


It burns
when IP.

A card game for lawyers with
a modicum of creativity

Fixed in a tangible medium of expression by Brian Love and colleagues,
in partnership with:



It Burns When I.P. is not affiliated with Cards Against Humanity LLC, nor any other entity with a facile understanding of trademark law. Anyone who believes otherwise should subject their brain to ex parte re-examination


When printing the game cards that follow, select “Print on both sides of paper” and “flip on short edge.” If you prefer to print on sticker labels suitable for application to [Your Shitty Jokes](#) cards, detailed instructions for doing so are available [here](#) and  .

Please note, however, that if you follow these instructions, we will be forced to sue you for tarnishment.

It Burns when I.P. is made available by Santa Clara University School of Law’s High Tech Law Institute under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Public License](#).

Game Rules:

- Organize the cards below into two decks: one that contains all 35 “Question Cards” and one that contains all 135 “Answer Cards.”
- Shuffle both decks, and deal each player a hand of Answer Cards. For effective gameplay, we recommend that each player receive a number of Answer Cards no greater than the number of patent applications filed by Jerome Lemelson and no less than the number of products he commercialized. Five to seven should suffice.
- Next, determine which player will draw the first Question Card. Select the player who was most recently sued by Louis Vuitton. In the unlikely event that no player has been sued, select instead the player who most recently visited a Taco Cabana. As a last resort, select the player who most closely resembles Hugo Zacchini. For the duration of this round of gameplay, this player shall be known as the *It Burns When I.P. Enforcement Coordinator*.
- The *I.P. Enforcement Coordinator* initiates a round of gameplay by drawing a Question Card and reading it to all other players. Each Question Card presents either an open-ended question or a sentence with missing text indicated by one or more blanks, i.e., “_____.”
- If the Question Card asks a question, each player should select the card from their hand that provides the best answer to the question presented. If the Question Card instead includes one or more blanks, each player should select the card(s) from their hand that best fill(s) in the blank(s). If the Question Card includes three blanks, each player may draw two additional Answer Cards before making their selections. All cards (or sets of cards) should be handed face down to the *I.P. Enforcement Coordinator*.

- At this point, any cards submitted by Gilbert Hyatt should be set aside and ignored. The *I.P. Enforcement Coordinator* shall then shuffle the remaining submissions and read them one at a time to the group. In a preferred embodiment, the *I.P. Enforcement Coordinator* re-reads the Question Card before reading each submitted Answer Card (or set of submitted Answer Cards).
- The *I.P. Enforcement Coordinator* then selects the “best” submission. To meet the expectations of IP lawyers with appellate practices, arbitrary and capricious decision-making is encouraged. Use of humor as a selection criteria is permissible but not recommended, as this will unfairly prejudice patent attorneys. The player who submitted the selected answer wins the hand.
- Before the next round of gameplay, each player draws one or more new Answer Card(s) to replace those submitted in the prior round. The player sitting immediately to the left of the *I.P. Enforcement Coordinator* in the prior round becomes the new *I.P. Enforcement Coordinator* for the next round of gameplay. The prior *I.P. Enforcement Coordinator* must now become a lobbyist for the RIAA, PhRMA, or INTA.
- The winner of the game is the player who wins the most hands before the game ends. However, determination of the winner may subsequently be challenged in a potentially infinite number of administrative proceedings that follow a different set of rules drafted by a shadowy cabal of former in-house counsel for Facebook, Amazon, Apple, Netflix, and Google.
- Warning: We regret to inform you that *It Burns When I.P.* may also be played using the rules provided with Cards Against Humanity, available [here](#) and .

This is strictly forbidden. Any player caught accessing these rules will be banned from further gameplay until such time as they can cogently explain the Supreme Court’s reasoning in *Star Athletica, L.L.C. v. Varsity Brands, Inc.*, 137 S.Ct. 1002 (2017).

