive mark that “subtly connote[s] something” about the company’s services, *Sleekcraft*,  
6 599 F.2d at 349, in that it conveys to users that the website allows them to pin their interests.

7 The Court’s conclusion that Pinterest is a suggestive mark does not end the inquiry under  
8 this factor. Identifying whether a mark is arbitrary, fanciful, suggestive, descriptive, or generic is  
9 only the first step. The second step is to determine the strength of the mark in the marketplace,  
10 i.e., the commercial strength of the mark. *One Indus., LLC v. Jim O’Neal Distrib., Inc.*, 578 F.3d  
11 1154, 1164 (9th Cir. 2009). “When similar marks permeate the marketplace, the strength of the  
12 mark decreases. In a crowded field of similar marks, each member of the crowd is relatively weak  
13 in its ability to prevent use by others in the crowd.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). “The  
14 more likely a mark is to be remembered and associated in the public mind with the mark’s owner,  
15 the greater protection the mark is accorded by trademark laws.” *GoTo.com, Inc. v. Walt Disney*  
16 *Co.*, 202 F.3d 1199, 1207 (9th Cir. 2000).

17 Pintrips offers little argument to dispute that “Pinterest” is a commercially strong mark.  
18 See Def. Br. at 18. At the time of the bench trial, approximately one-quarter of the United States’  
19 population (i.e., 80 million people) used the Pinterest website each month. The Court was not  
20 presented with evidence that the marketplace is crowded with other similar names. Although the  
21 Ninth Circuit has noted that suggestive marks are “comparatively weak,” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at  
22 349, the Pinterest mark should be afforded greater protection than most other suggestive marks  
23 given its commercial strength. Accordingly, the Court finds that this *Sleekcraft* factor weighs  
24 slightly in favor of Pinterest.

## 25 **2. The Proximity of the Parties’ Goods or Services**

26 “Goods or services that are closely related are generally more likely than unrelated goods  
27 or services to confuse the public as to their sources.” *La Quinta*, 762 F.3d at 875 (citation  
28 omitted). The proximity of the parties’ products is relevant to the confusion analysis in that “[f]or

1 related goods, the danger presented is that the public will mistakenly assume there is an  
2 association between the producers of the related goods, though no such association exists. The  
3 more likely the public is to make such an association, the less similarity in the marks is requisite to  
4 a finding of likelihood of confusion.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 350 (citation omitted). The public is  
5 likely to make such an association “when the goods are complementary, the products are sold to  
6 the same class of purchasers, or the goods are similar in use and function.” *Id.*; see also  
7 *Brookfield Commc’ns*, 174 F.3d at 1056 (“[T]he relatedness of each company’s prime directive  
8 isn’t relevant. Instead, the focus is on whether the consuming public is likely somehow to  
9 associate [the defendant’s] products with [the plaintiff.]”) (citation omitted).

10 Pinterest argues that the Pinterest and Pintrips websites are related because both companies  
11 offer “services related to the travel industry generally” and “collaborative products that allow  
12 consumers to plan travel using the Internet.” Pl. Br. at 6-7. Pinterest points to evidence  
13 introduced at trial demonstrating that Pinterest users often use its website to research their travel  
14 destinations and activities. See Tr. at 72:4-7 (“So a lot of people will use Pinterest to plan dream  
15 vacations, honeymoons, as we saw earlier. I’ve used it to plan travel itineraries for people coming  
16 to visit me in cities.”); *id.* at 72:16-17 (“There are lots of pins that will provide ideas about how  
17 you can save money or find the best -- best travel tips.”); *id.* at 73:7-9 (“[W]e worked with Travel  
18 + Leisure Magazine to get some coverage for Place Pins at launch, then to explain how people use  
19 Pinterest for travel.”). Pinterest also offered evidence that it allows users to create place pins on  
20 their Place Boards, which adds specific location information to a pin. See Tr. at 58:22-24 (“That’s  
21 a button that would allow the user to add some data to that pin using a partner that we have called  
22 [F]oursquare so that they can identify the actual location of that pin.”). Certain pins can be  
23 associated with indicators called “map markers,” which show the user where, for example, a pin of  
24 a hotel would be located on a map. See Tr. at 60:22-61:6.

25 While the Court credits the testimony of the Pinterest witnesses who discussed how  
26 Pinterest is used to research travel destinations, the Court disagrees that this use is similar to  
27 Pintrips’ service. Pintrips is an online tool that tracks fluctuating airline prices by providing users  
28 the ability to save flight itineraries from multiple airline websites to a single location. See Tr. at



1 464:2-474:14. After searching airline websites and pinning the itineraries they wish to track,  
2 Pintrips users may then return to the Pintrips website—without needing to duplicate the effort of  
3 their initial search—to see whether their selected flights have become more or less expensive. *Id.*  
4 Pintrips does not provide users the opportunity to research their travel destinations, identify sights  
5 to see while traveling, or gather ideas for new travel destinations from other users, given that all  
6 Pintrips Tripboards are, by default, private. *Id.* at 476:1-477:11. The only arguable “social  
7 media” aspect of the Pintrips site is a function allowing users to individually invite other users  
8 (generally traveling companions or people making travel arrangements on the user’s behalf) to  
9 access a particular trip so that those users can also view and pin itineraries for the primary user’s  
10 trips. *Id.*; see also *id.* at 661:10-23.

11 In contrast, Pinterest is a social media website where users can share photos, articles, and  
12 other information about their interests on personalized web-based Pinboards which are, by default,  
13 viewable by all of Pinterest’s 80 million monthly users. *Tr.* at 61:25-62:3. Travel is just one of  
14 the dozens and dozens of exceptionally broad subject-matter categories about which Pinterest  
15 users choose to pin. *Tr.* at 125:5-126:7. While Pinterest users undoubtedly use the service to  
16 research their travel destinations (as well as hundreds of other subjects), that fact does not render  
17 Pinterest’s social media service similar to Pintrips’ airline itinerary-tracking tool. Pinterest has no  
18 travel booking function; is not working on a travel booking function; and has no concrete plan to  
19 begin working on a travel booking function in the future. See *Tr.* at 88:14-15 (“We’ve discussed  
20 [expanding Pinterest’s products to facilitate booking travel], but we haven’t specifically set a date  
21 when we would start working on something like that.”). That Pinterest may aspire to provide a  
22 tool similar to Pintrips’ service at some unknown point in the future is too speculative and  
23 indefinite to weigh in favor of a finding of proximity under this factor.

24 In further support of its argument, Pinterest cites to a few emails in which Pintrips  
25 executives refer to Pinterest as a possible competitor. See, e.g., TX40; TX186. Although the  
26 Court agrees that these statements are relevant to its analysis, the Court finds the comparison of  
27 the services actually performed by the Pinterest and Pintrips websites to be more persuasive than  
28 the representations made by Pintrips’ executives to a public relations firm and in an investor pitch

1 deck. For example, in Mr. Gotlieb’s November 7, 2012 email to an employee at a public relations  
2 firm, he states that “[t]he main competitors Pintrips has are meta-sites. . . . The other competitors  
3 are either players that need to pivot and like our idea or newcomers.” TX40 at  
4 PINTRIPS\_00006790. In what appears to be almost an afterthought, Mr. Gotlieb states that  
5 “[o]ne more competitor would actually be Pinterest.” Id. at PINTRIPS\_00006791. The Court also  
6 does not find the “WHY INVEST NOW?” section of an investor pitch deck introduced at trial  
7 through Pintrips’ Chief Product Officer, Sheila Bijoor, to override the Court’s analysis of the  
8 parties’ services. See TX186 at PINTRIPS\_00006824 (“[I]nvest in us NOW because we have the  
9 ingredients for success, and there is competition in the market from players like Pinterest – so we  
10 have no time to waste!!”) (capital lettering and exclamation points in original). Both emails  
11 appear tailored to evoke a comparison to an already successful company, rather than serve as a  
12 reasoned analysis of Pintrips’ realistic competitors. The Court agrees with Ashley Raiteri, a travel  
13 industry consultant who was an integral player in the genesis of the Pintrips product (and who has  
14 substantially more experience working and consulting in the travel industry than Mr. Gotlieb or  
15 Ms. Bijoor, Tr. at 640:16-642:4), that Pinterest is not a competitor of Pintrips, Tr. at 672:2-5  
16 (stating that he did not “consider Pinterest to be a competitor of [Pintrips] or its products”).

17 Although this Sleekcraft factor does not weigh quite as overwhelmingly in favor of Pintrips  
18 as it would in the absence of the emails cited by Pinterest, the Court finds that this factor still  
19 strongly weighs against a likelihood of consumer confusion.

### 20 **3. Similarity of the Parties’ Marks**

21 “The similarity of the marks is ‘a critical question in the likelihood-of-confusion  
22 analysis.’” La Quinta, 762 F.3d at 875 (citation omitted). To assess similarity, courts must  
23 “compare the two marks in terms of sight, sound, and meaning, considering the marks as a whole,  
24 as [they] appear in the marketplace.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); see also  
25 Sleekcraft, 599 F.2d at 351 (“Similarity of the marks is tested on three levels: sight, sound, and  
26 meaning.”). Similarities between marks generally weigh more heavily than differences, id., and  
27 the amount of similarity required to support a likelihood of confusion decreases where the services  
28 at issue are themselves similar, La Quinta, 762 F.3d at 876 (citations omitted).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**a. Sight**

There are undeniable visual similarities between the “Pinterest” and “Pintrips” marks. Each mark begins with the word “pin” and then continues with another word (or portion of another word) beginning with the letter “t.” The marks are also the same approximate length: nine letters for Pinterest and eight letters for Pintrips. However, this is not a case where the allegedly infringing mark differs in only one or two inconspicuous letters in the middle of the mark, see *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 351 (*Sleekcraft* and *Slickcraft*), or is identical save for different emphasis on one of the letters, see *Pom Wonderful LLC v. Hubbard*, 775 F.3d 1118, 1128 (9th Cir. 2014) (observing the “o” in “POM” is heartshaped, and the “o” in “pom” has a breve over it). Here, the second half of each mark bears significant differences (i.e., “terest” and “trips”). While the differences in the latter half of the marks do not completely overcome the visual similarities identified above, they lessen the weight the Court gives to this sub-factor. Accordingly, this sub-factor weighs only slightly in favor of a finding of confusion.

