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INTRODUCTION

In 1956, American designers Charles and Ray Eames created the Eames Lounge and Ottoman for furniture manufacturer and retailer Herman Miller.¹ The design is as charming as it is innovative. The chair is an inspired combination of molded plywood, a groundbreaking process that took the Eameses four years to perfect,² and luxurious, tufted leather that resembles a baseball mitt.³ More than a half century later, the Eames Lounge is considered the most iconic chair from the Mid-Century Modern Era⁴ and one of the most comfortable chairs in the world.⁵ The chair and many other articles designed by the Eameses are permanent exhibits at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City.⁶

The chair’s fame and success makes it a target for counterfeit copies—ones virtually indistinguishable from the original—by companies like Rove Concepts, MCM Classics, and Modern Furniture Knockoff.⁷ Rove Concepts includes the design story of Charles and Ray Eames

¹JOHN NEUHART, MARILYN NEUHART, & RAY EAMES, EAMES DESIGN 207 (1989).
²Id. at 27, 60–61, 207. The Eameses went through thirteen different styles for the arm of the chair alone before settling on the final version. EAMES DEMETRIOS, AN EAMES PRIMER 172 (2001).
³NEUHART, NEUHART, & EAMES, supra note 1, at 207.
⁴See generally MARTIN EIDELBERG, THOMAS HINE, PAT KIRKHAM, DAVID A. HANKS, & C. FORD PEATROSS, THE EAMES LOUNGE CHAIR: AN ICON OF MODERN DESIGN 10 (2006) (describing the chair as having obtained “iconic status” and “emblematic of the Modern Movement” and “an icon of Mid-Century Modern.”) [hereinafter ICON OF MODERN DESIGN].
⁶DEMETRIOS, supra note 2, at 170.
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to sell its counterfeit copies. It mentions the design duo’s work towards perfecting their products, and their fame, yet fails to admit that the products it ships to U.S. consumers are counterfeit and directly conflict with U.S. law. The result is a confusion as to what authentic or original really means, and even worse, a public belief that the trade is legal.

Trade dress law combats these phenomena. Herman Miller successfully registered the Eames Lounge design configuration with the Principle Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). It has succeeded in asserting this trade dress in lawsuits against Alpha Design, Inc. and Nuevo Americana, Inc. To some it would be surprising that Herman Miller was able to acquire trade dress rights to this iconic chair. One opinion is that intellectual property law cannot protect a piece of furniture because furniture is “functional.” This is an oversimplification of the current state of trade dress law for furniture articles.

This Note analyzes the state of trade dress law per the United States Trademark Act (Lanham Act) as it pertains to furniture designs. Specifically, this Note describes the circuit split regarding the consideration of alternative designs as one of multiple evidentiary factors under the first prong of the functionality test post-TrafFix v. Marketing Displays, Inc., and analyzes the

---

8 See, e.g., Rove Lounge Chair with Ottoman, ROVE CONCEPTS, http://www.roveconcepts.com/rove-lounge-chair-ottoman.html (last visited Mar. 3, 2015) (“Inspired by the familiarity and comfort of an old baseball mitt, the husband and wife team of Charles and Ray created a style icon. It led to the creation of the Rove Lounge Chair and Ottoman . . .”).
9 Id.
10 USPTO Image Trademark, No. 2716843 (Filed Oct. 26, 1995).
12 Consent Judgment and Decree, Herman Miller, Inc. v. Nuevo Americana, Inc., No. 1:12CV01225 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 5, 2012) (granting judgment by the infringing party’s consent and decreeing that Herman Miller owns all rights throughout the United States to the product configuration trade dress of the Eames Lounge, the Aluminum Group, and the Softpad).
13 Id.
split’s effect on determining functionality for design features in furniture articles. Finally, in light of the realities of this particular area of the furniture industry, this Note argues that the nonfunctionality doctrine’s concerns associated with competitive burdens are unwarranted.

This Note proceeds in four parts. Part I describes the knock-off phenomena and its effect on the furniture industry and public. Part II provides an overview of ways in which to protect the intellectual property of furniture, discussing copyright, patents, trademarks, and trade dress. Part III analyzes how the various non-functionality doctrines among the federal circuit courts and USPTO affects trade dress actions and applications for furniture articles. Such analysis shows that the nonfunctionality requirement does not always bar furniture articles from acquiring trade dress. However, this section posits that courts will hamstring trade dress protections over elements of furniture design as a result of the circuit split. Part IV concludes with the significant policy concerns. In summation, society benefits when a legal monopoly is effectively granted over a particular design, given the following: 1) the role the furniture industry has in the U.S. economy; 2) the display of social responsibility of furniture companies like Herman Miller; 3) the cheapening of design by knock-offs; and 4) the durability of authentic furniture articles.

I. PROTECTING FURNITURE DESIGNS IN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

This section discusses the relevant intellectual property laws applicable to protecting furniture designs, giving special attention to trade dress law.

A. Copyright Law

In 1790, the First Congress enacted the first copyright law under the authority of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution, which secures the exclusive right to inventors of their works: “To promote
the Progress of Science and useful Arts.” Congress subsequently revised the Copyright Act in approximately forty-year intervals. The present copyright law, the Copyright Act of 1976, protects “original works of authorship fixed in a tangible medium of expression.” This includes “pictorial, graphic, and sculptural works” that “endures for a term consisting of the life of the author and 70 years after the author's death.” Copyright law does not protect useful articles that are not conceptually or physically separate from its pictorial, graphic, or sculptural features. Accordingly, courts have extended copyright protection only to ornamental furniture designs such as intricate woodworking or other separable design, but not the product configuration. Thus, the furniture industry has turned to patents and the law of trade dress to protect its intellectual property.

