



**United States Copyright Office**

Library of Congress · 101 Independence Avenue SE · Washington, DC 20559-6000 · [www.copyright.gov](http://www.copyright.gov)

August 23, 2016

Lew Hansen  
Sheridan Ross PC  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200  
Denver, CO 80202-5141

**Re: Second Request for Reconsideration for Refusal to Register Volcano Pattern on Knife Handles and Native Pattern on Knife Handles; Correspondence ID: 1-1G9PGPD**

Dear Mr. Hansen:

The Review Board of the United States Copyright Office ("Board") has considered Spyderco, Inc.'s ("Spyderco's") second request for reconsideration of the Registration Program's refusal to register two-dimensional artwork claims in the works titled "Volcano Pattern on Knife Handles" and "Native Pattern on Knife Handles" (separately, "Volcano Pattern" and "Native Pattern," collectively, "Works"). After reviewing the application, deposit copy, and relevant correspondence, along with the arguments in the second request for reconsideration, the Board affirms the Registration Program's denial of registration.

**I. DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKS**

The Works are claimed as 2-D artwork. The Volcano Pattern is a pattern on the black hard-plastic or silicone handle of a simple folding knife, consisting of rows of squares, each accented with circular indents, set on a square grid. A logo (referred to as the Spyderco Atlantic Salt "logo") is positioned at the center of the handle, but is not claimed as part of the design.

The Native Pattern is also a pattern on the black hard-plastic or silicone handle of a simple folding knife, consisting of a series of straight lines cut into the surface, projecting outward from a circle at the center of the handle, where a logo (referred to as the Spyderco Native "logo") is positioned. Again, the logo is not claimed as part of the design. At regular, increasing intervals going outward from the logo, the straight lines are intersected by arcs, also cut into the surface.

Reproductions of the Works are set forth below:

Volcano Pattern on Knife Handles



Native Pattern on Knife Handles



## II. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

On April 25, 2013, Spyderco filed applications to register copyright claims in the Works. In a June 23, 2015 letter, a Copyright Office registration specialist refused to register the claim, finding that the "claims are based on new material added to preexisting elements," and "the new

material does not contain a sufficient amount of original authorship.” Letter from Wilbur King, Registration Specialist, to Lew Hansen, Sheridan Lewis PC (July 23, 2015).

In a letter dated October 19, 2015, Spyderco requested that the Office reconsider its initial refusal to register the Works. Letter from Lew Hansen, Sheridan Ross PC, to U.S. Copyright Office (Oct. 19, 2015) (“First Request”). After reviewing the Works in light of the points raised in the First Request, the Office re-evaluated the claims and again concluded that although “the designs that accent the handles of the knives are conceptually separable,” those designs “do not contain a sufficient amount of creative expression to sustain claims in copyright.” Letter from Stephanie M. Mason, Attorney-Advisor, to Lew Hansen, Sheridan Ross PC, at 2-3 (Feb. 25, 2016).

In a letter dated May 9, 2016, Spyderco requested that, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 202.5(c), the Office reconsider for a second time its refusal to register the Works. Letter from Lew Hansen, Sheridan Ross PC, to U.S. Copyright Office (May 9, 2016) (“Second Request”). In that letter, Spyderco asserted that with respect to the Volcano Pattern, “[e]ven though . . . the dimples are arranged uniformly, the specific selection and arrangement of the shapes and angles is an original, creative design.” *Id.* at 5. Concerning the Native Pattern, Spyderco argued that the design “is not a simple application of a geometric pattern,” and that the lines “are not arranged to radiate from the circle uniformly and they do not radiate perpendicular to the circular element”, such that “[v]iewed as a whole, the design is sufficiently creative to surpass the ‘extremely low’ level of creativity required for copyright protection.” *Id.* at 3-4.

### III. DISCUSSION

#### A. *The Legal Framework*

##### 1) *Useful Articles and Separability*

The copyright law does not protect useful articles, which are defined as “article[s] having an intrinsic utilitarian function that is not merely to portray the appearance of the article or to convey information.” 17 U.S.C. § 101. Works of artistic craftsmanship that have been incorporated into a useful article may be eligible for copyright protection if they constitute pictorial, graphic, or sculptural works pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 102(a)(5). The protection for such works is limited, however, in that it extends only “insofar as [the works’] form but not their mechanical or utilitarian aspects are concerned.” *Id.* at 101. In other words, a design incorporated into a useful article is only eligible for copyright protection to the extent that the design includes “pictorial, graphic, or sculptural features that can be identified separately from, and are capable of existing independently of, the utilitarian aspects of the article.” *Id.*; *see also Esquire, Inc. v. Ringer*, 591 F.2d 796, 800 (D.C. Cir. 1978) (holding that copyright protection is not available for the “overall shape or configuration of a utilitarian article, no matter how aesthetically pleasing that shape . . . may be”).

