

TO: Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK
---	--

In Compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been filed in the U.S. District Court Oregon on the following Patents or Trademarks:

DOCKET NO. 1:08-cv-3085-CL	DATE FILED 8/15/2008	U.S. DISTRICT COURT Oregon
PLAINTIFF Harry and David, an Oregon corporation		DEFENDANT Provide Commerce, Inc., a Delaware corporation
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1 <i>See Complaint</i>		
2 <i>3,262,655</i>		
3 <i>1,529,034</i>		
4 <i>1,490,371</i>		
5 <i>793,717</i>		

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s)/ trademark(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment	<input type="checkbox"/> Answer	<input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading		
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	
1 <i>400,009</i>			
2 <i>905,212</i>			
3 <i>1,159,530</i>			
4			
5			

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

DECISION/JUDGEMENT

CLERK	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK	DATE 8/18/2008
-------	-------------------	-------------------

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Director Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Director
 Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Director Copy 4—Case file copy

Steven T. Lovett, OSB No. 910701

stlovett@stoel.com

Brad S. Daniels, OSB No. 025178

bsdaniels@stoel.com

STOEL RIVES LLP

900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600

Portland, OR 97204

Telephone: (503) 224-3380

Facsimile: (503) 220-2480

FILED 08 AUG 15 14:15 USDC ORP

Robert E. Bluth, OSB No. 902111

rbluth@harryanddavid.com

Harry & David Operations Corp.

2500 S. Pacific Highway

Medford, OR 97501

Telephone: (541) 864-2525

Facsimile: (541) 864-2885

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Harry and David

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF OREGON

MEDFORD DIVISION

HARRY AND DAVID, an Oregon
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

PROVIDE COMMERCE, INC., a Delaware
corporation,

Defendant.

Civil No.
CV '08 - 3085 - CL
COMPLAINT

(Trademark Infringement, Unfair
Competition, Trademark Dilution)

Plaintiff Harry and David ("Plaintiff" or "Harry and David"), by way of its Complaint against Defendant Provide Commerce, Inc. ("Defendant" or "Provide"), states and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Harry and David is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Oregon, with its principal place of business at 2500 South Pacific Highway, Medford, Oregon.

2. Defendant Provide is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 5005 Wateridge Vista Drive, San Diego, CA 92121. Defendant operates online retail websites for two brands, ProFlowers and Cherry Moon Farms, at the respective URLs <http://www.proflowers.com/> and <http://www.proflowers.com/cherrymoonfarms/>.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This action arises under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114 and 1125, and Oregon state law. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

4. Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in the state of Oregon because defendant directs its unlawful conduct into this district and its unlawful conduct causes injury within this district. Defendant has purposefully directed its unlawful conduct to the state of Oregon by advertising and soliciting business within this district through its unlawful use of plaintiff's marks as alleged below. Defendant also directs its business activities to the state of Oregon through the use of fully interactive internet websites, solicits business from web users within this district, and sells products to residents of this district.

5. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims asserted occurred in this district. Venue is also proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (c) because defendant may be found in this district for purposes of personal jurisdiction as alleged above.

BACKGROUND

6. Plaintiff Harry and David is a premier gourmet food and fruit gifts purveyor and one of the nation's oldest catalog mail order companies. Plaintiff's brand name and registered trademarks are widely recognized to the consuming public of the United States.

7. Plaintiff owns the registered trademarks, HARRY AND DAVID, HARRY & DAVID, and FRUIT-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB (collectively, "HARRY AND DAVID marks"). Plaintiff has seven federal registrations for its HARRY AND DAVID marks in connection with goods and services in several international classes. Those registration numbers are: No. 3262655 (registration date July 10, 2007), No. 1529034 (registration date March 7, 1989), No. 1490371 (registration date May 31, 1988), No. 0793717 (registration date August 3, 1965), No. 0400009 (registration date February 9, 1943), No. 0905212 (registration date December 29, 1970), and No. 1159530 (registration date June 30, 1981). Plaintiff is also the owner of Oregon Trademark Registration No. T9972 and Oregon Trademark Registration No. T9612, which cover the HARRY AND DAVID marks.

8. Plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks are incontestable, with the exception of No. 3262655.

9. Plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks have secondary meaning.

10. Plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks are famous marks that transcend the specific classes of goods and services for which plaintiff has registered its HARRY AND DAVID marks.

11. Internet users typically use a search engine to locate websites relevant to an inquiry by entering search terms into a search field. For example, customers and potential customers looking for plaintiff's Harry and David products may well simply type Harry and David, Harry & David, Fruit-of-the-Month Club, or some variation thereof, into search engines such as Google (www.google.com) and MSN (www.msn.com).

12. The search engine then uses the word or phrase to find websites that have terms that are the same or similar to the search terms. Internet search engines use proprietary algorithms to identify and sort relevant websites in what is often referred to as a "natural" search.

13. Internet search engines also engage in advertising sales in which the search engines sell search keywords—or keyword triggers—to advertisers. An internet retail business can purchase a keyword trigger that causes an advertisement for the business to appear when a user types in the keyword that the business purchased. The advertisements then appear as sponsored links directly above or to the side of the natural search results. In this way, purchasing keyword triggers allows retail sellers to target potential customers with certain interests by causing the sellers' advertisements to appear in response to search terms typed into the search engine that match keyword triggers purchased by advertiser.

14. Because clicking on a sponsored link results in a visit to the advertiser's retail site and a potential sale for the advertiser, the merchant advertisers pay the search engine for each time an internet user clicks on their sponsored links. The per-click payment scheme is payment for a referral or a "lead" for prospective customer.

15. The internet search engines sell keyword triggers without distinguishing between trademarked and non-trademarked terms. The search engines' policy regarding the purchase of keyword triggers by an advertiser mandates that the advertiser's website must be relevant to the term purchased. The determination of what is relevant is an arbitrary and subjective judgment by the search engine. Search engines sell plaintiff's registered and famous marks, including its HARRY AND DAVID marks, as keyword triggers.

16. Defendant purchased plaintiff's trademarked terms HARRY AND DAVID, HARRY & DAVID, and FRUIT-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB as keyword triggers from one or more search engine providers for the purpose of directing potential customers to defendant's retail site. On numerous dates—including, but not limited to, December 15, 2007; December 19, 2007; December 21, 2007; March 18, 2008; April 4, 2008; May 4, 2008; July 18, 2008; July 21, 2008; July 23, 2008; and July 29, 2008—when a user typed in Harry & David, Harry and David, Fruit-of-the-Month Club, or some variation thereof (including misspellings, non-hyphenated terms, and typographical errors like Hary and David or Harry nad David) as search terms in Google and MSN, advertisements for defendant's on-line retail businesses Cherry Moon Farms or ProFlowers appeared as sponsored links. Examples of such advertisements entitled "Fruit of the Month Gifts" and "Send Gift Baskets \$29.99" are shown below:

The image shows a screenshot of a Google search results page. At the top left is the Google logo. To its right is a search input field containing the text "fruit of the month club". To the right of the input field is a "Search" button and a link for "Advanced Search Preferences". Below the search bar, the page is divided into sections. On the left, under the heading "Web", there are two search results. The first result is for "Fruit of the Month Club®" with the URL "www.HarryandDavid.com" and the snippet "Harry and David Legendary Fruit. Send a Gift that Lasts All Year." The second result is for "Fruit of the Month Gifts" with the URL "www.CherryMoonFarms.com" and the snippet "Premium Organic & Fresh Fruit Clubs 3, 6, 12 month clubs. Free Delivery". On the right side of the page, under the heading "Results 1 -", there is a link for "Sponsored Links".


Sponsored Links

Send Gift Baskets \$29.99
Order Gift Baskets - Gourmet, Spa &
More for Nationwide Delivery USA
www.ProFlowers.com

17. When a user clicks on the titles of defendant's advertisements, the user is taken to defendant's retail websites for Cherry Moon Farms or ProFlowers.