**b. Sound**

“Sound is also important because reputation is often conveyed word-of-mouth.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 351. “Slight differences in the sound of trademarks will not protect the infringer.” *Id.* at 352 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Pintrips argues that the marks do not sound the same because Pintrips is a two-syllable word, while Pinterest is a three-syllable word. Def. Br. at 17. Although Pintrips may be correct as a matter of grammar, the Court accepts Pinterest’s argument (which is consistent with the pronunciations used by counsel and witnesses at the trial) that, in the real world, Pinterest often may be pronounced with two syllables (i.e., “Pin-trist”). Regardless, whether pronounced with two or three syllables, there is sufficient similarity in the sound of each mark to plausibly cause consumer confusion. The first syllable of each mark is identical, as is the first letter of the second syllable, followed very closely (although not immediately in the Pinterest mark) by an “r”. Accordingly, while the marks do not sound identical when spoken, they sound sufficiently similar for this sub-factor to favor a finding of confusion.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**c. Meaning**

“Closeness in meaning can itself substantiate a claim of similarity of trademarks.” Sleekcraft, 599 F.2d at 352. In this case, both marks are “made up” words that do not appear in the dictionary. Pinterest is a “mashup” or “telescoped” word, in that it combines two words (pin and interest) but does not repeat the two shared letters at the end of pin and the beginning of interest. Pintrips is a compound word comprised of two words (pin and trips) with no shared letters removed. Although both words suggest that consumers will be able to perform the well-known computer operation of pinning, each mark also suggests that the services permit consumers to pin different things: interests for Pinterest and trips for Pintrips. In other words, the only shared meaning associated with the two marks is based on the descriptive term “pin.” When viewed as a whole, the Court finds that the meanings of these made-up words do not support a finding of likelihood of consumer confusion. Accordingly, this sub-factor weighs in favor of Pintrips.

\* \* \*

In summary, the sight sub-factor weighs slightly in favor of Pinterest, the sound sub-factor weighs in favor of Pinterest, and the meaning sub-factor weighs in favor of Pintrips. Considering all three similarity sub-factors together, the Court finds that this Sleekcraft factor weighs slightly in favor of a finding of consumer confusion.

**4. Evidence of Actual Confusion**

“Evidence that use of the two marks has already led to confusion is persuasive proof that future confusion is likely.” Sleekcraft, 599 F.2d at 352. However, due to “the difficulty in garnering such evidence, the failure to prove instances of actual confusion is not dispositive. . . . [T]his factor is weighed heavily only when . . . the particular circumstances indicate such evidence should have been available.” Id.; see *Brookfield Commc’ns*, 174 F.3d at 1050 (“[D]ifficulties in gathering evidence of actual confusion make its absence generally unnoteworthy.”).

As observed by the Ninth Circuit in many other cases, it is unsurprising that there is little evidence of actual confusion here. Pinterest points to a single email sent to Pintrips’ customer support, in which an individual emailed Pintrips concerning her Pinterest login and password. One potentially confused consumer, standing alone, is not sufficient evidence of actual confusion

1 for this factor to weigh in favor of Pinterest. Moreover, even this email does not suggest that the  
2 consumer’s confusion affected her purchasing decision—i.e., that she visited or used the Pintrips  
3 website mistakenly believing it was the Pinterest website. See, e.g. *Instant Media, Inc. v.*  
4 *Microsoft Corp.*, No. 07-cv-02639-SBA, 2007 WL 2318948, at \*14 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2007)  
5 (“Relevant confusion is that which affects purchasing decisions, not confusion generally.”). On  
6 the other hand, because Pintrips has relatively few users, the Court would not expect significant  
7 evidence of confusion. Accordingly, the absence of evidence of confusion by actual Pinterest or  
8 Pintrips users neither helps nor hurts either party.<sup>1</sup>

9 At trial, Pinterest offered the findings of two surveys to support its claim of consumer  
10 confusion. The first survey, conducted by Dr. Jacob Jacoby, showed one group of participants a  
11 still mockup of Pintrips’ actual website landing page (without the URL bar), and another group of  
12 survey participants an altered landing page with the name “Cliptrips” and an associated “clip”  
13 button in place of the name Pintrips and its actual pin button. Dr. Jacoby’s survey then asked each  
14 participant to identify the source of the website they were shown. The second survey was  
15 conducted by Dr. Deborah Jay. Dr. Jay altered United Airlines’ website landing page by placing  
16 Pintrips’ pin button next to Facebook and Twitter’s social media icons as they appear on the real  
17 United Airlines website, and then asked survey participants to identify the company responsible  
18 for the inserted pin button. Pinterest argues that the results produced by these surveys demonstrate  
19 consumer confusion sufficient to tilt this factor in its favor.

20 The Court strongly disagrees. As described below, fatal defects in the design of each  
21 survey render their results meaningless to the resolution of this lawsuit.

22  
23  
24  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> The Court does not find testimony that the mother-in-law of the CEO of Pintrips mistakenly  
27 believed Pinterest was the name of her son-in-law’s company to be persuasive evidence of  
28 confusion. The trial evidence established that English is Mr. Gotlieb’s mother-in-law’s third  
language, that she has difficulty enunciating English words, and that she just started using the  
Internet in 2013.

1                                   **a. Dr. Jacoby’s Survey**

2                   Pintrips’ pretrial filings sought to exclude Dr. Jacoby’s testimony on the ground that his  
3 survey tested whether respondents were likely to associate the combination of the Pintrips name  
4 and its pin button with Pinterest, as opposed to the Pintrips name alone. Dkt. No. 147. Pintrips  
5 argued that including the pin button in the stimulus provided to respondents was a fundamental  
6 flaw in Dr. Jacoby’s survey design because Pinterest did not have a right to prohibit Pintrips from  
7 using the word pin to represent the well-known computer function of pinning. Id. The Court  
8 denied Pintrips’ motion in limine, holding that whether Pintrips had a right to use that term was a  
9 question of fact to be determined at trial, and could not supply a basis for excluding testimony  
10 before trial began. See Dkt. No. 191 at 5.

11                   Having now made the determination that Pintrips’ use of the pin button on its website  
12 constitutes fair use under 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4), see Section IV.B, the Court agrees with Pintrips  
13 that the results of Dr. Jacoby’s survey answer a different question than that posed to the Court by  
14 this lawsuit. Instead of measuring consumer confusion as to the Pintrips mark alone, Dr. Jacoby’s  
15 survey measured consumer confusion arising from the Pintrips mark and the Pintrips’ pin button  
16 when viewed in combination. However, confusion caused by Pintrips’ fair use of its pin button  
17 cannot support a finding of confusion between the Pinterest and Pintrips marks. See KP  
18 Permanent Make-Up, Inc. v. Lasting Impression I, Inc., 543 U.S. 111, 123 (2004) (“If any  
19 confusion results [from the defendant’s fair use of a descriptive term], that is a risk the plaintiff  
20 accepted when it decided to identify its product with a mark that uses a well known descriptive  
21 phrase.”) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). As Dr. Susan McDonald convincingly  
22 explained in her critique of Dr. Jacoby’s survey design, it is impossible to disaggregate the  
23 responses of survey respondents who associated Pintrips’ website with Pinterest (1) based in some  
24 way on its pin button or pinning functionality from those that (2) were influenced by the Pintrips  
25 name alone. See Tr. at 1010:6-1011:5; id. 1011:2-5 (“So when you use a [stimulus] that  
26 essentially . . . embodies two things at once, you are deprived of the ability to attribute causality to  
27 either one of those. You can’t parse it.”). Dr. Jacoby agreed that his survey was not designed to  
28 distinguish respondents’ answers in that manner. Tr. at 973:18-25 (agreeing to the statement that

1 “there is no way for you to separate out . . . what confusion was because of the name and what  
2 confusion was not because of the name . . . because the control didn’t include the pinning  
3 functionality in it”).

4 Although the possibility that survey respondents were confused by the fair use of Pintrips’  
5 pin button would by itself justify affording no weight to Dr. Jacoby’s survey results, the  
6 explanations provided by many survey respondents confirm that they were influenced by Pintrips’  
7 fair use of the word pin. As Dr. McDonald explained, “based on the open end[ed questions] . . .  
8 it’s abundantly clear that the pinning functionality was a very meaningful factor for some of the  
9 respondents.” Id. at 1010:3-5. A review of the open-ended answers of purportedly confused  
10 respondents reveals that a great number cited the simple fact that Pintrips permitted users to pin  
11 content as a reason to associate the service with Pinterest. See TX206, Appendix F2 (“it uses the  
12 phrase pin flights,” “because you pin it,” “the pins and the social media aspects,” “the pin trips  
13 statement,” “pin,” “the use of pins to highlight features,” “the use of pins,” “pinning your trips  
14 planned from various sites,” “you are pinning your desired selections”). These responses do not  
15 support the claim that consumers confused Pintrips’ website with Pinterest because of the alleged  
16 similarity of the Pintrips word mark.

17 Moreover, the Court finds that Dr. Jacoby’s survey cannot be saved simply by disregarding  
18 the confusion of survey respondents who affirmatively listed Pintrips’ pin button as the cause of  
19 their confusion. This is because Dr. Jacoby’s survey was not designed to identify how many other  
20 respondents were influenced by Pintrips’ pin button, but, for whatever reason, did not take the  
21 time to write down the pin button as his or her reason for associating the Pintrips website with  
22 Pinterest. See Tr. at 1010:20-25 (“People don’t say everything in an open end, but they often say  
23 things that are top of mind. I wouldn’t ever want to trust the absence of a particular reference or  
24 description of -- of why someone had made an attribution.”). In short, Dr. Jacoby’s survey design  
25 does not permit the Court to draw any inference about whether—absent the influence of the pin  
26 button and numerous references to the Pintrips website’s pinning features—any survey  
27  
28

1 respondents would have associated the Pintrips website with Pinterest.<sup>2</sup>

2 **b. Dr. Jay’s Survey**

3 Pintrips’ pretrial filings sought to exclude Dr. Jay’s testimony on the ground that her  
4 survey measured whether adding the Pintrips pin button to the bottom of the United Airlines  
5 website would lead to consumer confusion, despite the fact that Pintrips’ pin button has never  
6 been used in that manner. See Dkt. No. 150. Pinterest opposed that motion, arguing that internal  
7 emails sent shortly before the initiation of this action demonstrated that Pintrips discussed adding  
8 this feature, and that courts outside of this circuit have considered planned activities when  
9 deciding whether to order injunctive relief. See Dkt. No. 163-3 at 3-4 (citing *MetLife, Inc. v.*  
10 *Metro. Nat’l Bank*, 388 F. Supp. 2d 223 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) and *U.S. Polo Ass’n, Inc. v. PLR USA*  
11 *Holdings, Inc.*, 800 F. Supp. 2d 515 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)).

