



Brief of Amicus Curiae NYIPLA in Support of Petitioner

Author(s): Charles R. Macedo, David Goldberg, Christopher Lisiewski

[NYIPLA Urges Supreme Court to Clarify the Definition of “Expenses” in Lanham Act.](#)

On Thursday, May 16, 2019, the New York Intellectual Property Law Association (“NYIPLA”) filed an amicus brief in support of a petition for a writ of certiorari by Booking.com B.V. urging the Supreme Court to decide whether a trademark applicant must pay the United States Patent and Trademark Office’s (“PTO”) attorneys’ fees as “expenses in United States district court appeals pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1071 (b)(3). The NYIPLA takes the position that the Supreme Court should grant certiorari in this case and consolidate it with *Peter v. Nantkwest*, No. 18-801 under Rules of the Supreme Court 27.

In support, the NYIPLA argued that Booking.com raises the same issue as *NantKwest*, but challenges the statutory definition of “expenses” for the Trademark Act (15 U.S.C.) instead of the Patent Act (35 U.S.C.) [...]

Click to download pdf: [Motion For Leave To File Amicus Curiae Brief and Brief of New York Intellectual Property Law Association As Amicus Curiae In Support of Petitioner](#)