B. Design and Utility Patents

Under the same Constitutional authority as copyright, furniture designs may acquire intellectual property protection through design and utility patents. Utility patents cover the invention or discovery of a “new and useful process, machine, article of manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof.” Some features of furniture,

---

19 See Amini Innovation Corp. v. Anthony California, Inc., 439 F.3d 1365, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (finding protectable expression in the carved ornamental woodwork of bed frames).
20 See Universal Furniture Intern v. Collezione Europa USA, 413 F.3d 417, 434 (4th Cir. 2010) (finding protectable expression in separable designs of acanthus leaves on dresser).
21 See id. at 434 (suggesting that the shape or configuration of the furniture would not receive similar protection).
23 U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8, cl. 8.
such as their novel assembly of supporting parts for contour-conforming seat panels, acquire utility patents.\textsuperscript{26} Once the utility patent expires, the patented invention enters the public domain, and then others may copy the functional features disclosed in the patent.\textsuperscript{27} This process encourages advancement in product design and manufacture, because it invites the inventor to disclose the invention and enjoy the fruits of his or her labor.\textsuperscript{28}

Design patents cover the invention of a “new, original, and ornamental design for an article of manufacture.”\textsuperscript{29} The term of the design patent is fourteen years.\textsuperscript{30} The USPTO granted Charles Eames many design patents for the ornamental designs of his furniture for Herman Miller.\textsuperscript{31} However, because the Eameses designed their furniture during the mid-century, the designs transcended the fourteen-year patent period.\textsuperscript{32} Considering the durability and popularity of Eames furniture, this was no surprise. Thus, to continue ownership over such iconic designs, some other body of law is required. Accordingly, the manufacturers that have continuously produced and marketed older, iconic designs will elect to protect their intellectual property through trade dress law per the Lanham Act.

\textbf{C. Trademarks}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} See, e.g., U.S. Patent No. 2,554,490 A (Filed Mar. 1, 1947) (granting utility patent to construction of Eames LCW chair).
\item \textsuperscript{28} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{29} 35 U.S.C. § 171.
\item \textsuperscript{30} 35 U.S.C. § 173.
\item \textsuperscript{31} U.S. Patent No. 150,683 (Filed Mar. 27, 1947) (granting a patent for the design of the LCW chair by Charles Eames); U.S. Patent No. 219,212 S (Filed Mar. 3, 1969) (granting a patent for the design of the La Chaise by Charles Eames for Herman Miller); U.S. Patent No. D210,940 S (Filed Jan. 30, 1967) (granting a patent for the design of the padded seat by Charles Eames for Herman Miller).
\item \textsuperscript{32} See ICON OF MODERN DESIGN, supra note 4 at 10 (discussing mid-century modern furniture and icons of design).
\end{itemize}
The Lanham Act derives its authority under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution—not the Patent and Copyright Clause.\(^33\) In comparison to copyright and patents, trademark law shifts the focus away from protecting original design to protecting the owner’s exclusive right to distinguish his or her product,\(^34\) preventing others from free-riding on a company’s extensive marketing expenditures and goodwill,\(^35\) and preventing consumers from becoming confused as to product origin.\(^36\)

The purpose of trademark law is “to protect producers from illegitimate diversions of their trade by competitors” and to avoid confusing consumers.\(^37\) The Lanham Act provides, in part:

The intent of this chapter is to . . . mak[e] actionable the deceptive and misleading use of marks . . . to prevent fraud and deception . . . by the use of reproductions, copies, counterfeits, or colorable imitations of registered marks . . . .\(^38\)

The Lanham Act defines a trademark as: “[A]ny word, symbol, or device . . . used by a person . . . to identify and distinguish his or her goods . . . and to indicate the source of the goods, even if that source is unknown.”\(^39\) The Supreme Court established that the appearance or design feature of a product is a trademark and referred to as the product’s trade dress.\(^40\) Congress

---

\(^{33}\) Ethan Horwitz and Benjamin Levi, *Fifty Years of the Lanham Act: A Retrospective of Section 43(a),* 7 FORDHAM INTELL. PROP. MEDIA & ENT. L.J. 58, 61 (1996). Congress initially tried enacting the Trademark Act under the authority of the Copyright and Patent Clause of the U.S. Constitution but the Supreme Court invalidated it because it hinged on the wrong constitutional power. *Id.*


\(^{35}\) McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition § 2:15 (4th ed.).

\(^{36}\) *Id.* at § 3:6 (“If two products answer with trademarks that are similar, then the customer is likely to be confused and buy one product, thinking it comes from a source from which it really does not originate. This is the purest form of injury resulting from trademark infringement—the diversion of sales caused by customer confusion.”).

\(^{37}\) Mckenna, *supra* note 79 at 1839, 1841.


\(^{40}\) Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Products Co., 541 U.S. 159, 162 (1995); Traffix Devices, Inc. 532 U.S. at 28 (2001) (“The design or packaging of a product may acquire a distinctiveness which serves to identify the product with its manufacturer or source . . . .”)
subsequently amended the Lanham Act to recognize the concept. Accordingly, furniture articles are eligible for protectable trade dress because they are products that can exhibit source-identifying features, assuming that the article in question satisfies the other requisite elements.

The other requisite elements for a registerable trade dress with the USPTO are functionality and distinctiveness. An applicant may file his or her mark with the USPTO and an agency attorney will first determine whether the mark is functional by asking if the feature of the trade dress is "essential to the use or purpose of the article or if it affects the cost or quality of the article." The next inquiry is whether the product feature has acquired distinctiveness, also known as secondary meaning. A feature acquires secondary meaning "when the public views the primary significance of the product packaging as identifying the source of the product rather than the product itself." Thus, if the product feature is functional or does not have secondary meaning, it is not registerable on the Principal Register of the USPTO.

Additionally, the Lanham Act attaches civil liability to a person who misuses a mark to sell a good or package a product that is likely to confuse “the affiliation, connection, or association of such person with another person, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of his or her goods . . . by another person." A plaintiff must prove the following elements in a civil claim of trade dress infringement pertaining to furniture: 1) the trade dress is clearly defined and inherently distinctive or has acquired secondary meaning; 2) defendant’s use of the mark is likely to confuse as to source or sponsorship; and 3) the asserted trade dress is non-functional. Courts presume the

---

41 Id. For the purposes of this article, the term “mark” will include a product’s trade dress and trademark.
42 Registration of Trade Dress, TMEP 1202.02.
43 Functionality of Trade Dress, TMEP 1202.02(a) (quoting Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Prods. Co., 514 U.S. 159, 165 (1995)).
44 Distinctiveness of Trade Dress, TMEP 1202.2(b).
45 Id. at 1202.2(b)(ii) (quoting Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros. Inc., 529 U.S. 205, 211 (2000)).
47 McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition, § 8:1 (4th ed.)
trade dress is non-functional if it is already registered with the USPTO. However, as Part III will explain, courts have not uniformly applied the third requirement of non-functionality.