The Office employs two tests to assess separability: (1) a test for physical separability; and (2) a test for conceptual separability. *See* COMPENDIUM OF U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE PRACTICES § 924.2 (3d ed. 2014) (“COMPENDIUM (THIRD)”); *see also Inhale, Inc. v. Starbuzz*

*Tobacco, Inc.*, 755 F.3d 1038, 1041 n.2 (9th Cir. 2014) (finding that the Office’s interpretation of conceptual separability is entitled to deference); *Custom Chrome, Inc. v. Ringer*, 35 U.S.P.Q.2d 1714 (D.D.C. 1995) (finding that the Office’s tests for physical and conceptual separability are “a reasonable construction of the copyright statute[]” consistent with the words of the statute, existing law, and the legislature’s declared intent in enacting the statute).

To satisfy the test for physical separability, a useful article must contain pictorial, graphic, or sculptural features that can be physically separated from the article by ordinary means. See COMPENDIUM (THIRD) § 924.2(A); see also *Mazer v. Stein*, 347 U.S. 201 (1954) (sculpture of Balinese dancer eligible for copyright protection even though intended for use as lamp base); *Ted Arnold, Ltd. v. Silvercraft Co.*, 259 F. Supp. 733 (S.D.N.Y. 1966) (pencil sharpener casing shaped like a telephone was physically separable from the article’s utilitarian function).

To satisfy the test for conceptual separability, a useful article must contain pictorial, graphic, or sculptural features that can be visualized—either on paper or as a free-standing sculpture—as a work of authorship that is separate and independent from the utilitarian aspects of the article and the overall shape of the article. In other words,

... the feature must be [able to be] imagined separately and independently from the useful article without destroying the basic shape of that article. A pictorial, graphic, or sculptural feature satisfies this requirement only if the artistic feature and the useful article could both exist side by side and be perceived as fully realized, separate works—one an artistic work and the other a useful article.

COMPENDIUM (THIRD) § 924.2(B). If the feature is an integral part of the overall shape or contour of the useful article, that feature cannot be considered conceptually separable because removing it would destroy the basic shape of the article. See *id.*; see also H.R. REP. NO. 94-1476, at 55 (1976), reprinted in 1976 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5659, 5668 (citing a carving on the back of a chair or a floral relief design on silver flatware as examples of conceptually separable design features).

If the useful article does not contain any features that can be physically or conceptually separated from its utilitarian function, the Office will refuse to register the claim because Congress has made it clear that copyright protection does not extend to any aspect of a useful article that cannot be separated from its functional elements. If the Office determines that the work contains one or more features that can be separated from its functional elements, the Office will examine those features to determine if they contain a sufficient amount of original authorship to warrant registration.

## 2) Originality

A work may be registered if it qualifies as an “original work[] of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression.” 17 U.S.C. § 102(a). In this context, the term “original” consists of two components: independent creation and sufficient creativity. See *Feist Publ’ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 345 (1991). First, the work must have been independently created by the author, *i.e.*, not copied from another work. *Id.* Second, the work

must possess sufficient creativity. *Id.* Only a modicum of creativity is necessary, but the Supreme Court has ruled that some works (such as the alphabetized telephone directory at issue in *Feist*) fail to meet even this low threshold. *Id.* The Court observed that “[a]s a constitutional matter, copyright protects only those constituent elements of a work that possess more than a *de minimis* quantum of creativity.” *Id.* at 363. It further found that there can be no copyright in a work in which “the creative spark is utterly lacking or so trivial as to be virtually nonexistent.” *Id.* at 359.

The Office’s regulations implement the longstanding requirement of originality set forth in the Copyright Act and described in the *Feist* decision. *See, e.g.*, 37 C.F.R. § 202.1(a) (prohibiting registration of “[w]ords and short phrases such as names, titles, slogans; familiar symbols or designs; [and] mere variations of typographic ornamentation, lettering, or coloring”); *id.* § 202.10(a) (stating “to be acceptable as a pictorial, graphic, or sculptural work, the work must embody some creative authorship in its delineation or form”). Some combinations of common or standard design elements may contain sufficient creativity with respect to how they are juxtaposed or arranged to support a copyright. Nevertheless, not every combination or arrangement will be sufficient to meet this test. *See Feist*, 499 U.S. at 358 (finding the Copyright Act “implies that some ‘ways’ [of selecting, coordinating, or arranging uncopyrightable material] will trigger copyright, but that others will not”). A determination of copyrightability in the combination of standard design elements depends on whether the selection, coordination, or arrangement is done in such a way as to result in copyrightable authorship. *Id.*; *see also Atari Games Corp. v. Oman*, 888 F.2d 878 (D.C. Cir. 1989).

