Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. v. Akanoc Solutions, Inc. et al.

Doc. 161 Att. 11

## JURY INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

## CONTRIBUTORY TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

A "likelihood" of confusion requires that the confusion be probable, not simply a possibility. The allegedly infringing conduct must be likely to confound an appreciable number of reasonably prudent purchasers exercising ordinary care.

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

Murray v. Cable Nat. Broadcasting Co., 86 F.3d 858 (9th Cir.1996) ("A likelihood of confusion exists when a consumer viewing a service mark is likely to purchase the services under a mistaken belief that the services are, or associated with, the services of another provider. [citing Rodeo Collection, Ltd. v. West Seventh, 812 F.2d 1215, 1217 (9th Cir.1987)]. The confusion must "be probable, not simply a possibility.")

Entrepreneur Media, Inc. v. Smith, 279 F.3d 1135, 1151 (9th Cir.2002) ("To constitute trademark

infringement, use of a mark must be likely to confuse an appreciable number of people as to the source of the product. [citing Int'l Ass'n. of Machinists and Aerospace Workers v. Winship Green Nursing Ctr., 103 F.3d 196, 201 (1st Cir.1996)] [T]he law has long demanded a showing that the allegedly infringing conduct carries with it a likelihood of confounding an appreciable number of reasonably prudent purchasers exercising ordinary care." [italics in original])