12 In its order denying Pintrips’ motion to exclude Dr. Jay, the Court found that the facts at  
13 issue in the cases cited by Pinterest provided only marginal support for its argument. Dkt. No. 191  
14 at 6. In both *MetLife* and *U.S. Polo*, the imminency of the alleged infringement at issue made it  
15 unmistakably clear what the future allegedly infringing conduct would look like. In contrast, the  
16 Pintrips emails purportedly providing the basis for Dr. Jay’s survey demonstrated that Pintrips was  
17 still considering how to implement the injection of its pin button on third-party websites and, even  
18 assuming it was successful in convincing any third parties to do so, how that pin button would  
19 look. TX39 at PINTRIPS\_00006777; TX233. Pintrips’ plans—to the extent it had plans at all—  
20 were clearly in the formative stage. This presented a significant difficulty for Dr. Jay’s survey  
21 design in that she had to guess, at the very least: (1) what the Pintrips “pin” button would look  
22 like; and (2) where it would appear on the third-party travel website. Accordingly, the Court was  
23 deeply skeptical of Dr. Jay’s decision to place the hypothetical pin button next to the Facebook  
24 and Twitter icons at the bottom of the United Airlines home page, as that choice did not appear to  
25 be supported by any evidence in the record.

26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>2</sup> Because the Court assigns no weight to the results of Dr. Jacoby’s survey on this ground, the Court will not address the other significant issues of survey design and interpretation that compromise its results.



1           Despite these misgivings, the Court permitted Dr. Jay to testify on the chance that her  
2 testimony “could possibly provide some minimal probative value given that the development of  
3 Pintrips’ API button had passed the purely hypothetical stage.” Dkt. No. 191 at 6. But Dr. Jay’s  
4 testimony at trial did not reach even this minimal level of probative value. As numerous trial  
5 exhibits and testimony made clear, the email discussion upon which Dr. Jay based her survey did  
6 not concern the insertion of a pin button in a row of links to social media websites at the bottom of  
7 a third party’s webpage. See TX233 at PINTRIPS\_00006939 (email from Mr. Gotlieb stating that  
8 adding a button to third-party websites that directs users to the Pintrips website is “[d]efinitely not  
9 something to try and tackle right now”). In fact, that placement would be entirely inconsistent  
10 with the purpose of the Pintrips pin button, which is to allow users to select particular itineraries to  
11 be stored on their personal Pintrips Tripboard. Dr. Jay’s proposed placement of the pin button at  
12 the bottom of an airline’s webpage would serve no purpose, other than to transform it into  
13 something that it is not: a social media badge like the Twitter and Facebook icons already  
14 appearing on United Airlines’ website. As Mr. Raiteri credibly and convincingly explained during  
15 his examination:

16           Q. All right. Was there ever any discussion, June 8th until you left  
17 the company, about putting a Pintrips pin button on the bottom of  
18 that home page, for example, as an example, next to Facebook and  
Twitter social media badges?

19           A. No; that wouldn’t have made any sense.

20           Q. Why not?

21           A. Um, those buttons perform a different function than the Pintrips  
22 button. Those buttons are a way of expressing brand loyalty or  
23 brand identification. Which is not what the Pintrips button is for.  
The Pintrips button is to save the information for later perusal. It’s  
24 not to broadcast to the world that you like the flight or that the flight  
is amazing. It’s so that you can go back later and compare that  
flight to another flight before you buy it.

25 Tr. at 671:3-17.

26           Instead, the evidence presented at trial made clear that, to the extent Pintrips sought to have  
27 third-party websites inject its pin button in the future, it contemplated that the button would be  
28 inserted in the same general manner as it is seen when current Pintrips users download Pintrips’

1 Chrome plug-in (i.e., the pin button would appear next to each itinerary). As Mr. Gotlieb  
2 explained:

3 Q. . . . When you say you want your travel partners to inject a  
4 button, what did you mean?

5 A. Well, I meant, basically, instead of a user having to download our  
6 extension when they would go to a travel site like United and see  
7 different itinerary options, that our pin button would be there  
8 automatically.

9 [. . . ]

10 Q. I'm sorry, let me back up. Right now you have a browser  
11 extension which puts the image of a pin button on a travel site like  
12 Kayak; correct?

13 A. That is correct.

14 [. . . ]

15 Q. And if you were to develop an API bit of technology code to  
16 provide to Kayak --

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. -- would that be to replace the browser button, but put it in the  
19 same place?

20 A. Yes, it would. It's the same code.

21

22 Tr. at 235:23-237:2. In other words, Dr. Jay's survey is completely untethered from how Pintrips  
23 works now or has even been contemplated to work in the future. The Court finds the results of Dr.  
24 Jay's survey are not relevant to its analysis.

25

\* \* \*

26 For these reasons, the Court finds no persuasive evidence of actual confusion between the  
27 Pinterest and Pintrips marks. However, because the Court also finds that Pintrips' small user base  
28 suggests that evidence of confusion would likely not be available, this Sleekcraft factor does not  
weigh in favor of either party.

## 29 **5. Marketing Channels**

30 "Convergent marketing channels increase the likelihood of confusion." Sleekcraft, 599  
31 F.2d at 353. When examining the marketing channels used by the competing companies, the

1 Court considers “where the goods or services are sold, the sales and marketing methods employed,  
2 and the class of purchasers exposed to the marketing efforts.” *La Quinta*, 762 F.3d at 876-77  
3 (citation omitted). For example, the Ninth Circuit has found this factor to weigh in favor of a  
4 likelihood of confusion where the retail dealers of the parties both advertised their boats by  
5 “participating in smaller boat shows and by advertising in local newspapers and classified  
6 telephone directories.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 353. Pinterest argues that this factor weighs in  
7 favor of a finding of consumer confusion in this case because both Pinterest and Pintrips advertise  
8 on the Internet through Facebook and Twitter, as well as through word of mouth. See Pl. Br. at  
9 10.

10 However, the Ninth Circuit has declined to place substantial weight on this factor where  
11 the shared marketing channels are shared by numerous companies in addition to the parties at  
12 issue. See *Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Netscape Commc’ns Corp.*, 354 F.3d 1020, 1028 (9th Cir.  
13 2004) (“PEI and the advertisers use identical marketing channels: the Internet. More specifically,  
14 each of their sites appears on defendants’ search results pages. Given the broad use of the Internet  
15 today, the same could be said for countless companies. Thus, this factor merits little weight.”);  
16 see also *Entrepreneur Media*, 279 F.3d at 1151 (“Some use of the Internet for marketing, however,  
17 does not alone and as a matter of law constitute overlapping marketing channels.”) (emphasis in  
18 original). The Ninth Circuit’s observation in *Playboy* is truer today than it was when the decision  
19 was issued over a decade ago: almost every company advertises on the Internet. The same can be  
20 said of “word-of-mouth” advertising, which practically all businesses seek to encourage. Pinterest  
21 has pointed to no advertising activity that distinguishes Pintrips’ Internet advertising from the  
22 Internet advertising undertaken by most other companies.

23 Accordingly, like the Ninth Circuit in *Playboy*, the Court finds that this *Sleekcraft* factor  
24 does not tilt in favor of either party given the circumstances presented in this case.

25 **6. The Type of Goods and the Degree of Care Exercised by Purchasers**

26 “Low consumer care . . . increases the likelihood of confusion.” *Playboy*, 354 F.3d at  
27 1028. Under this factor, the Court must evaluate “the type of good or service offered and the  
28 degree of care one would expect from the average buyer exercising ordinary caution.” See *La*

1 Quinta, 762 F.3d at 877 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “When the buyer has  
2 expertise in the field, a higher standard is proper though it will not preclude a finding that  
3 confusion is likely.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 353. “Similarly, when the goods are expensive, the  
4 buyer can be expected to exercise greater care in his purchases; again, though, confusion may still  
5 be likely.” *Id.*

6 On one hand, like many website-based companies, both Pinterest and Pintrips offer their  
7 services for free. Accordingly, a case can be made that this factor weighs in favor of a finding of  
8 confusion. See *Brookfield Commc’ns*, 174 F.3d at 1060 (“[W]hen dealing with inexpensive  
9 products, customers are likely to exercise less care, thus making confusion more likely.”). On the  
10 other hand, unlike many inexpensive goods, Pintrips and Pinterest services do not sit next to each  
11 other on the grocery-store shelf waiting for a consumer to make an impulsive purchase. Both  
12 websites require consumers to create an account before they can start pinning. See *Tr.* at 54:4-  
13 55:25; *id.* at 465:20-466:5. Pintrips also requires users to download and install a special Chrome  
14 browser extension in order to use its service. See *id.* at 466:6-12.

15 The Court agrees with Pintrips that the threshold activities required to gain access to the  
16 parties’ services force consumers to exercise more care than they normally would be expected to  
17 take with regard to free products. For example, in order to reach the point where a potentially  
18 confused consumer can actually use the Pintrips service, that consumer must click through several  
19 web pages that describe the Pintrips product in detail, as well as download an extension onto his or  
20 her browser. See *id.* at 464:2-474:14. These steps provide potentially confused consumers the  
21 opportunity to realize their mistake at multiple points before they are in a position to start  
22 comparing itineraries.

23 Accordingly, the Court finds that this *Sleekcraft* factor is neutral or weighs slightly against  
24 a finding of confusion.

25 **7. Pintrips’ Intent in Selecting Its Mark**

26 “[I]ntent to deceive is strong evidence of a likelihood of confusion.” *Entrepreneur Media*,  
27 279 F.3d at 1148 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “When the alleged infringer  
28 knowingly adopts a mark similar to another’s, reviewing courts presume that the defendant can

1 accomplish his purpose: that is, that the public will be deceived.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 354.  
2 “This factor favors the plaintiff where the alleged infringer adopted his mark with knowledge,  
3 actual or constructive, that it was another’s trademark.” *Brookfield Commc’ns*, 174 F.3d at 1059.

4 In this case, Pinterest argues that Pintrips intentionally selected the Pintrips mark in order  
5 to take advantage of Pinterest’s brand recognition. In support of its position, Pinterest cites to  
6 evidence that Mr. Gotlieb learned of Pinterest on June 10, 2011 when Mr. Raiteri sent him an  
7 email directing him to “[t]ake a look at Pinterest.com in relation to our alpha[,]” see TX69 at  
8 PINTRIPS00006890, and that Pintrips did not obtain its Pintrips-related domain names until  
9 several days later, Tr. at 655:11-22. The Court agrees that the evidence introduced at trial fairly  
10 establishes this sequence of events. However, the Court finds that Pinterest’s suggestion that  
11 Pintrips was still deciding whether to use the Pintrips name by as late as the end of 2011 is not  
12 supported by the trial evidence.