A mere simplistic arrangement of non-protectable elements does not demonstrate the level of creativity necessary to warrant protection. For example, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York upheld the Copyright Office’s refusal to register simple designs consisting of two linked letter “C” shapes “facing each other in a mirrored relationship” and two unlinked letter “C” shapes “in a mirrored relationship and positioned perpendicular to the linked elements.” *Coach Inc. v. Peters*, 386 F. Supp. 2d 495, 496 (S.D.N.Y. 2005). Likewise, the Ninth Circuit has held that a glass sculpture of a jellyfish consisting of clear glass, an oblong shroud, bright colors, vertical orientation, and

the stereotypical jellyfish form did not merit copyright protection. *See Satava v. Lowry*, 323 F. 3d 805, 811 (9th Cir. 2003). The language in *Satava* is particularly instructive:

It is true, of course, that a combination of unprotectable elements may qualify for copyright protection. But it is not true that *any* combination of unprotectable elements automatically qualifies for copyright protection. Our case law suggests, and we hold today, that a combination of unprotectable elements is eligible for copyright protection only if those elements are numerous enough and their selection and arrangement original enough that their combination constitutes an original work of authorship.

*Id.* (internal citations omitted).

Similarly, while the Office may register a work that consists merely of geometric shapes, for such a work to be registrable, the “author’s use of those shapes [must] result[] in a work that, as a whole, is sufficiently creative.” COMPENDIUM (THIRD) § 906.1; *see also Atari Games Corp.*, 888 F.2d at 883 (“[S]imple shapes, when selected or combined in a distinctive manner indicating some ingenuity, have been accorded copyright protection both by the Register and in court.”). Thus, the Office would register, for example, a wrapping paper design that consists of circles, triangles, and stars arranged in an unusual pattern with each element portrayed in a different color, but would not register a picture consisting merely of a purple background and evenly-spaced white circles. COMPENDIUM (THIRD) § 906.1.

### ***B. Analysis of the Works***

After carefully examining the Works and applying the legal standards discussed above, the Board finds that the Works are useful articles that do not contain the requisite separable authorship necessary to sustain a claim to copyright.

First, it is undisputed that the Works (patterns on knife handles) are components of useful articles. Thus, for there to be any consideration of the Works’ design features, the features must be either physically or conceptually separable from the Works’ utilitarian functions as knife handles. *See Norris Indus., Inc. v. Int’l Tel. & Tel. Corp.*, 696 F.2d 918, 922 (11th Cir. 2011); *see also Esquire, Inc.*, 591 F.2d at 800. The Works clearly are not physically separable. Spyderco, however, argues that the Works are “conceptually separable from the shape of the useful articles and their utilitarian functions.” Second Request at 1. We agree. The patterns sought to be registered can be “imagined separately and independently” from the body of the knife handles themselves “without destroying the basic shape” of the handles. COMPENDIUM (THIRD) § 924.2(B).

Still, for a work to be eligible for copyright protection, it must “possess more than a *de minimis* quantum of creativity.” *Feist*, 499 U.S. 340, 363. The Works do not meet this low threshold. Spyderco correctly states that “geometric patterns, through original organization and presentation, may be copyrightable.” Second Request at 1. As noted above, however, the Copyright Office will not register patterns of simple shapes unless the “author’s use of those shapes results in a work that, as a whole, is sufficiently creative.” COMPENDIUM (THIRD) § 906.1. The key inquiry is whether the shapes are “selected or combined in a distinctive manner indicating some ingenuity.” *Atari Games*, 888 F.2d at 883.

The Volcano Pattern consists entirely of rows of squares accented with circular intents, placed on a square grid. Spyderco admits that “in this case the dimples are arranged uniformly,” but argues that “the selection and arrangement of the shapes and angles is an original, creative design.” Second Request at 5. The combination of a circle (or in this case, a “dimple”) inside a square is a common design approach. Furthermore, the placement of these elements on a square grid constitutes one of the most basic possible arrangements, and does not render the design sufficiently creative to be protectable under copyright. *See Feist*, 499 U.S. at 358 (noting that “not every selection, coordination, or arrangement will pass muster.”).

The Native Pattern consists merely of straight lines intersected by arcs at steadily increasing intervals. As discussed above, the “Copyright Act does not protect common


geometric shapes” such as straight and curved lines. COMPENDIUM (THIRD) § 906.1. A combination of straight lines and arcs could conceivably meet the minimum standards of creativity to warrant copyright protection, but in this case it does not. Even though the lines do not intersect the Spyderco Native logo at 90 degree angles in the center of the handle, as Spyderco points out, Second Request at 3, that fact is not sufficient to render the work original. The Native Pattern’s intersecting lines are an example of “merely bringing together only a few standard forms or shapes with minor linear or spatial variations,” which fails to meet the originality requirement for visual art works. COMPENDIUM (THIRD) § 905. Furthermore, although the distances between the arcs are not constant, they do appear to increase at a uniform rate. As a whole, the Native Pattern falls below the requisite level of creativity for a work to qualify for copyright protection.

In sum, the Board finds that the level of creative authorship involved in these Works is, at best, *de minimis*, and too trivial to enable copyright registration.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, the Review Board of the United States Copyright Office affirms the refusal to register the copyright claim in the Work. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 202.5(g), this decision constitutes final agency action in this matter.

BY:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chris Weston  
Copyright Office Review Board