II. THE CURRENT KNOCKOFF AND COUNTERFEITING PHENOMENA

The Lanham Act defines a counterfeit as a “spurious mark” that is sold without certification. A spurious mark is “identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a registered mark.” Similarly, a “knockoff” is the colloquial term for “colorable imitation,” which is “any mark which so resembles a registered mark” that is likely to confuse or deceive the consumer. In the furniture industry, copies of classic designs like the Eames Lounge Chair do not just resemble the original—they are visually indistinguishable versions of the original. Accordingly, companies that produce copies that are visually indistinguishable from the originals are producing counterfeit copies. For this Note, manufacturers that contract with designers for manufacture and use of their designs are “authorized manufacturers.” The designs such companies manufacture are termed “original” or “authentic.”

Some scholars argue that the knockoff and counterfeit trade cause little harm. One claim is that harm from intellectual property theft is low because the methodology estimating lost sales and tax revenue—between $200 billion and $250 billion a year and the loss of 750,000 jobs in the

---

48 Id.
50 Id.
51 Id.
52 Interview with Ross Atwood, Digital Media Director, Eames Office in Barre, Vermont (Feb. 17, 2015) (stating that it is almost impossible to distinguish a copy from the original in the pictures available on some web stores selling counterfeits).
United States—rely on big assumptions and are thus inconclusive.55 This claim also assumes that a consumer who buys a counterfeit is unlikely to buy the authentic product.56 However, this criticism is flawed.57 Furniture is a 166 billion dollar industry in the United States.58 Although there are no methodologically sound estimates detailing how much of the total lost revenue is attributable to the knockoff and counterfeit trade of furniture articles, it does not follow that there is no resulting financial harm. Mid-century modern and modern furniture designers, the focus of this Note, are considered the biggest victims within the furniture industry as more companies import knockoffs and counterfeit goods from Asia to sell them in the United States.59 For example, Manhattan Home Design sells “replicas” (another label that signifies the product is a copy, and in this case, an unauthorized copy of an original design).60 The company, which imports furniture from China,61 recently secured government contracts with New York City to supply furniture for Times Square Plaza, and the departments of corrections and transportation.62 Another store boasts as its clientele: MTV, Marriot Hotels, and Hilton Hotels and Resorts.63 These clients substituted the knockoff design in place of buying the original, but they are arguably within the same consumer

54 Eric R. Waltmire, How to Secure Your Client’s Brand Against Counterfeiting Operations in Asia, 22 DCBA BRIEF 46 (2009).
55 Id. at 2247 (arguing that organizations “took an estimate of the total number of counterfeit items sold . . . then multiplied by the full retail price of genuine articles.”).
56 Id.
57 Waltmire, supra note 20, at 46.
59 Interview with Ross Atwood, supra note 17 (observing that companies in the business of selling knockoffs most frequently copy mid-century modern and modern furniture). Mid-century modern and modern designs and the focus of this Note because these designs are more likely to be copied than other designs popularly
60 Jenny T. Slocum & Jess M. Collem, The Evolving Threat and Enforcement of Replica Goods, 33 W. NEW ENG. L. REV. 789, 791 (“The word “replica” to describe these same goods eliminates the consumer's perception of any illegality of the goods.”).
61 Interview with Scherry Khabul, Sales Associate, Manhattan Home Design in New York City (Mar. 6, 2015) (stating that most of their furniture is imported from China).
class that can afford originals. Considering the aforementioned clients’ purchase of knockoffs alone, intellectual property theft in the furniture industry has considerably affected potential sales and profits of authorized manufacturers licensed to produce original works.

Additionally, U.S. job loss due to intellectual property theft is disconcerting in the context of American furniture manufacturing. Bill Birchard wrote an account of Herman Miller’s socially conscious business model entitled: Merchants of Virtue: Herman Miller and the Making of a Sustainable Company. Birchard praises Herman Miller’s awarding of stock options to all employees—from the custodians and plant workers to the CEO. The company, in its all-inclusive approach, educated its employees about financial responsibility so that people in the plants and offices “understood more about how a business turned a profit than the average workers in America.” As a result, employees were more productive and innovated “green” manufacturing ideas. Herman Miller received numerous awards for its generous business model.

Not only do knockoffs and counterfeits cause economic loss, they are more likely to be inferior in quality. The Global Intellectual Property Center published a brand protection manual and argues:

Because the counterfeiter is unlikely to have access to the same quality raw goods as the legitimate manufacturer and has no incentive to institute quality control

---

65 Id. at 94 (2011) (“By 1995, every full-time employee who had worked for at least a year, from the janitors in the plants to the CEO, had become a stockholder.”).
66 Id. at 95.
67 Id. at 9.
68 See id., Prologue at x (commending Herman Miller’s 20-year record of awards).
practices or procedures, the resulting counterfeit product is most assuredly inferior in quality . . . 69

Indeed, a comparison between knockoff dealers and companies like Herman Miller, Emeco, and Knoll reveals a sharp contrast between furniture qualities.

For example, Herman Miller’s concurrent five-year and twelve-year warranties, quality control, and extensive testing procedures70 for the chair suggests that Herman Miller manufactures durable, quality Eames Lounge Chairs. Knoll, another modern furniture company, offers a twelve-year warranty for some of its chairs71; same for Steelcase.72 Yet another prominent American furniture manufacturer, Emeco, has a lifetime warranty for its famous Navy Chair that is made to last 150 years.73

Conversely, knockoff retailers do not offer comparable warranties. MCM Classics, for example, offers a sixty-day warranty and explicitly excludes an infringement warranty.74 Manhattan Home Design offers a one-year warranty on all of its products.75 Rove Concepts offers a limited five-year warranty for structural damage but limits its warranty covering workmanship


74 See Policies, MCM CLASSICS, www.mcmclassics.com/policies/ (last visited Oct. 21, 2004) (guaranteeing products for 60 days and excluding warranty of fitness for a particular purpose, merchantability, or infringement, and a waiver of any claim a customer may have against it).