13 During his direct examination, Mr. Raiteri explained the process by which he came up with  
14 the Pintrips name. His explanation was both credible and detailed. From June 8, 2011 through  
15 June 10, 2011, Mr. Gotlieb and three members of Mr. Raiteri’s travel incubator (Mr. Raiteri,  
16 Timothy O’Neil Dunne, and Paul Addy) participated in a brainstorming workshop to flesh out Mr.  
17 Gotlieb’s business ideas. Tr. at 643:5-12. During that meeting, they discussed several travel-  
18 related products. The first was Mr. Gotlieb’s idea for a consumer-facing website intended to  
19 “personaliz[e] the travel shopping experience and minimiz[e] frustration.” *Id.* at 645:2-4. The  
20 second, which Mr. Raiteri characterized as the “real revenue opportunity,” was a product that  
21 would use the back-end “data that we could collect by understanding a travel shopper’s  
22 preferences.” *Id.* at 645:4-6. As Mr. Raiteri explained, “we wanted one business which would be  
23 revenue-neutral, that would provide a service to travelers, and in the process, collect data. That  
24 data would be used by the second business to establish a dynamic pricing algorithm and market  
25 for airlines.” *Id.* at 645:15-19.

26 The Flightrax product that Mr. Gotlieb devised during his business school class was to be a  
27 consumer-facing product. *Id.* at 645:20-646:13. However, even going into the June 2011  
28 workshop, Mr. Raiteri, Mr. O’Neil Dunne, and Mr. Addy all considered the Flightrax name

1 unworkable. Id. at 645:23-646:7. During a brainstorming session on a new name for the Flightrux  
2 product, Mr. Addy stood at the whiteboard “going back and forth from a drawn-up mockup of a  
3 travel website like Expedia, where the itineraries were listed, and another drawn-up mockup of a  
4 canvas where different itineraries were compared.” Id. at 647:3-7. He repeated “[a]nd you pin  
5 this over here, you pin this trip to this board over here, and then you pin this trip to this board over  
6 here,” id. at 647:8-10, until Mr. Raiteri said “[t]hat’s what it is. Pinning trips. ‘Pintrips[,]’” id. at  
7 649:2-3. By the end of the brainstorming session, Mr. Raiteri had selected Pintrips as the name  
8 that he wanted for the consumer-facing product. Id. at 654:14-655:10. Mr. Raiteri did not learn  
9 about Pinterest’s existence until later that day when he “told [his wife] about how [the Pintrips  
10 product] would work, and how you would pin your trips to a pin board, and that we’d use  
11 bookmarklet technology to get it done, or maybe we’d build a Chrome extension.” Id. at 665:19-  
12 666:13. Mr. Raiteri’s wife volunteered that the Pintrips website sounded like it would operate like  
13 Pinterest, “where you install a bookmarklet, and then when you’re browsing, you can pin photos  
14 to your page.” Id. at 666:11-13.

15           Although Mr. Gotlieb and the other participants in the June 2011 workshop learned of  
16 Pinterest’s existence when Mr. Raiteri emailed them that night, TX69, Mr. Raiteri credibly  
17 explained that he sent that email (1) before he had even seen the Pinterest website; (2) in relation  
18 to whether the Pintrips alpha could feasibly use bookmarklet technology; and (3) not because he  
19 did or did not think Pinterest sounded like Pintrips. See id. at 667:7-15. No evidence was  
20 introduced at trial that suggested that the Pintrips mark was selected to take advantage of  
21 Pinterest’s brand recognition. In fact, no evidence suggests that Pinterest had substantial brand  
22 recognition as of June 2011 that Pintrips would want to appropriate. In June of 2011, Pinterest  
23 was still an invitation-only website, id. at 667:16-24, with only approximately 500,000 unique  
24 monthly visitors (as represented to the Court by Pinterest’s demonstrative offered during closing  
25 argument). None of the articles submitted to the Court as evidence of Pinterest’s reputation had  
26 yet been published. See Pl. FFCL ¶¶ 31-35. In short, Pinterest simply has not offered evidence to  
27 support its theory. Instead, the evidence was clear that the name Pintrips was chosen because it  
28 was the best option to come out of the three-day workshop, which Mr. Raiteri conceived without

1 any knowledge of Pinterest’s existence. Mr. Raiteri registered several Pintrips domain names just  
2 five days later. See Tr. at 658:3-15; TX1107.

3 Pinterest’s contention that Pintrips was still deciding between the names “Pintrips” and  
4 “Goodr” late into 2011 misconstrues the evidence introduced at trial. As Mr. Raiteri explained,  
5 Pintrips and Goodr were conceived as different products. Tr. at 645:2-19. One would provide a  
6 service to travelers and another would amass the traveler data for later use. Id. (explaining that the  
7 information gathered from the first product could be used by the second business “to establish a  
8 dynamic pricing algorithm and market for airlines”); see also id. at 461:14-19 (Mr. Gotlieb  
9 explaining that the second product could, “based on the knowledge of that specific user, behavior  
10 and whatnot, recommend, you know, when to take a cab to the airport, which flight they would  
11 take, and which airline, and arrive in which airport. Basically, automate the entire process as a  
12 travel agent would, but through a website.”). Mr. Raiteri registered both the Pintrips and Goodr  
13 domains not as possible names for the same product, but as distinct names for two different  
14 products. See Tr. at 655:20-22 (“I registered the two domain names that we were going to use for  
15 the two different products. Pintrips and Goodr.”). Although Pinterest has identified emails in  
16 which the name Goodr was occasionally used to refer to the consumer-facing product, see TX120;  
17 TX122, the Court finds that the evidence, when viewed as a whole, most persuasively supports the  
18 interpretation that Pintrips intended to use both the Pintrips and Goodr names in some capacity  
19 within no more than a few days of the June 2011 workshop.

20 Accordingly, the facts found by the Court present an unusual case. On the one hand, the  
21 Court credits the testimony that Pintrips’ founders came up with the Pintrips name before they had  
22 ever heard of Pinterest. This finding would normally tilt this Sleekcraft factor in favor of the  
23 defendant. On the other hand, Pintrips learned of Pinterest within a day of coming up with the  
24 Pintrips name, and months before it ever started to use the Pintrips name in commerce. In  
25 addition, Pinterest presented evidence that Mr. Gotlieb—while not admitting that the Pintrips  
26 mark was selected with Pinterest in mind—was certainly not upset that his company’s name  
27 turned out to be similar to a much more well-known mark. See Tr. at 333:16-334:3 (“[I]t’s a  
28 coincidence. But it might play to our hand.”). These facts could fairly be read to favor the

1 plaintiff. The closest factual circumstance to this case appears to be found in the Ninth Circuit’s  
2 decision in *Brookfield Communications*, where the plaintiff demonstrated that the defendant had  
3 knowledge of the plaintiff’s senior mark when it launched its website, but not necessarily when it  
4 registered the allegedly infringing domain name. 174 F.3d at 1059. Even where, unlike here, the  
5 two marks (“MovieBuff” and “moviebuff.com”) were “nearly identical,” the Ninth Circuit held  
6 the intent factor of the Sleekcraft analysis “indeterminate.” *Id.* at 1058-59.

7 The Court finds the same conclusion warranted here. This Sleekcraft factor does not favor  
8 either party.

9 **8. Likelihood of Expansion of the Product Lines**

10 When there is “a strong possibility that either party may expand his business to compete  
11 with the other,” this factor weighs in favor of finding “that the present use is infringing.”  
12 *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 354 (internal quotation marks omitted). “When goods are closely related,  
13 any expansion is likely to result in direct competition.” *Id.* The Court must determine whether the  
14 allegedly infringing mark is “hindering the plaintiff’s expansion plans.” *Survivor Media*, 406  
15 F.3d at 634. A plaintiff must offer proof beyond mere speculation or generalized expansion goals.  
16 See *id.* (holding that mere “expressed interest in”—rather than “concrete evidence” of—expansion  
17 tilted factor in favor of defendant); *Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss*, 6 F.3d 1385, 1394 (9th  
18 Cir. 1993) (holding evidence of alleged intent to expand did not demonstrate that the parties would  
19 “compete with a similar product in the same market”). For example, in *Sleekcraft*, the Ninth  
20 Circuit held that this factor weighed in favor of the plaintiff where the evidence demonstrated that  
21 the parties—who each manufactured slightly different varieties of recreational boats—were  
22 diversifying their product lines and thus had the strong possibility of entering the other’s  
23 speedboat submarket in the future. See 599 F.2d at 354.

24 Pinterest has offered no persuasive evidence that could tilt this factor in its favor. As  
25 explained in greater detail in Section IV.A.2, Pinterest has no travel booking function; is not  
26 working on a travel booking function; and has no concrete plan to begin working on a travel  
27 booking function in the future. See Tr. at 88:14-15 (“We’ve discussed [expanding Pinterest’s  
28 products to facilitate booking travel], but we haven’t specifically set a date when we would start



1 working on something like that.”). Pinterest’s suggestion that it may, at some unknown time in  
2 the future, create a travel booking tool like Pintrips falls well short of the “strong possibility” of  
3 expansion a plaintiff is required to demonstrate in order for this factor to weigh in favor of a  
4 finding of confusion. See *Survivor Media*, 406 F.3d at 634 (“Although [the plaintiff] expressed  
5 interest in expanding his product line, mere speculation is not evidence.”).

6 Accordingly, this Sleekcraft factor weighs heavily in favor of Pintrips.

7 **9. Balancing of the Sleekcraft Factors**

8 The relative import of each Sleekcraft factor is case-dependent. In this case, most of the  
9 factors are neutral. Two factors favor Pinterest (the strength of the Pinterest mark and the  
10 similarity of the Pinterest and Pintrips marks), but those factors favor Pinterest by only a slight  
11 margin. On the other hand, the two factors that favor Pintrips (the similarity of the parties’  
12 services and likelihood of expansion) support Pintrips to a significantly greater degree. Having  
13 weighed these factors in light of the unique facts of this case, the Court finds that Pinterest has not  
14 met its burden to prove a likelihood of consumer confusion as to the Pinterest and Pintrips marks  
15 under the Sleekcraft test.