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>A comedian's best weapon against joke theft: _____.</p> | <p>A group of IP lawyers formed an experimental nerdcore-punk fusion band. I hear they named it _____.</p> | <p>Ask your doctor if Cyclospasmol* is right for you. Side effects include _____.</p> <p><i>*See Inwood Labs., Inc. v. Ives Labs., Inc., 456 U.S. 844 (1982).</i></p> | <p>Berne Convention?* Sounds like a place you'd go to learn about _____.</p> <p><i>*Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Sept. 9, 1986, as last revised at Paris, July 24, 1971, 1161 U.N.T.S. 3.</i></p> | <p>California employment law is so pro-employee that employment agreements can't even prohibit _____.</p> |
| <p>Can you believe France just decreed that _____ is now copyright infringement?!?</p> | <p>Did you hear? _____ was just confirmed as the new U.S. IP Enforcement Coordinator.</p> | <p>Forget the legislative history. We all know that the Defend Trade Secrets Act was really passed to stop people from _____.</p> | <p>"Free riders"? Sounds like a movie about _____.</p> | <p>How does the Federal Circuit decide patentable subject matter cases?</p> |

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**


SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>If a member of the Federal Circuit was appointed to the Supreme Court, we'd probably wind up with a constitutional right to _____.</p> | <p>I'm only able to understand the Supreme Court's <i>Star Athletica</i>* opinion when I'm microdosing _____.</p> <p><i>*Star Athletica, L.L.C. v. Varsity Brands, Inc., 137 S.Ct. 1002 (2017).</i></p> | <p>IP lawyers' pickup lines always seem to mention _____.</p> | <p>Little known fact: Giles Rich was heavily inspired by _____ while writing the Patent Act of 1952.</p> | <p>Marshall, Texas is a really boring place. Patent litigators have no choice but to pass the time by _____.</p> |
| <p>No law student's preparation for an IP Survey final exam would be complete without _____.</p> | <p>One weird trick to qualify for admission to the patent bar under Category B*: _____.</p> <p><i>See General Requirements Bulletin for Admission to the Examination for Registration to Practice in Patent Cases Before the USPTO 4-7 (2021).</i></p> | <p>Sorry, but KFC's "11 herbs and spices" recipe is totally NOT a secret. It's just salt, pepper, oregano, _____, and _____.</p>  | <p>Sorry, USPTO! I wasn't able to pay my maintenance fee on time due to _____.</p> | <p>Step 1: Obtaining IP rights Step 2: _____ Step 3: Profit!</p> |

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Thank God for <i>Matal v Tam</i>!* Now I can finally re-name my company _____.</p> <p><i>*Matal v. Tam, 137 S. Ct. 1744 (2017).</i></p> | <p>The judge could hardly stop herself from giggling when she sentenced the IP lawyer to serve “Life plus 70” for illegally _____.</p> | <p>The IP lawyer was kicked out of the library because she wouldn’t stop _____.</p> | <p>The most controversial section of the Restatement of Copyright is entitled _____.</p> | <p>There are so many <i>Georgia Pacific</i>* factors that few people realize one calls for consideration of _____.</p> <p><i>*Georgia-Pac. Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp., 318 F. Supp. 1116 (S.D.N.Y. 1970).</i></p> |
| <p>trademarks : patents :: _____ : _____</p> | <p>What did the IP lawyer chain her bicycle to?</p> <p><i>See Brandir Int’l, Inc. v. Cascade Pac. Lumber Co., 834 F.2d 1142 (2d Cir. 1987).</i></p> | <p>What is claimed is: a method for _____, comprising _____ and _____.</p> <p>Draw 2 Pick 3</p> | <p>What magic words do IP lawyers say when they cast a spell?</p> | <p>What will Disney do when Mickey falls into the public domain?</p> |

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>What's stopping New York from adopting the Uniform Trade Secrets Act?</p> | <p>What's the hardest part of applying the "fair use" test?</p> | <p>When I'm appointed Director of the USPTO, I'll create a new Art Unit devoted exclusively to _____.</p> | <p>You know an IP lawyer is having a mid-life crisis when he starts talking about _____.</p> | <p>Your new favorite "descriptive fair use" hypo: a comparative ad that reads, "If you like _____, you'll LOVE _____."</p> |
|--|---|---|--|--|