related failures to one year.\textsuperscript{76} An exact copy of Emeco’s Navy was subjected to the Emeco stress test.\textsuperscript{77} The unlicensed copy folded under the weight.\textsuperscript{78} Similarly, Be Original Americas conducted a stress test by jumping on knockoffs of Fritz Hansen Series 7 chairs from two undisclosed companies.\textsuperscript{79} With just two or less jumps on each chairs’ spine, they collapsed under the jumper’s weight.\textsuperscript{80} In comparison, the original Series 7 withstood seven or more jumps without budging.\textsuperscript{81} Thus, the consumer’s perceived risk about knockoff product quality may be relatively high in comparison to the perceived risk for furniture articles made by authorized U.S. manufacturers such as Emeco, Herman Miller, Steelcase, and Knoll.\textsuperscript{82} Furthermore, this conclusion challenges the notion that multiple producers of the same chair design will make the product “at the highest quality for the lowest price.”\textsuperscript{83}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{77} \textit{An Emeco Navy Chair knock-off getting the “stress test”}, DESIGN MILK (Nov. 18, 2013), http://design-milk.com/emeco-navy-chair-good-design/ (showing the effect on two chairs after a stress test).
\item \textsuperscript{78} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{79} Be Original Americas, \textit{Fritz Hansen’s Series 7 Chair: Knockoffs vs. The Original}, YOUTUBE (Jul. 24, 2013), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UTfcie56ZK0. Be Original Americas is an organizational movement supported by members, including furniture manufacturers Herman Miller and Fritz Hansen, whose goal is to “establish a set of industry standards that encourages consumers, the architecture/design community, producers, dealers and media partners to fully support creativity and authenticity in order to invest in the future of design, incentivize innovation and give back to the industry and the people it serves.” \textit{About Us}, BE ORIGINAL AMERICAS, http://www.beoriginalamericas.com/about-us/ (last visited Apr. 8, 2015).
\item \textsuperscript{80} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{81} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{83} Amy B. Cohen, \textit{Following the Direction of TrafFix: Trade Dress Law and Functionality Revisited}, 50 IDEA 593, 595 (2010).
\end{itemize}
Iconic, original furniture articles are also capable of retaining value. The price of the Eames Lounge Chair in 1961 was $653.\textsuperscript{84} Adjusted for inflation in 2014, the chair would be $5,204.\textsuperscript{85} Remarkably, an authentic, new Eames Lounge sells for $4,559.\textsuperscript{86} Conveyance of Herman Miller products to an original owner’s successors is a common practice.\textsuperscript{87} A vintage Eames Lounge can sell for $3,000 to $7,000.\textsuperscript{88} The chair’s success in the vintage marketplace confirms its durability and fixed value.

Despite an original’s proven durability and value, there are cynical consumers that justify their purchase of counterfeit lounge chairs. They believe the current price is outrageous and misaligned with the original pricing during the mid-century, design-for-the-masses philosophy that the Eames Office conceived.\textsuperscript{89} However, as explained above, in buying the original, the consumers get the look, a piece of history, and durable furniture that they may convey to their successors. Knockoffs may provide the classic look, but without the longevity.

Imports of knockoffs are on the rise. “U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), seized more than $196 million in Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) infringing goods in 2007, which is an increase of 26 percent in domestic value over the previous year.”\textsuperscript{90} This increase suggests there is yet another problem perpetuated

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{85} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{86} Eames Lounge Chair and Ottoman, HERMAN MILLER STORE, http://store.hermanmiller.com/Products/Eames-Lounge-Chair-and-Ottoman (last visited Oct. 20, 2014) (selling for $4,559).
  \item \textsuperscript{87} Interview with Dan Osteroff, Consultant, Eames Office in Los Angeles, California (Feb. 20, 2015).
  \item \textsuperscript{88} The Jetsetrnv8r, Vintage Furniture – Real or Fake? Eames Lounge Chair & Ottoman http://jetsetrnv8r.wordpress.com/2008/09/14/vintage-furniture-%E2%80%93-real-or-fake-eames-lounge-chair-ottoman/ (last visited Oct. 24, 2014).
  \item \textsuperscript{89} ELIZABETH ARMSTRONG, BIRTH OF THE COOL: CALIFORNIA ART, DESIGN, AND CULTURE AT MIDCENTURY 31 (2007) (“The greatest achievement of the Eames office team was that it succeeded in getting low-cost, durable, well-designed furniture to the consumer at a low cost on a mass level.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{90} Eric R. Waltmire, How to Secure Your Client’s Brand Against Counterfeiting Operations in Asia, 22 DCBA BRIEF 46 (2009).
\end{itemize}
by knockoff manufacturers: the age-old and controversial concern regarding the negative labor and environmental effects of global outsourcing. Whereas Emeco and Herman Miller manufacture their furniture in the U.S., some companies sell knockoffs manufactured in countries such as China. Regrettably, offshore manufacturers do not observe similar fair-labor practices. First, the sale of counterfeit products is linked to child labor. Two intellectual property attorneys summarize the problem regarding the lack of meaningful regulation in some countries:

Without any supervision, manufacturers of counterfeit goods are therefore free to exploit the socially irresponsible and otherwise prohibited resources of child labor . . . . [I]t is estimated that child workers make up as much as twenty percent of the workforce in China and contribute significantly to the manufacture of counterfeit products. This cheap and “illegal” workforce lowers the cost of manufacture and increases the profits associated with the goods and fosters the replica industry.

In comparison, the film Food=Waste commended Herman Miller’s domestic factory because it circulates natural air in place of air conditioning, has natural sunlight, and overall, “[t]he building respects the people inside of it.”

By the same token, much of what is manufactured today is “destined for the trash heap.”

Today’s consumer culture degrades our environment with increased waste and resource

---

91 *Emeco’s Environmental Policies, supra* note 47; *Fact Sheet, supra* note 47.
92 *See* Interview with Scherry Khabul, *supra* note 26 (stating that some of Manhattan Home Design’s furniture is made in China).
94 *Id.*
95 *Id.* at 794–95 (2011) (citing Dana Thomas, Deluxe: How Luxury Lost its Luster 205 (2007)).
96 *FOOD=WASTE* (VPRO Backlight 2007).
The concept of “cradle-to-cradle” design offers a solution to waste and resource depletion by promoting good design processes that use materials that are safe to use and reuse while honoring social fairness and human dignity. This includes processes such as upcycling and recycling, in contrast to downcycling. The film Food=Waste again commended Herman Miller for making its chairs according to the “cradle-to-cradle” concept. Similarly, Emeco confronts the waste problem by the very fact that its chairs are made to last, and some consist of 65% recycled polyethylene terephthalate (PET), or Coca-Cola bottles. Finally, Steelcase obtained LEED-CI Platinum and ISO 14001 certificates for its multiple Michigan manufacturing facilities. The Platinum LEED-CI is the highest level a commercial project may receive under the U.S. Green Building Council’s rating system for environmental standards and underscores responsible sustainability efforts.