16 **B. “Pin” vs. “Pin”**

17 Pinterest next asserts that Pintrips infringes its “Pin” and “Pin it” marks through the use of  
18 the word “pin” on the Pintrips website’s pin button (and related content). As with the Pinterest  
19 mark, Pinterest’s “Pin” mark is registered and Pinterest’s use of that mark is senior to the  
20 existence of Pintrips.<sup>3</sup> However, the Court’s analysis of Pintrips’ use of the word pin is different  
21 than the analysis undertaken above. Pintrips argues that Pinterest’s infringement claim fails  
22 because Pintrips’ use of the word pin qualifies as “fair use” under the Lanham Act. See 15 U.S.C.  
23 § 1115(b)(4).

24 “If the trademark holder were allowed exclusive rights [to describe a person, a place or an  
25

26 <sup>3</sup> Pinterest does not have a federally registered trademark for its “Pin It” mark, and thus seeks to  
27 enforce its rights to the “Pin It” mark based on its common law trademark rights, if any. Pl. FFCL  
28 ¶¶ 14-18. The Court does not address whether Pinterest has a right to prohibit others’ use of the  
“Pin It” mark because it finds that Pintrips’ use of the term pin on its pin button qualifies as fair  
use, making the existence of Pinterest’s common law right to the term “Pin It” irrelevant.

1 attribute of a product], the language would be depleted in much the same way as if generic words  
2 were protectable.” *New Kids on the Block v. News Am. Pub., Inc.*, 971 F.2d 302, 306 (9th Cir.  
3 1992); see also *William R. Warner & Co. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 265 U.S. 526, 529 (1924) (“The use  
4 of a similar name by another to truthfully describe his own product does not constitute a legal or  
5 moral wrong, even if its effect be to cause the public to mistake the origin . . . of the product.”).  
6 Accordingly, trademark law recognizes a defense to liability where the defendant’s allegedly  
7 infringing use of the plaintiff’s mark is “a use, otherwise than as a mark, . . . of a term or device  
8 which is descriptive of and used fairly and in good faith only to describe the goods or services of  
9 such party, or their geographic origin.” 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4). In other words, “[t]he ‘fair-use’  
10 defense, in essence, forbids a trademark registrant to appropriate a descriptive term for his  
11 exclusive use and so prevent others from accurately describing a characteristic of their goods.”  
12 *New Kids*, 971 F.2d at 306 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

13 To prevail on a “fair use” defense, the alleged infringer is “not required to ‘negate  
14 confusion.’” *Fortune Dynamic*, 618 F.3d at 1039 (quoting *KP Permanent*, 543 U.S. at 118). “The  
15 common law’s tolerance of a certain degree of confusion on the part of consumers followed from  
16 the very fact that in cases like this one an originally descriptive term was selected to be used as a  
17 mark, not to mention the undesirability of allowing anyone to obtain a complete monopoly on use  
18 of a descriptive term simply by grabbing it first.” *KP Permanent*, 543 U.S. at 122; see also *id.* (“If  
19 any confusion results, that is a risk the plaintiff accepted when it decided to identify its product  
20 with a mark that uses a well known descriptive phrase.”) (internal quotation marks and citation  
21 omitted). However, the fact that a defendant may prevail on a fair use defense even where its use  
22 has the possibility to cause consumer confusion “does not foreclose the relevance of the extent of  
23 any likely consumer confusion in assessing whether a defendant’s use is objectively fair.” *Id.*  
24 How a “mark is categorized as a matter of conceptual strength has no bearing on whether [a  
25 defendant] is entitled to the fair use defense.” *Fortune Dynamic*, 618 F.3d at 1039.

26 Pintrips argues that its use of the word pin constitutes fair use because it uses that word (1)  
27 “otherwise than as a mark” and “only to describe [its] goods or services”; and (2) “in good faith.”  
28 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4). The Court finds that Pintrips prevails on its “fair use” defense for the

1 reasons set forth below.

2 **1. Pintrips Uses “Pin” to Describe a Feature of its Service, Not as a Mark**

3 The first and second factors under the fair use analysis consider whether Pintrips uses the  
4 word pin “otherwise than as a mark” and “only to describe [its] goods or services.” Id. The  
5 Lanham Act defines a trademark as something used “to identify and distinguish . . . goods . . . and  
6 to indicate the source of the goods.” Id. § 1127. “To determine whether a term is being used as a  
7 mark, we look for indications that the term is being used to ‘associate it with a manufacturer.’”  
8 Fortune Dynamic, 618 F.3d at 1040 (quoting Sierra On-Line, Inc. v. Phoenix Software, Inc., 739  
9 F.2d 1415, 1423 (9th Cir. 1984)). The Ninth Circuit has identified at least two factors that indicate  
10 whether a term is being used as a trademark: (1) “whether the term is used as a symbol to attract  
11 public attention, which can be demonstrated by the lettering, type style, size and visual placement  
12 and prominence of the challenged words”; and (2) “whether the allegedly infringing user  
13 undertook precautionary measures such as labeling or other devices designed to minimize the risk  
14 that the term will be understood in its trademark sense.” Id. (internal quotation marks and  
15 citations omitted).

16 In this case, Pintrips has provided overwhelming evidence that its use of the word pin is  
17 used to describe the common act of pinning—i.e., one of the services offered by the Pintrips  
18 website—and not to identify, distinguish, or indicate the source of those goods or services.  
19 Pintrips produced substantial evidence at trial that the terms pin and pinning have concrete and  
20 well-known meanings in both the computing field generally and the social media field specifically.  
21 The Court credits the un rebutted testimony of Pintrips’ expert Peter Kent, who explained that early  
22 software designers traditionally used real-world metaphors such as folders, files, desktops, and  
23 bulletin boards to describe new technological functions. Tr. at 544:20-545:21. Mr. Kent’s  
24 testimony and the exhibits accepted into evidence demonstrate that the words pin and pinning  
25 have been used for over twenty years to describe the act of attaching one virtual object to another,  
26 much like one would use a physical pin to attach an object to a cork board. See TX1040 (excerpt  
27 from book published in 1994, noting that messages sent to computer bulletin boards are “left  
28 ‘pinned up’ for future reference”); TX1041 (excerpt from book published in 1997, noting that

1 Internet users may post an email message to a bulletin board in much the same way that they  
2 would pin a note on a cork board).

3 Pintrips also presented evidence that some of the largest and most successful software and  
4 Internet companies have, for over a decade, used the word pin for this common and well-known  
5 purpose. For example, Microsoft’s 2001 operating system, Windows XP, provided its users the  
6 ability to pin certain virtual objects—such as programs, folders, or files—to the operating system’s  
7 start menu. See Tr. at 557:12-558:19; see also TX1053 (article dated January 17, 2007 describing  
8 the “pinned items list” feature of Windows XP). Mr. Kent further testified that Microsoft also  
9 included the pinning functionality in its Word, Access, Excel, and PowerPoint programs, as well  
10 as its web browsers. See Tr. at 559:3-25 (Internet Explorer 9 allowed users to pin web pages  
11 hosted by third parties to their web browser); id. at 568:9-569:11 (programs in Microsoft’s suite of  
12 office products each permitted users to pin files to a recent document list); see also TX1055;  
13 TX1076. In addition, Google offers its users a downloadable add-on toolbar for web browsers,  
14 which allows users to pin certain virtual buttons for easy access, Tr. at 571:14-573:6, and also  
15 included the pinning functionality in its Android smartphone and tablet operating system, id. at  
16 573:7-574:9. In short, the Court found Mr. Kent’s testimony (and the exhibits introduced during  
17 his testimony) to be credible and persuasive evidence that the word pin and the act of pinning are  
18 common and well-understood terms across virtually all major forms of computer technology  
19 purchased and used by the public.

20 Mr. Kent provided evidence that large social media websites similar to Pinterest use the  
21 term pin to describe the same functionality. For example, Facebook permits users to pin posts to a  
22 “group” and to pin messages, photos, and videos to each user’s personal Facebook “timeline.” Tr.  
23 at 590:1-592:3; TX1065; TX1068. Numerous media articles—many of which predate the genesis  
24 of Pinterest—report the terms pin and pinning as used in the same fashion by other companies.  
25 See TX1339 (“The UK’s largest retailer aims to revolutionise the way people shop online with an  
26 interactive desktop that . . . aims to replicate a typical family fridge door. . . . Users can . . . ‘pin’  
27 digital photos and messages to the screen[.]”); TX1340 (describing photo map that permits users  
28 to “share photos from your adventures around the globe by pinning them to a map for friends to

1 click through”); TX1043 (discussing new Microsoft publishing system that would allow users to  
2 “lock down a Montage in time by pinning news stories, photos, videos, and more to a page”).<sup>4</sup> In  
3 short, the words pin and pinning are regularly used to describe a particular, well-known, and  
4 decades-old computer operation.

5 Accordingly, Pintrips’ pin button must be viewed in light of the long and pervasive use of  
6 similar pinning features and buttons employed by all manner of software and Internet companies.  
7 With that context in mind, no reasonable weighing of the evidence presented at trial could lead to  
8 the conclusion that Pintrips used the term pin as a way to identify, distinguish, or indicate the  
9 source of its goods or services. In fact, any attempt to distinguish Pintrips by use of its pin button  
10 would be futile, given that the words pin and pinning have been used to describe the same feature  
11 by many of the most popular and well-known software and Internet products since well before  
12 Pintrips’ creation. The home page of the Pintrips website reinforces this interpretation. The  
13 Pintrips website expressly describes its pin button as a feature of the website that permits users to  
14 perform the same well-known pinning function offered by the numerous software products and  
15 Internet websites discussed above. See TX240 (“Pin any flight from any site”); *id.* (“Use the ‘Pin’  
16 Button to save flights from any travel site”); *id.* (“With the Pintrips Pin Button, you can shop  
17 around for flights and pin the ones you want to save into a personal trip board”). The Court finds  
18 that these repeated descriptions, which alert the user that the term pin is being used to describe an  
19 aspect of the Pintrips service (as opposed to being used as a mark), strongly militate against a  
20 finding that Pintrips uses pin as a mark. See *Fortune Dynamic*, 618 F.3d at 1040 (noting that  
21 whether the alleged infringer used “precautionary measures such as labeling or other devices  
22 designed to minimize the risk that the term will be understood in its trademark sense” is relevant  
23

---

24 <sup>4</sup> The Court does not consider these news sources for the truth of the matter asserted—i.e., that the  
25 products described in these articles existed or contained the functionality discussed. Instead, the  
26 Court considers these articles for the non-hearsay purpose of how the media (as a stand-in for the  
27 public) uses the term at issue in the relevant context. See *Premier Nutrition, Inc. v. Organic Food*  
28 *Bar, Inc.*, No. 06-cv-00827-AG, 2008 WL 1913163, at \*7 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2008) (“None of the  
statements in the articles are used to prove the truth of the matter asserted. Plaintiff refers to the  
articles merely to show the use of the term ‘organic food bar’ by the public.”) (citation omitted),  
*aff’d*, 327 F. App’x 723 (9th Cir. 2009).

