

Jed Wakefield, Litigation Partner
Representative Trademark Litigation



Google v. ACPS Global, Inc. (2012): Represented Google before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board in an opposition to ACPS Global's application to register SOOGLE for consumer travel and transportation services. Obtained summary judgment refusing registration of the SOOGLE mark.

Symantec v. Comodo (2011-2012): Represented Symantec in trademark infringement suit against Comodo concerning logos used for security and authentication services. Comodo dropped its use of the disputed logo and withdrew its trademark application.

Groupion LLC v. Groupon (2011-2012): Defended Groupon in trademark infringement lawsuit brought by Groupion, LLC. Defeated preliminary injunction motion and ultimately won summary judgment of non-infringement on all of plaintiff's claims.

VIA Technologies v. Vizio Inc. (2011): Represented Plaintiff VIA Technologies in trademark infringement case against Vizio over the VIA mark as used on consumer electronics.

Twitter v. Twittad (2011): Represented Twitter in trademark lawsuit over third party registration that infringed Twitter's TWEET mark.

Twitter v. Teeshirtmania.biz LLC (2011): Currently representing Twitter before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board in opposition and cancellation proceedings over the TWITTER mark.

Google v. Ahuja (2009-2010): Represented Google before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. Obtained summary judgment refusing registration of the applicant's FUNTOOGLE mark.

Sun Microsystems v. Solaris Computer Systems (2008): Represented Sun in trademark infringement lawsuit over the SOLARIS mark. Obtained permanent injunction.

Harlequin Enterprises v. Massbaum (2005-2006): Represented international publisher Harlequin Enterprises in trademark, dilution and false advertising claim against film production company. Following motion for preliminary injunction, negotiated agreement under which defendant changed its name.

Applied Anagramics v. Call Connect Communications (2002): Represented defendant in trademark and breach of contract case concerning rights to the marks 1-800-DENTIST and 1-800-DOCTORS in the Central District of California. Settled on favorable terms.

Sun Microsystems v. Yava Ltd. (2001-2002): Coordinated efforts with U.K. counsel and Sun in U.K. trademark infringement action involving the JAVA mark.

Sun Microsystems v. Sun Consulting (2001): Represented plaintiff in lawsuit against software consulting company in the Northern District of California; negotiated agreement under which defendant agreed to change its name.

Exodus Communications v. Exodus Technologies (2001): Represented Internet hosting company Exodus Communications in trademark infringement suit brought against Exodus Technologies. Exodus Technologies promptly agreed to change its name.

Critical Path Solutions v. Critical Path (2001): Represented Defendant Critical Path, Inc. in trademark case brought by political “bulk mailing” company in Santa Clara County Superior Court. Despite similarity in company names, defeated all of plaintiff’s claims on summary judgment.

More Online v. More.com (2000): Represented defendant online drugstore More.com in trademark lawsuit brought by e-commerce company in the Central District of California. Negotiated favorable settlement following our client’s defeat of plaintiff’s application for temporary restraining order.

Exegetics v. Sun Microsystems (2000): Defense of trademark opposition proceedings before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. Case settled on favorable terms.

Sun Coast v. Sun Microsystems (1998): Defended Sun in trademark infringement - declaratory relief action involving Internet domain name and use of SUN-based name by ISP. Achieved favorable settlement in mediation.

Sun Data v. Sun Microsystems (1997-1998): Represented Sun Microsystems in extensive trademark litigation in the United States District Court for the Central District of Georgia. Case settled on favorable terms.

Netopia v. Prairie Systems (1997): Defense of trademark infringement action when client was threatened with trademark suit over its use of the name “Virtual Office.” Obtained judgment of non-infringement and cancellation of defendant’s mark.