III. THE CIRCUIT SPLIT ON THE NON-FUNCTIONALITY DOCTRINE

Furniture manufacturers and designers can use trade dress law to combat the knockoff and counterfeiting phenomena described above. However, as this Note maintains, a primary obstacle to brandishing trade dress ownership against copycats is the inconsistent application of the non-functionality doctrine.
The non-functionality doctrine says that if an article’s design is functional, it will by no means acquire trade dress.105 This doctrine is used to prevent trademark law from imposing unacceptable competitive burdens on competitors and to strike a proper balance between trademark law and patent law.106

As many scholars have recognized, the circuit courts are divided on what has evidentiary value in determining functionality.107 The Supreme Court in TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc. clarified some aspects of confusion with regard to functionality in general, such as the order of decision and the weight to give to a feature’s expired utility patents.108 There remains a debate on whether courts may consider the existence of alternative designs as evidence of nonfunctionality.109 That is not to say that the mere existence of alternative designs is determinative of non-functionality, just whether their availability may be a factor.

TrafFix clarified the order of decision. According to the Supreme Court in TrafFix, a court should first examine whether a product feature is essential to the use or purpose of a product and whether such features affect the product’s cost or quality.110 This Note refers to this first step as the first prong of utilitarian functionality. If a court still does not find the feature to be functional

106 Id.
109 Id.; see Tracey McCormick, Will TrafFix “Fix” the Splintered Functionality Doctrine?: TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc., 40 Hous. L. Rev. 541, 543, 556–57 (2003) (arguing that TrafFix is “not likely to provide lower courts with enough guidance to resolve the courts of appeals split over the proper legal standard for functionality.”); see also Vincent N. Palladino, Trade Dress Functionality After TrafFix: The Lower Courts Divide Again 93 Trademark Rep. 1219, 1228 (2003) (arguing that refusing to consider alternative designs “runs afoul of TrafFix.”).
and aesthetic functionality is at issue, then the next inquiry is about whether exclusive use of a product feature would create a significant non-reputation related disadvantage and whether there are alternative designs available.\textsuperscript{111} This Note refers to the inquiry into aesthetic functionality as the second prong of functionality. A feature that creates a non-reputation related disadvantage with no available alternative designs will almost certainly show that the product feature is functional and may not be protectable by trade dress law.\textsuperscript{112} If the product feature is still non-functional, a court may continue on to the other requisite elements of secondary meaning and likelihood of confusion.

The contested issue among the circuit courts\textsuperscript{113} is whether a court should consider alternative designs when addressing the functionality of the product design.\textsuperscript{114} The federal circuit court interprets \textit{TrafFix} to mean that evidence regarding alternative designs and competitive need is only irrelevant when a product is functional under the \textit{Inwood} standard.\textsuperscript{115} That means that when a product is functional based solely on cost or quality factors,\textsuperscript{116} the mere existence of alternative designs will not save it; however, \textit{TrafFix} did not foreclose courts from considering the alternatives.\textsuperscript{117} Conversely, other courts interpret the \textit{TrafFix} proposition to demand that, under the first prong of utilitarian functionality, they \textit{may not} consider alternative designs.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{111} Id. \\
\textsuperscript{112} Id. \\
\textsuperscript{113} See Amy B. Cohen, \textit{Following the Direction of TrafFix: Trade Dress Law and Functionality Revisited}, 50 IDEA 593, 658-59 (discussing the split in courts using the evidence of alternative designs when first determining a product design’s functionality). \\
\textsuperscript{114} See id. at 33–34 (“There is no need, furthermore, to engage, as did the Court of Appeals, in speculation about other design possibilities, such as using three or four springs which might serve the same purpose. Here, the functionality of the spring design means that competitors need not explore whether other spring juxtapositions might be used.”). \\
\textsuperscript{115} Valu Eng’g, Inc. v. Rexnord Corp., 278 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2002). \\
\textsuperscript{116} Remember the traditional rule supported in \textit{TrafFix}: an article is functional if it is essential to the use or purpose of the article, \textit{or} affects the cost or quality of the article. This is utilitarian functionality. \textit{TrafFix}, 532 U.S. at 33. \\
\textsuperscript{117} Valu Eng’g, Inc, 278 F. 3d at 1276. \\
\textsuperscript{118} Eppendorf-Netheler-Hinz GMBH v. Ritter GMBH, 289 F.3d 351 (5th Cir. 2002).
The Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) applies the understanding of *TrafFix* proposed by the federal circuit. The TMEP uses the *In re Morton-Norwich* decision, which provides a basis to consider the following evidence:

1. The existence of a utility patent that discloses the utilitarian advantages of the design sought to be registered;
2. Advertising by the applicant that touts the utilitarian advantages of the design;
3. Facts pertaining to the availability of alternative designs; and
4. Facts pertaining to whether the design results from a comparatively simple or inexpensive method of manufacture.

Other circuits also state that the above factors have evidentiary value when determining what is essential to the use or purpose or what affects the cost or quality of the article (the first prong of utilitarian functionality).

The pressing question for furniture manufacturers becomes, how does the circuit split over the elements of determining functionality affect trademark protection for chair designs? How does a judge look at a chair and determine which design feature is functional and which is not? Are the interpretations consistent with the purpose of the Lanham Act? Some scholars dislike the fact that trade dress can effectively grant a monopoly over a design feature. But, as this Note argues,
given the realities of copycat furniture and the purpose of the Lanham Act, this critique is not warranted.

A. Post-TrafFix Chair Configuration Cases: Heptagon Creations, Pride Family Brands, and Specialized Seating

One exemplary case from the camp of courts that fails to consider the Morton-Norwich factors, or evidence of alternative designs, is Heptagon Creations, Ltd. v. Core Marketing Group LLC. Here, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York cited TrafFix in applying the functionality doctrine but without the understanding that alternative designs are evidence for non-functionality. Heptagon Creations brought the action against defendant’s interior design firm for recreating digital copies of Heptagon’s furniture to attract potential buyers of a listed apartment building. Heptagon Creations designed nine furniture pieces that it alleged were comprised of non-functional and artistic elements. The Cocoon Chair had “textured seating material and tree trunk cocoon siding.” The district court rejected Heptagon’s request for trade dress on this piece, reasoning that because the design element—the carved tree trunk—comprised the seat and armrest, it was “essential to the use or purpose of the [furniture piece]’ or ‘affect[ed] the cost or quality of the [furniture piece].’” The court quickly dismissed the opportunity to protect the other furniture pieces at issue by simply stating, “The same holds true for the salient features of the other eight pieces of furniture.”