1 to fair use analysis).

2 Although not precedential, the Ninth Circuit’s persuasive reasoning in the unpublished  
3 case *Webceleb, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 554 F. App’x 606 (9th Cir. 2014), confirms the  
4 Court’s conclusion.<sup>5</sup> In *Webceleb*, the plaintiff sued several defendants under the Lanham Act and  
5 California’s Unfair Competition Law for their allegedly infringing use of the plaintiff’s “web  
6 celeb” mark. The Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court’s order granting summary judgment to  
7 the defendants, holding that no reasonable jury could find that the defendants used the term “web  
8 celeb” as a source identifier. *Webceleb*, 554 F. App’x at 607. Instead, the Court found that each  
9 of the defendants’ allegedly infringing uses used the term in its “common parlance” as a  
10 description of “Internet celebrities.” *Id.* Of particular significance to this case, the Court found  
11 that “[t]he use of ‘web celeb’ *as part of a stylized ‘button’* and a headline on defendants’ online  
12 magazine is also not a trademark use.” *Id.* (emphasis added). Instead, “[w]eb celeb’ headlined  
13 stories about Internet celebrities and the ‘Favorite Web Celeb’ contest, much like the stylized  
14 ‘*AWW*’ button denoted cute or ‘*aww*’-inspiring content.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

15 Similar to the “web celeb” button used by the defendants in *Webceleb*, Pintrips took a  
16 word with a well-known definition (i.e., the act of attaching one virtual object to another) and  
17 placed it on a button to inform users that the button, once clicked, would perform that commonly-  
18 understood operation. In fact, this case presents an easier question than the “web celeb” button  
19 addressed by the Ninth Circuit because (1) unlike a “web celeb” button, which ostensibly could  
20 perform any number of operations, the word pin describes exactly what the button does; and (2)  
21 numerous other companies have used similar buttons and features to perform the same pinning  
22 feature for decades. In short, much like the words “save” and “print”—which are placed on  
23 buttons, icons, and drop-down menus in all manner of computer programs and websites—the word  
24 pin describes an operation that will be performed once clicked. Under 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4),  
25 Pinterest cannot prohibit other companies from using the word pin to describe that well-known  
26 operation, which is exactly how the evidence demonstrates that Pintrips uses the word pin here.

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>5</sup> Unpublished Ninth Circuit decisions may be considered for their persuasive value. See *Rounds v. Comm’r Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 795 F.3d 1177, 1185 (9th Cir. 2015)

1           The Court finds Pinterest’s arguments to the contrary unpersuasive. First, Pinterest argues  
2 that “[u]nlike a print button, the very purpose of the word ‘pin’ in this context is to associate the  
3 button in a user’s mind with a unique source: Pintrips. Otherwise, Pintrips’ ‘pin’ button would not  
4 convey to users which website the ‘pinned’ content would appear on.” Pl. Reply Br. at 14.  
5 Pinterest’s brief cites no evidence introduced at trial that plausibly supports this argument, and the  
6 Court’s review of the trial testimony and exhibits accepted into evidence unearthed none. Instead,  
7 the evidence presented during trial establishes the contrary. As described above, numerous other  
8 software products and Internet websites include a pinning function, which allows its users to  
9 attach certain virtual objects to a particular area on the user interface. In other words, the purpose  
10 of the word pin on a pin button is not necessarily to associate the button with its source.  
11 Facebook, Google, and Windows all permit users to pin virtual objects, and because they all use  
12 the same word to identify the pinning operation, that word could not plausibly serve to identify  
13 their unique brand. Instead, and exactly like the “print” button Pinterest attempts to distinguish,  
14 the Pintrips pin button simply identifies the well-known operation that the button will perform if  
15 clicked.

16           Pinterest’s argument also ignores that, in order for the Pintrips pin button to even appear  
17 on a third-party website, a consumer must have already (1) created an account at  
18 www.pintrips.com and (2) downloaded Pintrips’ browser extension. See Tr. at 465:20-466:13. In  
19 other words, consumers who see Pintrips’ pin button on third-party websites already know “which  
20 website the ‘pinned’ content would appear on,” Pl. Reply Br. at 14, because they had to take  
21 several affirmative steps through the Pintrips website in order for that button to appear in the first  
22 place.

23           Second, Pinterest argues that “the button’s stylized nature—with multiple colors and a pin  
24 icon matching the pin icon in the Pintrips logo—further the conclusion that it is intended to  
25 attract attention and indicate source, rather than merely describe Pintrips’ services.” Id. at 14. The  
26 Court disagrees. As an initial matter, the Court is guided by the Ninth Circuit’s decision in  
27 Webceleb, which found that even a “stylized ‘button’” bearing the words “web celeb” did not  
28 amount to trademark use. 554 F. App’x at 607. Moreover, what little “styling” is present on the

1 button (most prominently, the image of a pin) actually reinforces the non-trademark purpose of the  
2 pin, i.e., that it will perform the pinning operation if clicked. Accordingly, much like the image of  
3 a printer next to a print button or the image of a (now archaic) floppy disk next to a save button,  
4 the Court does not consider the styling of Pintrips’ pin button to support an inference that the word  
5 pin will be seen as a mark. If anything, the styling of the button cuts against Pinterest. When  
6 combined with the fact that multiple statements on the Pintrips homepage expressly inform the  
7 user that the button will perform a particular service offered by Pintrips, the Court find no basis  
8 for Pinterest’s argument that the button’s styling demonstrates that the pin button is being used as  
9 a mark.

10 Third, Pinterest argues that “[t]he existence of numerous alternatives for labeling content  
11 creation buttons like Pinterest’s Pin It and Pintrips’ ‘pin’ buttons confirms that Pintrips’ use of  
12 ‘pin’ was not descriptive.” Pl. Reply Br. at 15. But the Fortune Dynamic case cited by Pinterest  
13 does not support that broad statement. In Fortune Dynamic, the Court found that the word  
14 “delicious” was more suggestive than descriptive because the defendant had a number of  
15 alternative words that could adequately capture its goal of providing a “playful self-descriptor” on  
16 the front of its tank top. 618 F.3d at 1042. The Ninth Circuit’s observation does not mean that  
17 any word with a synonym must be suggestive. For example, the term “copy and paste” is no less  
18 descriptive because other words, such as “reproduce and insert,” could also be used to accurately  
19 describe the same computer operation. In fact, Pinterest’s proposal that Pintrips use an alternative  
20 word for pin similar to “tweet,” “stumble” or “luv”—none of which are descriptive terms of the  
21 kind contemplated by 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4)—suggests that Pinterest’s real argument is that  
22 Pintrips does not have a right to use the common descriptive word pin so long as it could create its  
23 own branded non-descriptive word as a stand-in. That position is flatly inconsistent with 15  
24 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4). Pintrips may avail itself of the fair use defense whether or not it could have  
25 dreamed up a non-descriptive word to use in place of pin.

26 Finally, Pinterest attempts to distinguish its use of the word pin from the common usage  
27 discussed above. According to Pinterest, when its website refers to the word pin as a noun, it is  
28 not talking about the method of affixing a virtual object in place; it is actually talking about the



1 virtual object affixed. See Pl. Br. at 18 (“Pinterest uses PIN as a noun to refer to the entire piece of  
2 content that a user has created by importing content from another site, editing, captioning it, and  
3 choosing to place it on a specific board on Pinterest.”). Pin as a verb, for its part, is the process of  
4 creating that piece of digital content on Pinterest. Id. (“Pinterest uses PIN as a verb to refer to the  
5 process of creating a Pin on Pinterest.”). Pinterest characterizes these uses as “non-standard,” id.,  
6 going as far as to say that it “pioneered the use of PIN-formative terms in the context of social  
7 media and bookmarking.” Dkt. No. 134 (Second Amended Complaint) ¶ 9.

8 As an initial matter, the Court is not convinced that, to the extent Pinterest’s use of the  
9 word pin is non-standard, that non-standard use is different in a way that would affect the Court’s  
10 analysis. In essence, Pinterest’s “pioneering” linguistic change is identical to that already applied  
11 to many common terms used in software programs and Internet websites. For example, “print”  
12 can mean both the act of printing a document, as well as the document printed (i.e., a “print” or a  
13 “printout”). Similarly, “copy” is both the act of copying and the document copied, and “post” is  
14 both the act of posting and the picture or text posted. The transition of the word pin from the act  
15 of attaching a virtual object to the virtual object pinned is not exactly a revolutionary development.  
16 More important, Pinterest has provided no authority suggesting that the first company to adopt  
17 such a minor linguistic change to a purely descriptive term is provided the right to exclude all  
18 others from using that same description.

19 However, the Court need not reach this question, because Pinterest has not provided  
20 evidence that Pintrips uses the term pin in the same, purportedly novel, way that Pinterest does.  
21 Instead, the evidence demonstrates that Pintrips uses the term pin in the exact same way as  
22 Microsoft, Facebook, and the many other companies that have come before it: as a verb for  
23 attaching one virtual object to another. The Pintrips website is explicit that the virtual object  
24 pinned by the Pintrips pin button is a flight. The home page of the Pintrips website alone states  
25 this three times. See TX240 (“Pin any flight from any site”) (emphasis added); id. (“Use the ‘Pin’  
26 Button to save flights from any travel site”) (emphasis added); id. (“With the Pintrips Pin Button,  
27 you can shop around for flights and pin the ones you want to save into a personal trip board”)  
28 (emphasis added). Even the trial testimony cited by Pinterest in support of its position

1 demonstrates that Pintrips uses the word pin for the well-known meaning described above:

2 Q. Would you please describe for the Court what we are looking at  
3 here.

4 A. This is basically Step 2 which is, again, the Pintrips pin button.  
5 And we're telling -- we're showing them what the pin button looks  
6 like, and saying this is -- pin any flight from any site. And then call  
7 to action, which is again the pin button.

8 Tr. at 465:20-466:1; Pl. FFCL ¶ 120 (citing same).

9 Q. Would you please, with your finger, circle where your pin button  
10 is injected?

11 A. (Indicating) It's a little bit off, sorry. Trying to -- mine has  
12 shifted.

13 Q. So that's where your pin button is injected?

14 A. Yes. And as we scroll down, it's injected next to each itinerary.

15 [ . . . ]

16 Q. So let's pick a flight, then. All right? I'll start with the first one,  
17 the Delta flight, 9:15 p.m. Do you see that?