18. Defendant's retail websites offer the web user the opportunity to purchase food products, fruit baskets, gift baskets, and related products from defendant, as shown in the following screen shots:





19. Defendant does not offer for sale any of plaintiff's Harry and David products. In fact, defendant does not sell any of plaintiff's products. Instead, defendant uses plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks to generate traffic to defendant's competing retail websites from individuals who were searching for Harry and David products or the Harry and David website, with the likely intent to purchase Harry and David products.

20. Defendant's use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks as keyword triggers is a use in commerce.

21. Defendant's use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks as keyword triggers is likely to and does cause customer confusion. Customers searching for Harry and David

products are directed to defendant's Cherry Moon Farms and Pro Flowers retail websites, which are neither affiliated with nor authorized by plaintiff to use its HARRY AND DAVID marks. Users may assume that defendant's retail websites are authorized to use plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks, or are affiliated with and may offer Harry and David products. Furthermore, defendant offers a competitive line of food products, fruit products, gift baskets, and related mail-order food products for sale. Consumers may assume that defendant's products have the same qualities and attributes as plaintiff's food and fruit products sold under the HARRY AND DAVID marks and/or are sponsored or licensed by, or affiliated with, plaintiff.

22. Even customers who, upon arriving at defendant's websites, realize that they are not at a website that sells plaintiff's Harry and David products have been initially confused and deceived into visiting the defendant's websites, where they may purchase defendant's competitive products.

23. Defendant seeks and receives a direct material benefit from the use of plaintiff's marks as keyword triggers, such as receiving more visits from customers for its products, which are in direct competition with plaintiff's products.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Federal Trademark Infringement—15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a))

24. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 23.

25. Defendant's use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks as keyword triggers is a use in commerce of plaintiff's registered Harry and David marks that is likely to cause customer confusion or mistake, or to deceive.

26. Defendant is thus liable under 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a) for infringement of plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID trademarks.

27. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), plaintiff is entitled to recover defendant's profits and the costs of the action.

28. Because defendant's actions in using plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks as keyword triggers was intentional and in bad faith, the court should enter an award of enhanced damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)(3) in an amount up to three times the actual damages.

29. This case is an exceptional case under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)(3), and plaintiff should be awarded its reasonable attorney fees.

30. In addition, because plaintiff's remedies under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), while necessary, are not sufficient to fully protect plaintiff's continuing interest in preserving its marks against future infringements by defendant, plaintiff is entitled to an injunction against defendant's use in the future of plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks, or any colorable imitation or confusingly similar variation of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks, as keyword triggers for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products. Plaintiff is also entitled to an injunction prohibiting any other infringing use such as in or as the title for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Federal Unfair Competition—15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))

31. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 23.

32. Defendant's use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks as keyword triggers is a use in commerce in connection with defendant's goods that is likely to cause customer

confusion or mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, association, sponsorship, or approval of defendant's goods by plaintiff.

33. Defendant is thus liable under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) for unfair competition by its uses of plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID trademarks.

34. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), plaintiff is entitled to recover defendant's profits and the costs of the action.

35. Because defendant's actions in using plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks as keyword triggers was intentional and in bad faith, the court should enter an award of enhanced damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)(3) in an amount up to three times the actual damages.

36. This case is an exceptional case under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)(3) and plaintiff should be awarded its reasonable attorney fees.

37. In addition, because plaintiff's remedies under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), while necessary, are not sufficient to fully protect plaintiff's continuing interest in preserving its mark against future acts of unfair competition by defendant, plaintiff is entitled to an injunction against defendant's use in the future of plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks, or any colorable imitation or confusingly similar variation of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks, as keyword triggers for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products. Plaintiff is also entitled to an injunction prohibiting any other infringing use such as in or as the title for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Federal Trademark Dilution—15 U.S.C. § 1125(c))

38. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 23.

39. Plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks are famous marks under the common law and under the factors described for protection against dilution in 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(A) and transcend the specific classes of goods and services for which plaintiff has registered its HARRY AND DAVID marks.

40. Defendant's use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks as keyword triggers is a use in commerce of plaintiff's registered and famous HARRY AND DAVID marks.

41. Defendant's use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks began after plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks became famous.