---

123 Id. (citing Yurman Design, Inc. v. PAJ, Inc., 262 F.3d 101, 117 (2d Cir.2001)). The court cited Yurman for the functionality test, which articulated the same test set forth by the TrafFix Court. Id.
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126 Id. at *1, *7.
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Similarly, in *Pride Family Brands, Inc. v. Carl’s Patio, Inc.*, a manufacturer sought to establish common law trade dress in particular and general tropical design elements of its furniture collection.\(^{129}\) The Florida district court recognized the two categories of functionality but primarily barred trade dress using the second.\(^{130}\) First, in a footnote, the court found one design feature barred by the first category of functionality:

One of the claimed elements, a lashing that connects the leaf to the arm of the Coco Isle chair is essential to the construction of the chair as Plaintiff’s CEO even conceded and it is therefore functional under the first category.\(^{131}\)

In its analysis of whether *aesthetic* functionality should bar trade dress at issue, the court stated that the brown and beige finishes, natural fabric colors, and the cast embellishments that resemble bamboo nodes evoke a tropical feel, which patio furniture companies commonly use.\(^{132}\) The plaintiff could not acquire trade dress protection in the tropical motif because doing so would foreclose other tropical patio furniture companies from using the natural, tropical furniture elements.\(^{133}\)

Both *Pride Family Brands* and *Heptagon* courts failed to consider evidence of alternative designs or the *Morton-Norwich* factors in their analysis under the first utilitarian functionality prong. Although the court in *Pride Family Brands* focused on the aesthetic functionality doctrine to bar trade dress on a furniture motif, the court’s footnote regarding utilitarian functionality offers insight into its position regarding the meaning of “essential.” According to the court, that which


\(^{130}\) *Id.*

\(^{131}\) *Id.* at n.9.

\(^{132}\) *Id.* at *4.

\(^{133}\) *Id.*
connects a design to an arm of a chair meets the “essential to the use or purpose” standard.134 Similarly, the court in Heptagon reasoned that a design element that “comprised” the seat and armrest rendered the furniture article functional.135 These positions, which are akin to the logic of other circuit courts,136 confuse utility and function by trumpeting the role of a design feature that merely accommodates the article and its purpose. This was also a result of piecemeal analysis of an article that the court should have viewed as a whole.137 Part III will further discuss these issues.

In contrast to the logic of the two cases above, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York applied a very different test in determining the likelihood of success of a plaintiff’s trade dress infringement claim in Blumenthal Distributing, Inc. v. Executive Chair, Inc.. In Blumenthal, the defendant manufactured colorable imitations of the overall appearance of two Blumenthal office chairs.138 The court stated the requirement that the product design be nonfunctional but did not use TraFFix’s standard regarding the feature being essential to the use or purpose or affecting the cost or quality of the piece.139 The analysis focused more on the non-generic look of the chair and the alternative designs available; thus, after concluding that trade

135 Interestingly, functionality was not a contested issue before the court. Heptagon provided information about why the furniture was not a useful article for the purpose of its copyright claim but did not provide similar information for its trade dress infringement claim such as evidence showing an availability of alternative designs. Heptagon Creations, Ltd. v. Core Group Marketing, LLC, WL 6600267 at *1, *7 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).
136 Vincent N. Palladino, Trade Dress Functionality After TraFFix: The Lower Courts Divide Again, 93 TRADEMARK REP. 1219, 1232–34 (discussing the circuit court decisions that equate utility with functionality).
137 The brief analysis under the first prong of functionality in the footnote did not analyze the functionality of the furniture piece as a whole. Interestingly in a previous case, the same court had established that analysis of the design at issue requires a review of each element of the trade dress as a whole. Vital Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. American Body Bldg. Products, LLC, 511 F. Supp. 2d 1303, 1313 (S.D. Fla. 2007) (“[T]he inquiry is an overall examination of the Plaintiff's bottle shape, the bottle neck, and the vertical lettering.”).
139 Id. at *7.
dress protection over the chair would not hinder legitimate competition in the office chair industry, the chair was nonfunctional for the purposes of the preliminary injunction.  

In Specialized Seating, Inc. v. Greenwich Industries, LP, the district court cited TrafFix’s proposition that a functional design is essential to the use or purpose or affects the cost or quality of the product feature and applied the Morton-Norwich factors. This was all still under the first prong of analysis for determining utilitarian functionality. The district court found that the folding x-frame chair design at issue was functional and not entitled to trade dress.

On appeal, the Seventh Circuit affirmed the district court’s findings and never reached the issue of aesthetic functionality. Expired utility patents covered all aspects of the chair except for the “b-back” design. The Seventh Circuit court believed the b-back design was also a functional shape, in that it affected the cost or quality, because it was incorporated as a solution to a specific problem to folding chairs (not buckling when concert-goers sit on the backs of the chairs) and achieved a favorable strength-to-weight ratio without operating as a distinctive, ornamental, source identifier. The court considered the alternative designs but noted that all of the alternative designs for folding chairs were functional because they also “represent different compromises along the axes of weight, strength, kind of material, ease of setup, ability to connect (‘gang’) the chairs together for maximum seating density, and so on.” The court noted that distinctive elements could be nonfunctional if added to aid consumers in determining its origin. For

---
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instance, *W.T. Rogers Co. v. Keene* concerned the functionality of a stackable letter tray with irregular hexagonal cutout end caps.\(^{149}\) Although the cutouts provided structural stability, separated the trays, and reduced the weight and cost, their irregular hexagon shape was nonfunctional.\(^{150}\) In contrast to the *Keene* case the court provided as an example, the design at issue in *Specialized Seating* lacked a distinctive, functionless shape.\(^{151}\) The manufacturer even touted the functionality of the chair’s design in its advertisements.\(^{152}\) The chair was thus not eligible for trade dress.\(^{153}\)

**B. Analysis: Chairs and the Future of Trade Dress**

The judicial opinions discussed above exhibit several problems that, if continued, could severely curtail furniture manufacturers from acquiring trade dress protections for otherwise registerable chairs.\(^{154}\) Such problems are: a court’s piecemeal analysis, conflating utility and functionality resulting in their misapplying the term “essential” in a way that contravenes the purpose of the Lanham Act and case law, and refusal to consider as evidence the alternative designs under the first prong of functionality.