18 A. Yes, I do.

19 Q. Let's click on pin button, and go to the next page.

20 [ . . . ]

21 Q. Now, what are we seeing here?

22 A. So we see a couple of things. The first one is the pin button  
23 turned into a pinned button. Show that an action was taken, and that  
24 that specific itinerary has been pinned to the Pintrips board that was  
25 created.

26 Tr. at 471:23-472:23; Pl. FFCL ¶ 120 (citing same).

27 Pintrips simply does not use the word pin as a noun to refer "to the entire piece of content  
28 that a user has created by importing content from another site, editing, captioning it, and choosing  
to place it on a specific board." Pl. Br. at 18. Pinterest's observation that less prominent portions  
of the Pintrips website use pin as a noun—making it theoretically ambiguous as to whether  
Pintrips is referring to a piece of digital content in the way Pinterest supposedly does—is not  
convincing given the multiple unequivocal statements on the Pintrips home page. Those

1 statements are flatly inconsistent with Pinterest’s definition. Accordingly, even assuming that  
2 Pinterest’s slightly modified use of the word pin entitles it to prevent others from also describing  
3 digital content as a pin (an argument the Court views skeptically), the Court finds that Pintrips has  
4 not done so here.

5 After weighing the evidence presented at trial and considering the arguments made by the  
6 parties, the Court concludes that Pintrips satisfies the first two elements of the fair use analysis in  
7 that it uses the term pin “otherwise than as a mark” and “only to describe [its] goods or services.”  
8 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4).

9 **2. Pintrips Exercised Good Faith**

10 The last factor of the fair use defense asks whether the defendant has exercised “good  
11 faith.” 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4). In analyzing this factor, courts are to consider “whether defendant  
12 in adopting its mark intended to capitalize on plaintiff’s good will.” *Fortune Dynamic*, 618 F.3d at  
13 1043 (quoting *EMI Catalogue P’ship v. Hill, Holliday, Connors, Cosmopulos Inc.*, 228 F.3d 56,  
14 66 (2d Cir. 2000)); see also *id.* (observing this factor “involves the same issues as the intent factor  
15 in the likelihood of confusion analysis”). Here, Pinterest argues that “Pintrips adopted the Pintrips  
16 name and ‘pin’ button with the specific intent of piggybacking off Pinterest’s goodwill and  
17 reputation in the marketplace.” Pl. Reply Br. at 14.

18 However, the evidence cited by Pinterest does not support that conclusion. Each of the  
19 trial testimony excerpts and emails referenced in paragraph 89 of Pinterest’s findings of fact and  
20 conclusions of law concern the choice of the Pintrips mark, not the use of the word pin on the  
21 Pintrips pin button. See Pl. FFCL ¶ 89. The Court also finds irrelevant the allegation that,  
22 according to Pinterest, Pintrips was considering changing its pin button to a pin it button. See *id.*  
23 ¶ 91 (citing emails in which Pintrips executives considered “mockups” of a “pin it” button); but  
24 see Tr. at 190:4-7 (“We never asked [the person creating the mockups] to write ‘pin it’ on it. We  
25 just told him we wanted to do a visual redesign of our buttons. And it was the ones that he created  
26 said ‘pin it’ on it. We never had any intentions of changing it to ‘pin it.’”). Whether Pintrips may  
27 have intended (or even currently intends) to transition from a pin button to a pin it button simply  
28 does not factor into the analysis of whether Pintrips uses the term pin on its current button in good



1 U.S. 418, 431 (2003). Accordingly, the FTDA extends dilution protection only to those whose  
2 mark is a “household name.” *Nissan Motor Co. v. Nissan Comput. Corp.*, 378 F.3d 1002, 1011  
3 (9th Cir. 2004) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “For example, Tylenol  
4 snowboards, Netscape sex shops and Harry Potter dry cleaners would all weaken the commercial  
5 magnetism of these marks and diminish their ability to evoke their original associations. These  
6 uses dilute the selling power of these trademarks by blurring their uniqueness and singularity,  
7 and/or by tarnishing them with negative associations.” *Mattel, Inc. v. MCA Records, Inc.*, 296  
8 F.3d 894, 903 (9th Cir. 2002) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

9 While Pinterest has brought dilution claims under both federal and California state law, the  
10 analysis under each is the same. See *Jada Toys, Inc. v. Mattel, Inc.*, 518 F.3d 628, 634 (9th Cir.  
11 2008). In order to prevail on its dilution claims, Pinterest must show that “(1) the mark is famous  
12 and distinctive; (2) the defendant is making use of the mark in commerce; (3) the defendant’s use  
13 began after the mark became famous; and (4) the defendant’s use of the mark is likely to cause  
14 dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment.” *Id.* Although neither federal nor California state  
15 law requires a showing of competition or likelihood of confusion to succeed on a dilution claim,  
16 the plaintiff must establish that “the mark used by the alleged diluter [is] identical, or nearly  
17 identical, to the protected mark” in order to satisfy the second element of the dilution analysis. *Id.*  
18 (quoting *Thane Int’l, Inc. v. Trek Bicycle Corp.*, 305 F.3d 894, 905 (9th Cir. 2002)). Whether  
19 dilution by blurring is likely is assessed with reference to six factors provided by statute. See 15  
20 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B).

21 However, the Court need not engage in the full dilution analysis because it finds that—  
22 even assuming Pintrips’ use of the words Pintrips and pin was likely to cause dilution—Pinterest  
23 has not established that its own marks were famous by the time Pintrips first made use of its marks  
24 in commerce.

### 25 **1. Pintrips First Used its Name in Commerce by October of 2011**

26 In order to prevail on a claim of trademark dilution, the plaintiff must establish that its  
27 mark was famous when the defendant first began to use the mark in commerce. The Ninth Circuit  
28 has interpreted this portion of Section 1125 to mean any use of the mark in commerce by the

1 defendant, not necessarily the particular use being challenged in the litigation. See Nissan, 378  
2 F.3d at 1012-13. “If it were otherwise, and first use for purposes of § 1125(c) turned on whatever  
3 use the mark’s owner finds particularly objectionable, [o]wners of famous marks would have the  
4 authority to decide when an allegedly diluting use was objectionable, regardless of when the party  
5 accused of diluting first began to use the mark.” Id. (quoting *The Network Network v. CBS Inc.*,  
6 No. 98-cv-01349-NM, 2000 WL 362016, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 18, 2000)). To fix the date by  
7 which the plaintiff must demonstrate fame, the defendant’s use of the challenged mark in  
8 commerce need not be “substantial or cover a wide geographic area[.]” Id. at 1012 (quoting *Enter.*  
9 *Rent-A-Car Co. v. Advantage Rent-A-Car, Inc.*, 330 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003)).

10 In this case, the parties proposed different dates by which Pinterest should be required to  
11 demonstrate fame: September 2011 and November 2012. Pintrips argues that September 2011 is  
12 the appropriate date because that is when it promoted Pintrips to the public as the name of the  
13 company’s product by attending a trade show where a Pintrips banner was displayed and where  
14 fliers and product demos were distributed. See Def. Reply Br. at 10. Pinterest suggests November  
15 2012, when Pintrips “officially switched from a small test group to a service actually offered to the  
16 public.” Pl. Br. at 11.

17 The Court largely agrees with Pintrips, although the Court believes the appropriate date is  
18 October 2011, not September 2011. In September 2011, Pintrips employees attended a travel-  
19 related trade show and promoted their fledgling company under the Pintrips name. Mr. Gotlieb  
20 testified that he personally picked up the “Pintrips” banner used at that trade show from the print  
21 shop. Tr. at 223:20-25. However, because no Pintrips employee who attended that trade show  
22 testified at trial, the Court was not presented with evidence concerning the number of trade show  
23 attendees or the promotional activities actually undertaken by Pintrips. While Pintrips’ activities  
24 at the September 2011 trade show may very well have been sufficient to establish commercial use  
25 of the Pintrips mark by themselves, the Court cannot make that conclusion on the evidence  
26 presented at trial.

27 However, other evidence presented at trial establishes that Pintrips used its name in  
28 commerce shortly after that trade show. Within six weeks of Pintrips’ June 2011 strategy meeting,

1 Pintrips had created a “flash” website launch page with its logo and an invitation for visitors to  
2 submit their email address to receive notifications from Pintrips. See *id.* at 669:8-25. Pintrips  
3 collected 300-400 email addresses through its website until, in October of 2011, it “sent out emails  
4 to ask people to install the Chrome extension.” *Id.* at 670:7-12. Mr. Raiteri estimated that, when  
5 combined with the employees’ personal email lists, Pintrips sent approximately 5,000 email  
6 invitations for people to install and use the Pintrips product. See *id.* at 670:5-19. This activity  
7 constitutes use of the mark in commerce, especially considering the Ninth Circuit’s admonition  
8 that any use of the mark in commerce, regardless of whether that use is “substantial or cover[s] a  
9 wide geographic area,” is sufficient to set the date in time at which the plaintiff must demonstrate  
10 fame. *Nissan*, 378 F.3d at 1012 (citation omitted).

11 This level of commercial activity is very different than the facts at issue in *RIPL Corp. v.*  
12 *Google Inc.*, which Pinterest cites in support of its proposed November 2012 date. No. 12-cv-  
13 02050-RSM, 2014 WL 1350810 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 3, 2014). As an initial matter, the question  
14 addressed by the Western District of Washington in *RIPL* was whether the plaintiff had abandoned  
15 its mark, not when a defendant had used the allegedly diluting mark in commerce for the first  
16 time. *Id.* at \*3-7. But even assuming that the abandonment inquiry conducted in *RIPL* is  
17 equivalent to the question of first commercial use facing this Court, the facts of *RIPL* are easily  
18 distinguishable. In *RIPL*, the court found that after the launch of the plaintiff’s product in 2007,  
19 the plaintiff provided “no evidence of commercial activity, no evidence that the website, service,  
20 or mark was sufficiently public to create an association between the mark and its owner, and no  
21 evidence of marketing activity beyond maintaining the website past 2007.” *Id.* at \*5. In contrast,  
22 Pintrips offered un rebutted testimony that it established a website in July or August of 2011, that it  
23 promoted its product at a trade show in September 2011, and that it affirmatively invited  
24 thousands of people to download and actually use its product in October of 2011. While Pintrips’  
25 beta launch in November of 2012 clearly expanded the scope of its commercial activities, it was  
26 not the first time that it used the Pintrips mark in commerce.

27 Accordingly, the Court finds that Pintrips first used its marks by no later than October of  
28 2011. In order to prevail on its dilution claim, Pinterest must demonstrate that its marks were

1 famous by that date.