42. Defendant's use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks is likely to cause dilution by blurring of Harry and David's famous HARRY AND DAVID marks under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B). Defendant is using plaintiff's exact or virtually the same marks; plaintiff's marks have acquired substantial distinctiveness since their first use in commerce; plaintiff exclusively uses its HARRY AND DAVID marks on Harry and David products; the HARRY AND DAVID marks are highly recognized; defendant intended to create an association with plaintiff's marks in order to divert business to itself; and there is no actual association between defendant and plaintiff.

43. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(1) and (5), plaintiff is entitled to an injunction against defendant's use in the future of plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks, or any colorable imitation or confusingly similar variation of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks, as keyword triggers for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine

Harry and David products. Plaintiff is also entitled to an injunction prohibiting any other use that dilutes plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks such as in or as the title for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products.

44. In addition, because, on information and belief, defendant first used plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks in commerce after October 6, 2006 and because defendant willfully intended to trade on the recognition of plaintiff's famous HARRY AND DAVID marks, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(5)(A) and (B)(i), plaintiff is also entitled to the remedies set forth in 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a).

45. Under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), plaintiff is entitled to recover defendant's profits and the costs of the action.

46. Because defendant's actions in using plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks as keyword triggers was intentional and in bad faith, the court should enter an award of enhanced damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)(3) in an amount up to three times the actual damages.

47. This case is an exceptional case under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)(3) and plaintiff should be awarded its reasonable attorney fees.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(State Trademark Infringement—ORS 647.095)

48. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 23.

49. Defendant's unauthorized use in commerce of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks is likely to confuse and deceive consumers, or cause consumers to believe mistakenly that defendant and/or its products are affiliated, connected, or associated with plaintiff or approved by plaintiff.

50. Defendant is thus liable under ORS 647.095 for infringement of plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks.

51. Pursuant to ORS 647.105, plaintiff is entitled to recover the greater of \$10,000 or the sum of: (1) an amount not to exceed three times the profits derived by defendant from the wrongful use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks; and (2) an amount not to exceed three times all damages suffered by plaintiff because of defendant's wrongful use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(State Trademark Dilution—ORS 647.107)

52. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 23.

53. Defendant's use of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks is likely to cause injury to plaintiff's business reputation and/or dilution of the distinctive quality of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks. Defendant is using plaintiff's exact or virtually the same marks; plaintiff's marks are famous and have acquired substantial distinctiveness since their first use in commerce; plaintiff exclusively uses its HARRY AND DAVID marks on Harry and David products; the HARRY AND DAVID marks are highly recognized; defendant intended to create an association with plaintiff's marks in order to divert business to itself; and there is no actual association between defendant and plaintiff.

54. Pursuant to ORS 647.107, plaintiff is entitled to an injunction against defendant's use in the future of plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks, or any colorable imitation or confusingly similar variation of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks, as keyword triggers for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products. Plaintiff is also entitled to an injunction prohibiting any other use that dilutes

the distinctive quality of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks such as in or as the title for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products.


PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

1. Awarding plaintiff up to three times defendant's profits and up to three times the amount found as actual damages for defendant's infringement of plaintiff's registered Harry and David marks, unfair competition, and willful dilution by blurring of plaintiff's famous marks, as stated herein.
2. Entering an injunction against (1) defendant's use in the future of plaintiff's registered HARRY AND DAVID marks, or any colorable imitation or confusingly similar variation of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks, as keyword triggers for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products, and (2) any other infringing use or use that dilutes the distinctive quality of plaintiff's HARRY AND DAVID marks such as in or as the title for any advertisement for the sale of any product other than genuine Harry and David products.
3. Awarding plaintiff its costs of the action and its reasonable attorney fees; and
4. Awarding plaintiff such other and further relief as the court deems equitable, just, and appropriate.

DATED: August 15, 2008.

STOEL RIVES LLP


STEVEN T. LOVETT

OSB NO. 910701

Telephone: (503) 224-3380

ROBERT E. BLUTH

OSB NO. 902111

Telephone: (541) 864-2525

Attorneys for Plaintiff Harry and David