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

HIGH TECH LAW INSTITUTE

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

**QUESTION
CARD**

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>2 Live Crew</p> <p><i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i>, 510 U.S. 569 (1994).</p> | <p>A “headstart” injunction</p> <p><i>Winston Research Corp. v. Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co.</i>, 350 F.2d 134, 142 (9th Cir. 1965).</p> | <p>A “moron in a hurry”</p> <p><i>Morning Star Cooperative Soc’y v. Express Newspapers Ltd.</i>, [1979] FSR 113 (Oct. 18, 1978).</p> | <p>A “murky morass”</p> <p><i>MySpace, Inc. v. GraphOn Corp.</i>, 672 F.3d 1250, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2012).</p> | <p>A “Psycho Chihuahua”</p> <p><i>Wrench LLC v. Taco Bell Corp.</i>, 256 F.3d 446, 449 (6th Cir. 2001).</p> |
| <p>A “string of puppies”</p> <p><i>Rogers v. Koons</i>, 960 F.2d 301, 304 (2d Cir. 1992).</p> | <p>A Big O Big Foot</p> <p><i>Big O Tire Dealers, Inc. v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.</i>, 561 F.2d 1365 (10th Cir. 1977).</p> | <p>A bunch of Bratz</p> <p><i>Mattel, Inc. v. MGA Entm’t, Inc.</i>, 616 F.3d 904 (9th Cir. 2010).</p> | <p>A disgruntled college professor</p> <p><i>Madey v. Duke Univ.</i>, 307 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2002).</p> | <p>A George Wendt puppet</p> <p><i>Wendt v. Host Int’l, Inc.</i>, 125 F.3d 806 (9th Cir. 1997).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p>A German PhD dissertation</p> <p>In re <i>Hall</i>, 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).</p> | <p>A human-animal chimera</p> <p>USPTO Media Advisory, Facts on Patenting Life Forms Having a Relationship to Humans (Apr. 1, 1998).</p> | <p>A longfelt, unmet need</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i>, 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).</p> | <p>A monkey taking a selfie</p> <p><i>Naruto v. Slater</i>, 888 F.3d 418 (9th Cir. 2018).</p> | <p>A one-piece seersucker outfit from Wal-Mart</p> <p><i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc.</i>, 529 U.S. 205 (2000).</p> |
| <p>A photo of the Indianapolis skyline</p> <p><i>Bell v. Wilmott Storage Serv., LLC</i>, 12 F.4th 1065 (9th Cir. 2021).</p> | <p>A request for continued examination</p> <p>37 CFR § 1.114.</p> | <p>A super soaker</p> <p><i>Larami Corp. v. Amron</i>, 27 U.S.P.Q.2d 1280 (E.D. Pa. 1993).</p> | <p>A trash bag that looks like a jack-o-lantern</p> <p>In re <i>Dembiczak</i>, 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999).</p> | <p>“All that wiggles is not Jell-O”</p> <p><i>Downey v. Gen. Foods Corp.</i>, 286 N.E.2d 257, 259 (N.Y. 1972).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**


SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Aesthetically pleasing styrene-foam torsos</p> <p><i>Carol Barnhart Inc. v. Econ. Cover Corp.</i>, 773 F.2d 411 (2d Cir. 1985).</p> | <p>Andy Warhol</p> <p><i>Andy Warhol Found. for Visual Arts, Inc. v. Goldsmith</i>, 11 F.4th 26 (2d Cir. 2021).</p> | <p>Anthropomorphic albino worms</p> <p><i>Winter v. DC Comics</i>, 69 P.3d 473 (Cal. 2003).</p> | <p>Asexual reproduction</p> <p>35 U.S.C. § 161.</p> | <p>Backlog</p>  |
| <p>Balls with “finger placement indicia”</p> <p><i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i>, 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001).</p> | <p>Barbie Girl</p> <p><i>Mattel, Inc. v. MCA Records, Inc.</i>, 296 F.3d 894 (9th Cir. 2002).</p> | <p>Beanie Babies</p> <p><i>Ty Inc. v. Perryman</i>, 306 F.3d 509 (7th Cir. 2002).</p> | <p>Behaving in a manner “characteristic of a pirate”</p> <p><i>Halo Elec., Inc. v. Pulse Elec., Inc.</i>, 136 S. Ct. 1923, 1932 (2016).</p> | <p>Buick Aspirin</p> <p>H.R. Rep. 104-374, 1996 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1029, 1030 (Nov. 30, 1995).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Buying all the bamboo in Japan</p> <p><i>See, e.g.,</i> ANDRE MILLARD, EDISON AND THE BUSINESS OF INNOVATION (1990).</p> | <p>Calling a 1-900 number to talk about New Kids on the Block</p> <p><i>New Kids on the Block v. News Am. Publ'g, Inc.</i>, 971 F.2d 302 (9th Cir. 1992).</p> | <p>Canal Street</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Omega SA v. 375 Canal, LLC</i>, 984 F.3d 244 (2d Cir. 2021).</p> | <p>Conception</p> <p>35 U.S.C. § 102(g).</p> | <p>Counting and measuring every last dimple on a golf ball</p> <p><i>Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. David Geoffrey & Assocs.</i>, 904 F.2d 677 (Fed. Cir. 1990).</p> |
| <p>Curlicue French fries</p> <p><i>Lamb-Weston, Inc. v. McCain Foods, Ltd.</i>, 941 F.2d 970 (9th Cir. 1991).</p> | <p>Cybersquatting</p> <p><i>See, e.g.</i>, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d).</p> | <p>Death squads</p> <p><i>See, e.g.</i>, Peter Pitts, 'Patent Death Squads' vs. Innovation, WALL ST. J. (June 10, 2015, 7:23 PM) (quoting then-Chief Judge of the Federal Circuit Randall R. Rader).</p> | <p>Dissection</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Arnstein v. Porter</i>, 154 F.2d 464, 468 (2d Cir. 1946).</p> | <p>Drawing a wicked tractor pull rig on a tablecloth in your mother's kitchen</p> <p><i>Nat'l Tractor Pullers Ass'n v. Watkins</i>, 205 U.S.P.Q. 892 (N.D. Ill. 1980).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Dressing robots up like Vanna White</p> <p><i>White v. Samsung Elec. Am., Inc.</i>, 971 F.2d 1395 (9th Cir. 1992); 989 F.2d 1512 (9th Cir. 1993).</p> | <p>Egyptian Goddess</p> <p><i>Egyptian Goddess, Inc. v. Swisa, Inc.</i>, 543 F.3d 665 (Fed. Cir. 2008).</p> | <p>Engaging in amateur lexicography</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i>, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).</p> | <p>Enjoy Cocaine!</p> <p><i>Coca-Cola Co. v. Gemini Rising, Inc.</i>, 346 F. Supp. 1183 (E.D.N.Y. 1972).</p> | <p>Enjoying Taco Cabana’s “festive eating atmosphere”</p> <p><i>Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc.</i>, 505 U.S. 763, 765 (1992).</p> |
| <p>Expressing yourself with rubber dog toys</p> <p><i>VIP Prods. LLC v. Jack Daniel’s Props., Inc.</i>, 953 F.3d 1170 (9th Cir. 2020).</p> | <p>“falsely portray[ing] [musicians] as ‘vile, depraved, stupid, cowardly, subhuman individuals who engage in wanton acts of violence, murder and bestiality for pleasure and who should be killed”</p> <p><i>Winter v. DC Comics</i>, 69 P.3d 473, 476 (Cal. 2003).</p> | <p>Fighting about how to pronounce PHOSITA/POSITA/POSA</p> <p><i>See</i> 35 U.S.C. § 103.</p> | <p>Filming a human cannonball</p> <p><i>Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broad. Co.</i>, 433 U.S. 562 (1977).</p> | <p>Filming David Spade misusing a Slip ‘N Slide</p> <p><i>Wham-O, Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp.</i>, 286 F. Supp. 2d 1254 (N.D. Cal. 2003).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Fruits of labor</p> <p>JOHN LOCKE, TWO TREATISES ON GOVERNMENT (3d ed. 1698).</p> | <p>Funk Brothers</p> <p><i>Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.</i>, 333 U.S. 127 (1948).</p> | <p>Gerald Ford's autobiography</p> <p><i>Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters.</i>, 471 U.S. 539 (1985).</p> | <p>Geraldo Rivera</p> <p><i>Sellers v. Am. Broad. Co.</i>, 668 F.2d 1207 (11th Cir. 1982).</p> | <p>Getting rich by gluing sh-t to ceramic tiles</p> <p><i>Lee v. A.R.T. Co.</i>, 125 F.3d 580 (7th Cir. 1997); <i>Mirage Editions, Inc. v. Albuquerque A.R.T. Co.</i>, 856 F.2d 1341 (9th Cir. 1988).</p> |