The first problem is the aforementioned post-*TrafFix* courts’ focus on the individual elements of an article without reckoning with the totality of the appearance. Many circuits have determined that the proper inquiry is to view the article’s combination of features as a whole so that together, the nonfunctional elements acquire trade dress when arranged distinctively.\(^{155}\) Unlike

---

\(^{149}\) *Id.* (citing *W.T. Rogers Co. v. Keene*, 778 F.2d 334, 339–40 (7th Cir. 1985)).

\(^{150}\) *Id.*

\(^{151}\) *Id.* at 726–28.


\(^{153}\) *Specialized Seating, Inc.*, 616 F.3d at 727–28.

\(^{154}\) Assuming the manufacturer does not also fail to meet the elements of secondary meaning and likelihood of confusion. See infra Part II for a discussion on requisite elements to receive product trade dress.

\(^{155}\) *See Tools USA and Equipment Co. v. Champ Frame Straightening Equipment, Inc.*, 87 F. 3d 654, 658 (4th Cir. 1996) (“the critical functionality inquiry is not whether each individual component of the trade dress is functional,
the piecemeal analysis in *Heptagon* and *Pride Family Brands*, the *Specialized Seating* court correctly and carefully considered both functional elements that comprised the folding chair and the chair’s functionality as a whole. Had the court applied the fragmentary analysis like the previous cases, the shape of the b-back design may have been functional under the “essential to the use or purpose” rule for the sole reason that it comprises the chair’s backrest. However, the backrest was functional for the reason that it affected the cost or quality of the chair because it was a solution to a problem of folding chairs, and the alternative designs of other folding chairs, although abundant, similarly incorporated solutions to the same problem.

The next problem is conflating utility and functionality. The opinions in *Heptagon* and *Pride Family Brands* show that when a court applies *TrafFix* and does not consider design alternatives or any of the *Morton-Norwich* factors, the decision will turn on the meaning of “essential” if the challenged design does not otherwise affect the cost or quality of the article.156 Both courts wrote no more than a couple of sentences analyzing why the features were essential to the use or purpose of the chair.157 They applied the term “essential to the use or purpose” as

---


157 The heart of the analysis in *Heptagon* was essentially one sentence long. See *Heptagon Creations, Ltd.*, at *7 (“[T]he seating material and tree trunk cocoon siding actually comprise the chair’s seat and arm rests and so are features that are essential to the use or purpose of the furniture piece.”) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also *Pride Family Brands, Inc.*, at n.9 (“One of the claimed elements, a lashing that connects the leaf to the arm of the Coco Isle chair is essential to the construction of the chair.”).
most people would in everyday speech. This phrase alone does not provide enough information and requires a supporting definition, or else courts will continue to use it to mean that anything which serves a utilitarian purpose, or has a use, is functional. That application is a misunderstanding about the Supreme Court and the Restatement’s stance on functionality.  

A layman’s use of “function” and “utility” is inappropriate because the terms are legal terms of art. Indeed, the judicial opinions discussed thus far understood the meaning of “essential to the use or purpose” differently because of their understanding of the concepts of utility and function. The Restatement provides: “A packaging or product feature is not functional merely because the feature serves a utilitarian purpose.” Similarly, “the Supreme Court's Inwood, Qualitex and TrafFix decisions . . . recognize that utility is not the equivalent of functionality.”

The standard left room for useful features—as long as they are not essential to the product. Specialized Seating illustrated this point in the example: a distinctive shape of an article (hexagonal cutouts) can acquire protection even though it also provides structural stability.

When the courts in Pride Family Brands and Heptagon refused to grant protection to a design feature because it “comprised” the chair or “connected” two parts of the chair, they conflated utility and functionality. An ornamental feature that connects two parts of a chair obviously is useful in that it is a connector, but this alone does not show it is functional under the standard because “essential” further qualifies functional. Accordingly, the meaning of “essential to the use or purpose” is not synonymous with useful, per se. Furthermore, the design element
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158 Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition § 17 (1995); See Palladino, supra note 129, at 1232 (explaining how the Supreme Court’s case law is consistent with the Restatement).
159 Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition § 17 (1995).
160 See Palladino, supra note 129, at 1232.
161 Specialized Seating, Inc. v. Greenwich Indus., LP, 616 F.3d 722, 727 (7th Cir. 2010).
162 That standard of course being that which is essential to the use or purpose of the article.
should not have to be useless and physically separate from the article’s primary function (providing a seat). If it did, the test would effectively become the difficult physical separability test that is unique to copyright law. What is more, if the physical separability principle is forced upon trade dress law then chair configurations would never acquire trade dress.

As indicated above, the Heptagon court’s denial of trade dress on the grounds that the design element comprised the chair is an example of conflating utility and functionality. That said, there is still a problem of not further defining the term “essential.” The Second Circuit has adopted supporting definitions to promote a more cohesive understanding of what “essential” means. For instance, the Second Circuit supplemented the term with the following definition: “[A] design feature is essential ‘only if the feature is dictated by the functions to be performed; a feature that merely accommodates a useful function is not enough.’” This supplemental definition also supports the conceptual and legal separation between utility and function by the very fact that it provides more information for courts to interpret and comprehend. More courts need to adopt similar approaches because if there is no cohesion in defining and applying the term, predictability for common law trade dress protection in infringement actions diminishes. What is more, market competition diminishes because some actors and industries are protected while furniture is not.

Many chairs pre-TrafFix acquired trade dress due, in large part, to evidence of the existence of alternative chair designs that serve the same overall purpose or function as the challenged design. In comparison, the courts in Heptagon and Pride Family Brands did not consider

---

163 See infra Part II (discussing copyright law and chair configurations).
164 Id.
166 See Gasser Chair Co., Inc. v. Infanti Chair Mfg. Corp., 943 F.Supp. 201, 214 (E.D.N.Y. 1996), aff’d 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1208 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (concluding that the overall chair designs at issue were not functional in light of the presence of a number of other chairs on the market serving the same function with a different appearance);
alternative designs for the contested features and the designs at issue consequently failed to acquire trade dress.\textsuperscript{167} Thus, if a court’s decision turns on the meaning of “essential,” without a supplemental definition and without consideration of alternative designs or the \textit{Morton-Norwich} factors under the first utilitarian prong, it will hamstring furniture manufacturers from acquiring trade dress protection.