2 **2. Pinterest Was Not Famous by October 2011 (or by November 2012)**

3 A “famous” mark is one that “is widely recognized by the general consuming public of the  
4 United States as a designation of source of the goods or services of the mark’s owner.” 15 U.S.C.  
5 § 1125(c)(2)(A). In order to qualify as “famous,” the asserted mark must have “such powerful  
6 consumer associations that even non-competing uses can impinge on their value.” *Avery*  
7 *Dennison Corp. v. Sumpton*, 189 F.3d 868, 875 (9th Cir. 1999). “[T]he FTDA extends dilution  
8 protection only to those whose mark is a household name.” *Nissan*, 378 F.3d at 1011 (internal  
9 quotation marks and citation omitted); see also *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, No. 11-cv-  
10 01846-LHK, 2012 WL 2571719, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2012) (“The Ninth Circuit has  
11 recognized that fame requires a high standard of consumer awareness beyond the trademark  
12 owner’s specific market—the mark should be a ‘household name’ or ‘part of the collective  
13 national consciousness.’”) (citation omitted). “[T]o meet the ‘famousness’ element of protection  
14 under the dilution statutes, ‘a mark [must] be truly prominent and renowned.’” *Avery*, 189 F.3d at  
15 875 (citation omitted).

16 In determining whether a mark is famous, a court may consider “all relevant factors,”  
17 including: (1) “[t]he duration, extent, and geographic reach of advertising and publicity of the  
18 mark”; (2) “[t]he amount, volume, and geographic extent of sales of goods or services offered  
19 under the mark”; (3) “[t]he extent of actual recognition of the mark”; and (4) whether the mark is  
20 registered. 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(A)(i)-(iv). This is a high standard. The Ninth Circuit has  
21 routinely found even very old and commercially successful marks insufficiently famous under  
22 § 1125(c). See, e.g., *Avery*, 189 F.3d at 876-77 (finding *Avery* and *Dennison* marks not famous  
23 despite decades of use, \$3 billion in annual sales, and \$5 million in advertising); *Fruit of the*  
24 *Loom, Inc., v. Girouard*, 994 F.2d 1359, 1362 (9th Cir.1993) (finding that “fruit” mark “is far  
25 from being in the class” of “Tiffany,” “Polaroid,” “Rolls Royce,” “Kodak,” “Century 21,” and  
26 “Oscar” marks).

27 Pinterest has provided no persuasive evidence that any of its marks were famous by  
28 October of 2011. Virtually all of the news articles offered by Pinterest were published after that



1 date, and are thus irrelevant. See, e.g., Pl. FFCL ¶¶ 29-35 (citing news articles primarily from late  
2 2011 and 2012). Pinterest had approximately 1 million monthly users by August of 2011 (less  
3 than half a percent of the United States population), see Tr. at 92:1-4, and, according to a Pinterest  
4 demonstrative summarizing data included in a Pinterest report, just less than 5 million monthly  
5 users by November 2011 (just under two percent of the United States population). Neither figure  
6 comes close to suggesting that Pinterest had attained the level of prominence necessary for a brand  
7 to become part of the collective national consciousness. In fact, the Pinterest website was still  
8 operating as a closed, invitation-only website just several months before. See Tr. at 667:19-24  
9 (“[In June of 2011] it was still in closed beta, so all I could do was wait for an invitation. I think  
10 they had a video describing how it worked that you could see. But . . . you couldn’t use the site  
11 unless you were invited.”). In addition, the “Pinterest” mark was not even registered until May of  
12 2012. See TX23. No reasonable weighing of these facts could satisfy the first element of the  
13 dilution analysis.

14 Moreover, Pinterest’s dilution claim would fail on the same ground even were the Court to  
15 adopt Pinterest’s proposed November 2012 date. Pinterest presented four types of evidence in  
16 support of its position: (1) contemporaneous news articles discussing Pinterest; (2) the volume of  
17 traffic on its website; (3) a survey conducted by a consulting service in July of 2012; and (4) the  
18 registration of its “Pinterest” mark. The Court will address each category in turn.

19 First, Pinterest presented approximately a dozen news articles published before November  
20 of 2012 that discuss Pinterest and its rapid growth. See Pl. FFCL ¶¶ 29-35. These articles were  
21 published by prominent newspapers and media outlets, including The New York Times, The Wall  
22 Street Journal, The Los Angeles Times, and Fortune. Id. ¶ 31. Of course, receiving publicity from  
23 the national media raises the awareness of a brand. However, it is clear from the content of these  
24 articles that Pinterest had not yet achieved the level of prominence necessary for a finding of fame  
25 at the time of publication. For example, many of the articles begin with a description of what  
26 Pinterest is and what it does, which would be unnecessary (or even baffling) for famous brands  
27 like Coca-Cola or Barbie. See, e.g., TX160 (CNET article beginning with the sentence “Pinterest,  
28 an invitation-only site that describes itself as a pinboard to organize and share things you love, is

1 growing at a phenomenal pace.”); TX173 (Wall Street Journal article which begins by describing  
2 Pinterest as “the online scrapbooking website that has become a Silicon Valley darling because of  
3 its rapid user growth”). Other articles commented on how, until extremely recently, even local  
4 technology media barely knew of Pinterest’s existence. See TX168 (CNN article observing that  
5 “[t]he web-based ‘pinboard,’ which launched almost two years ago, barely got a mention on  
6 Silicon Valley news sites until six months ago, when early adopters suddenly realized that a site  
7 with millions of monthly users had sprung up almost unnoticed by the tech press”).

8 In short, these articles demonstrate that Pinterest had enjoyed rapid (and even  
9 unprecedented) growth in its user base in a very short period of time, which made the relatively  
10 new company a newsworthy subject for a number of publications. These articles also demonstrate  
11 that the articles’ authors were not sure that their readership would know what Pinterest was  
12 without immediate explanation. A dozen (or even a few dozen) articles commenting on the  
13 newsworthy growth of a website does not suggest that the website has attained the level of fame  
14 necessary to prevail on a dilution claim. See *Fruit of the Loom*, 994 F.2d at 1363 (“We need not  
15 decide the exact degree of strength a protectable mark must reach, but it must at least be mature  
16 and well-known.”) (emphasis added). In fact, the tenor of the articles submitted strongly suggests  
17 the opposite.

18 Second, Pinterest presented evidence that its website drew 25 million monthly active users  
19 by October of 2012, see Pl. Br. at 12, which is about 8% of the U.S. population. However, the  
20 number of monthly users drawn by Pinterest in late 2012 is only a fraction of the number drawn  
21 by Yelp, the website at issue in the only case Pinterest cites in which a court referred to the  
22 number of monthly users as supporting a finding of fame. See *Yelp Inc. v. Catron*, 70 F. Supp. 3d  
23 1082, 1096 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (“The reach of publicity of the Yelp Marks is extensive, as the Yelp  
24 Site averaged 102 million monthly unique visitors between January and March 2013.”) (emphasis  
25 added).

26 Third, Pinterest introduced a survey conducted in July of 2012, which found that 75% of  
27 the survey respondents recognized the name Pinterest. See TX133. However, Pinterest did not  
28 call a witness with personal knowledge of how the survey was conducted or from where its pool of

1 survey respondents was drawn. Accordingly, no testimony at trial established that the pool of  
2 survey respondents was drawn from the general public as opposed to a sub-group of individuals  
3 predisposed to be familiar with Pinterest. See Avery, 189 F.3d at 879 (rejecting the findings of  
4 three market research surveys where respondents were drawn from sub-groups of the general  
5 population more likely to be familiar with the plaintiff’s marks). In fact, there is a high likelihood  
6 that the survey pool was not drawn from the general public, given that it was comprised of a  
7 disproportionate percentage of female vs. male respondents: out of 837 interviews, 70% of  
8 respondents were female and 30% male. See TX133 at PIN00017216. In addition, all  
9 respondents to the survey reported spending at least 90 minutes online in an average day for  
10 personal purposes alone, not including any time spent on work matters. *Id.* In short, Pinterest has  
11 not established that the July 2012 survey was conducted with a pool of respondents drawn from  
12 the general public, and, accordingly, the Court cannot consider its findings as evidence that the  
13 general public was familiar with Pinterest’s marks.

14 Fourth, the Court agrees with Pinterest that the fact that its Pinterest mark was registered  
15 before November 2012—albeit only six months before—weighs slightly in favor of a finding of  
16 fame. But see Avery, 189 F.3d at 876 (“To be capable of being diluted, a mark must have a degree  
17 of distinctiveness and ‘strength’ beyond that needed to serve as a trademark.”) (citations omitted).

18 When these facts are weighed together, it is clear that Pinterest had not attained the status  
19 of a household name by November of 2012. The facts presented at trial suggest that Pinterest was  
20 a relatively new company that had received favorable media attention in response to its early  
21 growth. However, the number of Pinterest’s monthly users in November of 2012 is dwarfed by  
22 the number of monthly users of Yelp, the company at issue in the only case cited by Pinterest on  
23 this point. That a sizeable (but still relatively small) sliver of the United States population used  
24 Pinterest in November of 2012 does not, without more, suggest that non-users would be familiar  
25 with its services. See Apple, 2012 WL 2571719 at \*7 (“The Ninth Circuit has recognized that  
26 fame requires a high standard of consumer awareness beyond the trademark owner’s specific  
27 market—the mark should be a ‘household name’ or ‘part of the collective national  
28 consciousness.’”) (citation omitted). Pinterest simply has not demonstrated the extraordinarily


1 high level of public awareness that a mark must reach in order to qualify as famous under the  
2 FTDA. See Nissan, 378 F.3d at 1014 (finding material disputed issue of fact regarding whether  
3 fame existed where the plaintiff introduced evidence of \$898 million in sales over a five year  
4 period and 65% consumer recognition); see also 4 McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair  
5 Competition § 24:106 (4th ed.) (recommending a high standard for fame, such as at least 75%  
6 consumer recognition in a survey response). Accordingly, even if November 2012 were the  
7 appropriate date by which to measure fame, Pinterest’s dilution claim still would fail.

8 **V. CONCLUSION**

9 For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds in favor of Pintrips on all causes of action  
10 asserted by Pinterest in its Second Amended Complaint. The Court does not reach Pintrips’  
11 Counterclaims, as Pintrips has represented that invalidation of Pinterest’s “Pin” marks would only  
12 be necessary if Pintrips’ marks were interpreted to infringe. Def. Br. at 24. The Clerk shall  
13 terminate all pending motions, enter judgment, and close the file.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: 10/21/2015

16   
17 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
18 United States District Judge