| <p>Googling something on Bing</p> <p><i>Elliott v. Google, Inc.</i>, 860 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2017).</p> | <p>Guiding a “gobbler” with my “joy stick”</p> <p><i>Atari, Inc. v. N. Am. Philips Consumer Elecs. Corp.</i>, 672 F.2d 607, 610 (7th Cir. 1982) (“Using a ‘joy stick,’ the player guides the gobbler through the maze, consuming pink dots along the way.”).</p> | <p>“hard-wound, industrial toilet tissue”</p> <p><i>Paper Converting Mach. Co. v. Magna-Graphics Corp.</i>, 745 F.2d 11, 13 (Fed. Cir. 1984).</p> | <p>Hindsight bias</p> <p><i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i>, 383 U.S. 1 (1966).</p> | <p>Hot news</p> <p><i>Int'l News Serv. v. Associated Press</i>, 248 U.S. 215 (1918).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Impressing party guests with a kickass kaleidoscope</p> <p><i>Beachcombers Int'l, Inc. v. WildeWood Creative Prods., Inc.</i>, 31 F.3d 1154 (Fed. Cir. 1994).</p> | <p>“intensive breeding efforts”</p> <p><i>Yoder Bros., Inc. v. Cal.-Fla. Plant Corp.</i>, 537 F.2d 1347, 1351 (5th Cir. 1976).</p> | <p>Jerry Falwell</p> <p><i>Lamparello v. Falwell</i>, 420 F.3d 309 (4th Cir. 2005).</p> | <p>Juicy Whip</p> <p><i>Juicy Whip, Inc. v. Orange Bang, Inc.</i>, 185 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 1999).</p> | <p>“juxtapos[ing] the romantic musings of a man whose fantasy comes true, with degrading taunts, a bawdy demand for sex, and a sigh of relief from paternal responsibility”</p> <p><i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i>, 510 U.S. 569 (1994).</p> |
| <p>Katy Perry</p> <p><i>Gray v. Perry</i>, No. 2:15-cv-05642, 2020 WL 1275221 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2020).</p> | <p>Lindsay Lohan</p> <p><i>Lohan v. Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc.</i>, 97 N.E.3d 389 (N.Y. 2018).</p> | <p>Low res nudie magazine pics</p> <p><i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i>, 508 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2007); <i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i>, 416 F. Supp. 2d 828 (C.D. Cal. 2006).</p> | <p>Lubing up a steam engine with animal fats</p> <p><i>Tilghman v. Proctor</i>, 102 U.S. 707 (1880).</p> | <p>Manuel Noriega</p> <p><i>Noriega v. Activision/Blizzard, Inc.</i>, No. BC551747 (Cal. Sup. Ct. L.A. County 2014).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Mayo</p> <p><i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i>, 566 U.S. 66 (2012).</p> | <p>Michael Bolton</p> <p><i>Three Boys Music Corp. v. Bolton</i>, 212 F.3d 477 (9th Cir. 2000).</p> | <p>Mike Tyson's face tattoo</p> <p><i>Whitmill v. Warner Bros. Entm't., Inc.</i>, No. 11-cv-0752 (E.D. Mo. May 24, 2011).</p> | <p>Mister Charbucks</p> <p><i>Starbucks Corp. v. Wolfe's Borough Coffee, Inc.</i>, 588 F.3d 97 (2d Cir. 2009).</p> | <p>Monty Python</p> <p><i>Gilliam v. Am. Broad. Co.</i>, 538 F.2d 14 (2d Cir. 1976).</p> |
| <p>Mouthwash that tastes like a fireball from hell</p> <p><i>Warner-Lambert Pharm. Co. v. John J. Reynolds, Inc.</i>, 178 F. Supp. 655 (S.D.N.Y. 1959).</p> | <p>Moving the hinge plate under the plow shank</p> <p><i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i>, 383 U.S. 1 (1966).</p> | <p>Mr. Wiggle</p> <p><i>Downey v. Gen. Foods Corp.</i>, 286 N.E.2d 257 (N.Y. 1972).</p> | <p>Naked licensing</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Dawn Donut Co. v. Hart's Food Stores, Inc.</i>, 267 F.2d 358, 367 (2d Cir. 1959).</p> | <p>Naming porta potties after talk show hosts</p> <p><i>Carson v. Here's Johnny Portable Toilets, Inc.</i>, 698 F.2d 831 (6th Cir. 1983).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>“new age drinks”</p> <p><i>PepsiCo, Inc. v. Redmond</i>, 54 F.3d 1262 (7th Cir. 1995).</p> | <p>Nonconsensual aerial photography</p> <p><i>E. I. duPont deNemours & Co. v. Christopher</i>, 431 F.2d 1012 (5th Cir. 1970).</p> | <p>Office action</p> <p>MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE § 2260.</p> | <p>OJ Simpson</p> <p><i>Ritchie v. Simpson</i>, 170 F.3d 1092 (Fed. Cir. 1999).</p> | <p>Ordinary skill in the art</p> <p>35 U.S.C. § 103.</p> |
