Guaranteeing Enforcing and Defending Intellectual Property Rights on Amazon

By EDWARD WIGGLES and ALANNA MILLER

It is no surprise that Amazon, one of the world’s largest retailers, maintains its own process for managing infringement and counterfeiting complaints. This process has been designed specifically for asserting and defending against infringement claims.

In this article, we explain how trademark and patent infringement strategies on Amazon by describing the process for rights holders to report infringement, and the impact of successful enforcement concerning ‘computer generated models’ and ‘influencers’ in the context of alleged infringement and counterfeiting.
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Amazon permits the submission of a Take-Down Request from the rights holder including, but not limited to, infringement issues. If the rights holder believes the Take-Down Notice is meritless, the accused infringer must submit a “Plan of Action” (1) “the reason(s) you believe the Take-Down Notice is meritless,” (2) your contact information, and (3) the name of the Take-Down Request from the Amazon account information.
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The patentability of artificial intelligence (AI) has been increasingly questioned within the technology industry. This year, the USPTO released its revised guidelines for determining the subject matter eligibility test. The Supreme Court's decision in Alice v. CLS Bank International set the stage for the modern approach to determining the patentability of AI. The USPTO's revised guidelines provide a more streamlined and consistent approach to evaluating AI patents.

Considering the advances in AI technology and intellectual property law, how do these recent developments shape the outlook of AI patentability?

The revised guidelines may provide more clarity and predictability for AI-related patents. However, it remains to be seen whether the new guidelines will address the concerns of the Supreme Court.

Additional considerations for patent owners include the potential for reduced legal fees and increased patent validity. The revised guidelines also offer hope for those involved in the AI technology sector, as they may be more inclined to pursue patents for their inventions.

In conclusion, the revised guidelines may provide a more stable legal environment for AI patents. However, further developments in the AI technology sector will continue to shape the outlook of AI patentability.
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ugmented reality (AR) technology, in its computer-generated environment, is rapidly advancing to a point of general commercial application. With the retail industry in particular, the expectation is that the market will exceed $50 billion in the next three to four years. « Continued from page 9

AR Advertising

AR is no different from traditional advertising, and the rules that currently govern it are being enforced by the courts. « Continued from page 11
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As Amazon continues to grow and change the way it presents itself, the landscape of intellectual property (IP) infringement issues on Amazon continues to expand. It is increasingly important for attorneys to have the tools to assist clients in managing these new IP infringement issues on Amazon.

If Plan A fails, or instead of a Plan A, if concurrent with Plan A, the accused infringer may seek Plan B, in which case the motion to dismiss is granted. If the accused infringer chooses to file suit in the state in which the accused infringer is located rather than where the rights holder is situated, the accused infringer may encounter similar challenges to asserting personal jurisdiction over the rights holder. This is arguably because the minimal contacts, i.e., action, place of business or residence, or even a single service or delivery of advertising, may be insufficient to establish minimum contacts. The New York Attorney General generally relies on either copyright or trademark infringement as grounds for its enforcement of consumer protection laws, but the Supreme Court has held that the New York AG cannot bring claims under either copyright or trademark law.
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