There are additional issues with courts discounting alternative designs within the first prong of functionality. One legal scholar persuasively argued that the approach is a gross misunderstanding of the \textit{TrafFix} opinion.\textsuperscript{168} In addition, the purpose of the nonfunctionality doctrine is to prevent trademark law from imposing unacceptable competitive burdens on competitors and to strike a proper balance between trademark law and patent law.\textsuperscript{169} The reason courts and the TMEP have considered alternative designs is to determine whether competitors can compete equally well without incorporating the challenged design. Therefore, not considering the alternatives contravenes the doctrine’s purpose.

\textbf{IV. POLICY DISCUSSION}

Giving trade dress protection to distinctive chairs will only prevent competitors from using the design in a way that will likely confuse consumers—it will not prevent competitors from using

\textsuperscript{167} The court barred the tropical motif with the doctrine of aesthetic functionality. However, the footnote that barred trade dress on its utilitarian functionality was not a motif; rather, it was a uniquely distinctive design. \textit{See infra} Part III (discussing how the court applied the functionality doctrine in Heptagon and Pride Family Brands).

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{See Palladino}, supra note 137, at 1128 (arguing that refusing to consider alternative designs “runs afoul of \textit{TrafFix}.”).

\textsuperscript{169} \textit{See infra} notes 101–02 and accompanying text.
functional elements. This is partly because in the realm of mid-century modern furniture, the design of a chair was not as much the result of utilitarian pressures as aesthetic choices.\textsuperscript{170} And during that era, there was an explosion of diversity in chair designs.\textsuperscript{171} The Eameses worked with a sculptor to fragment their organic shell forms into steel grids.\textsuperscript{172} In other words, diverse, artistic visions often serve as the impetus for a chair’s design. Protecting the overall look of such chairs will not result in a monopoly protection for \textit{necessary elements}. Therefore, there should be little concern about burdens placed on competitors if the law prevents them from copying classic designs like the Eames Lounge Chair or modern designs like Philippe Starck’s Victoria Ghost Chair. In light of this abundance of alternative designs that will serve the purpose of sitting, courts can grant trade dress to the look of many mid-century and modern designs without worry that it will burden competitors.

Moreover, allowing copycats to benefit off the goodwill of an established mark is unfair. As previously stated, the purpose of the Lanham Act is to protect the owner’s exclusive right to distinguish his or her product so that he or she may receive the benefit of his or her extensive marketing expenditures.\textsuperscript{173} To this point, one scholar succinctly noted that the manufacturer bears the “entire economic burden of innovation while the competition rides freely by unlimited imitation and is thus rationally dissuaded from independent investment.”\textsuperscript{174} Likewise, 

\textsuperscript{170} See ARMSTRONG, supra note 54, at 180–81 (“The well-designed consumer products conceived by the Eames office most often derived their final ‘look’ from a technical solution. But they were also an epic artistic feat; Ray[] [Eames’] sculptural seat elements floated like ethereal pads above the structural frames . . . . Each plywood element became architecture/sculpture in its own right.”).

\textsuperscript{171} See DEMETRIOS, supra note 2, at 36 (discussing the Museum of Modern Art’s Organic Designs in Home Furnishings competition, which drew 585 competing designs in 1940). The organizer of the competition wanted to see design evolve because there had been no outstanding design developments in recent years in the field of home furnishings. Id.

\textsuperscript{172} Id. at 177–88.

\textsuperscript{173} See infra notes 89–91 and accompanying text.

\textsuperscript{174} See Dorota Niechwiej Clegg, \textit{Aesthetic Functionality Conundrum and Trademark: A Proposal for a Foster Home to an Orphan of Intellectual Property Laws}, 89 IOWA L. REV. 273, 308 (2003); see also Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC, 535 U.S. 467, 552 (2002) (“No company will invest billions of dollars ... if competitors who have not
manufacturers that produce exact copies of the classics or other popular designs do not copy for the sake of its better design (that which makes the product cheaper, faster, lighter, or stronger); they copy in order to get a piece of the market success that is attributed to that “look.” These reasons ensure that fair competition—the reason Congress enacted the Lanham Act\textsuperscript{175}—will be preserved.

Finally, there is much to gain from granting trade dress to authentic articles made by companies like Emeco, Herman Miller, Knoll, and Steelcase. These domestic companies help in relieving the trade deficit, display social and environmental responsibility, and produce durable, reliable furniture articles that knockoffs (legal or illegal) have yet to match.\textsuperscript{176} Fortunately, these companies have had some success in asserting their trade dress rights against infringers.\textsuperscript{177}

**CONCLUSION**

Thirteen years after the *TrafFix* decision, there is still a split in the circuit courts on how to interpret the functionality standard. From the more recent case law pertaining to the functionality of chair designs, three main observations can be made. First, courts will severely curtail the trade dress eligibility of a chair if they continue to unpredictably apply a piecemeal analysis to design elements. Second, courts will curtail eligibility if they continue to conflate utility and functionality or overlook the comprehensive definition of “essential.” Finally, courts will contravene the

\textsuperscript{175}See infra notes 89–91 and accompanying text.

\textsuperscript{176}See infra Part I.

purpose of the functionality doctrine—avoiding burdens on competition—if they do not consider as evidence the alternative designs under the first prong of functionality. The future of trade dress registrations on the Federal Register for classic designs (like the Eames Lounge Chair) is solid; such designs will continue to be registerable because the TMEP requires examining attorneys to apply the Morton-Norwich factors. However, if a competitor challenges a design, the product owner, even with incontestable trademark status, must overcome the burdens of inconsistency and misapplication in the federal courts.

Furniture companies that manufacture authentic designs such as Herman Miller, Emeco, Knoll, and Steelcase better serve society’s interest in relieving the trade deficit, supporting socially and environmentally responsible companies and durable, reliable furniture. The purpose behind the functionality doctrine and the Lanham Act at large pertain to free and fair competition. Free riding off the aforementioned companies’ expenditures is a patently unfair practice that courts should prevent.

---

178 See infra note 119 and accompanying text (quoting and explaining the Morton-Norwich factors).
179 Even though some classic furniture designs have registered trade dress, functionality is a defense in an infringement action; therefore, even the registered and uncontestable classics are subject to reevaluation of functionality. Specialized Seating, Inc. v. Greenwich Indus., LP, 616 F.3d 722, 724 (7th Cir. 2010).