| <p>Pairing Death cigarettes with Black Death vodka</p> <p><i>Death Tobacco, Inc. v. Black Death USA</i>, No. 92-cv-6437, 1993 WL 761982 (C.D. Cal. June 30, 1993).</p> | <p>Patronizing the Tri-State Swap-O-Rama</p> <p><i>Hard Rock Cafe Licensing Corp. v. Concession Servs., Inc.</i>, 955 F.2d 1143 (7th Cir. 1992).</p> | <p>People Eating Tasty Animals</p> <p><i>People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals v. Doughney</i>, 263 F.3d 359 (4th Cir. 2001).</p> | <p>Pharmaceuticals made from pee</p> <p><i>Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.</i>, 927 F.2d 1200 (Fed. Cir. 1991).</p> | <p>Photoshopping Dustin Hoffman’s head onto other people’s bodies</p> <p><i>Hoffman v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc.</i>, 255 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2001).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Physical phenomena</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i>, 447 U.S. 303 (1980).</p> | <p>Plopping down on my “Lovee Lamb”</p> <p><i>In re Budge Mfg. Co.</i>, 857 F.2d 773 (Fed. Cir. 1988).</p> | <p>Polka Pickles</p> <p><i>Pikle-Rite Co. v. Chicago Pickle Co.</i>, 171 F. Supp. 671 (N.D. Ill. 1959).</p> | <p>Probative similarity</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Positive Black Talk Inc. v. Cash Money Records, Inc.</i>, 394 F.3d 357 (5th Cir. 2004).</p> | <p>Publicly performing the Hatch-Waxman Act</p> <p>17 U.S.C. § 106(4); 21 U.S.C. § 355(j).</p> |
| <p>Putting another dime in the celestial jukebox</p> <p><i>See, e.g.,</i> PAUL GOLDSTEIN, COPYRIGHT’S HIGHWAY: FROM GUTENBERG TO THE CELESTIAL JUKEBOX (1994).</p> | <p>Putting on my “Time Out” pants</p> <p><i>Blue Bell, Inc. v. Farah Mfg. Co.</i>, 508 F.2d 1260 (5th Cir. 1975).</p> | <p>Quid pro quo</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.</i>, 416 U.S. 470, 484 (1974).</p> | <p>Ransacking apartments like a “stooge”</p> <p><i>Arnstein v. Porter</i>, 154 F.2d 464, 467 (2d Cir. 1946).</p> | <p>Rapping a cane against a wooden street</p> <p><i>City of Elizabeth v. Am. Nicholson Pavement Co.</i>, 97 U.S. 126 (1877).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Releasing genetically modified bacteria into the ocean</p> <p><i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i>, 447 U.S. 303 (1980).</p> | <p>Renting VHS tapes to watch in the “private booth” out back</p> <p><i>Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc. v. Redd Horne, Inc.</i>, 749 F.2d 154 (3d Cir. 1984).</p> | <p>Reproduction right</p> <p>17 U.S.C. § 106(1).</p> | <p>Robin Thicke</p> <p><i>Williams v. Gaye</i>, 895 F.3d 1106 (9th Cir. 2018).</p> | <p>“Rollin’ in my 5.0 with the ragtop down so my hair can blow [I don’t get sued by Convertible Top Replacement Co.]”</p> <p>Vanilla Ice, <i>Ice Ice Baby</i> (SBK Records 1990); <i>Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.</i>, 377 U.S. 476 (1964).</p> |
| <p>Scientology texts</p> <p><i>Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Lerma</i>, 908 F. Supp. 1362 (E.D. Va. 1995).</p> | <p>Sherlock Holmes</p> <p><i>Klinger v. Conan Doyle Estate, Ltd.</i>, 755 F.3d 496 (7th Cir. 2014).</p> | <p>Showing off a Rubik’s Cube to college students</p> <p><i>Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.</i>, 793 F.2d 1261 (Fed. Cir. 1986).</p> | <p>Showing that special someone how much you care by enhancing their underwear</p> <p><i>Egbert v. Lippmann</i>, 104 U.S. 333 (1881).</p> | <p>Shrimp intestines</p> <p><i>Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.</i>, 406 U.S. 518 (1972).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**



SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Smelling thread to decide if you want to buy it</p> <p>In re <i>Clarke</i>, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1238 (Trademark Tr. & App. Bd. 1990).</p> | <p>“Soft” IP</p>  | <p>Spreading conspiracy theories about Elvis’ death</p> <p><i>Sellers v. Am. Broad. Co.</i>, 668 F.2d 1207 (11th Cir. 1982).</p> | <p>Squeezing the adrenaline out of animal parts</p> <p><i>Parke-Davis & Co. v. H.K. Mulford Co.</i>, 189 F. 95 (S.D.N.Y. 1911).</p> | <p>Starting a diaper patent war</p>  |
| <p>Sticking guitars on Rastafarians</p> <p><i>Cariou v. Prince</i>, 714 F.3d 694 (2d Cir. 2013).</p> | <p>Suggestive marks</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Abercrombie & Fitch Co. v. Hunting World, Inc.</i>, 537 F.2d 4 (2d Cir. 1976).</p> | <p>Sweat of the brow</p> <p><i>Feist Publ’ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.</i>, 499 U.S. 340 (1991).</p> | <p>Sylvester Stallone</p> <p><i>Anderson v. Stallone</i>, 11 U.S.P.Q.2d 1161 (C.D. Cal. 1989).</p> | <p>The “zone of natural expansion”</p> <p><i>See, e.g., Tally-Ho, Inc. v. Coast Cmity. Coll. Dist.</i>, 889 F.2d 1018 (11th Cir. 1989).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>The \$6,000 belt buckle I bought from a guy named Barry</p> <p><i>Kieselstein-Cord v. Accessories by Pearl, Inc.</i>, 632 F.2d 989 (2d Cir. 1980).</p> | <p>The Shaft theme song</p> <p><i>Cream Records, Inc. v. Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co.</i>, 754 F.2d 826 (9th Cir. 1985).</p> | <p>The Three Stooges</p> <p><i>Comedy III Prods., Inc. v. Gary Saderup, Inc.</i>, 21 P.3d 797 (Cal. 2001).</p> | <p>The white stuff in the middle of an Oreo</p> <p><i>U.S. v. Liew</i>, No. 3:11-cr-00573 (N.D. Cal.).</p> | <p>Threatening to break every toilet in Milwaukee</p> <p><i>City of Milwaukee v. Activated Sludge, Inc.</i>, 69 F.2d 577 (7th Cir. 1934).</p> |
| <p>Tiger Woods</p> <p><i>ETW Corp. v. Jireh Pub., Inc.</i>, 332 F.3d 915 (6th Cir. 2003).</p> | <p>Tornado Taz</p> <p><i>Nadel v. Play-By-Play Toys & Novelties, Inc.</i>, 208 F.3d 368 (2d Cir. 2000).</p> | <p>Trying to sound like Bette Midler</p> <p><i>Midler v. Ford Motor Co.</i>, 849 F.2d 460 (9th Cir. 1988).</p> | <p>Twelve Monkeys</p> <p><i>Woods v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i>, 920 F. Supp. 62 (S.D.N.Y. 1996).</p> | <p>Using Fish-Fri to fry fish at a fish fry</p> <p><i>Zatarains, Inc. v. Oak Grove Smokehouse, Inc.</i>, 698 F.2d 786 (5th Cir. 1983).</p> |

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

Vanilla Ice



Wearing a banana costume

Silvertop Associates, Inc. v. Kangaroo Mfg., Inc., 931 F.3d 215 (3d Cir. 2019).

Weird Al Yankovic



Writing a 465-stanza haiku about decryption software



“You might be a redneck” jokes

Foxworthy v. Custom Tees, Inc., 879 F. Supp. 1200 (N.D. Ga. 1995).

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**

**ANSWER
CARD**

SANTA CLARA LAW

**HIGH TECH
LAW INSTITUTE**