Insights: Alerts

Arizona Court Rejects Armored Vehicle Manufacturer's Advertising and Trademark Claims

MAY 23, 2025 Written by Bryan J. Wolin

A recent Arizona district court decision reminds brand owners that bold accusations of false association and deceptive branding can quickly fall apart in the absence of certain key facts. In *Armored Group LLC v. Lutzker*, the armored vehicle manufacturer "TAG" alleged that three former executives, operating under the name "TAG Dynamics," sought to confuse the market and mislead the public into believing a joint venture existed between the two companies. TAG asserted a number of claims, including under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (false association and false advertising). However, when it came to demonstrating deception in the U.S.—a key element of its claims—TAG's case was full of holes, and the court dismissed the case at the pleadings stage.

No U.S. Commerce, No Lanham Act Claim

The court leaned heavily on the Supreme Court's Abitron decision, which restricts Lanham Act liability to acts that occur in ***U.S.*** commerce. Since TAG's allegations stemmed primarily from conduct at a ***European*** trade show, the court found no domestic "use in commerce" sufficient to support a claim under the Lanham Act. The court flatly rejected the idea that foreign marketing could support a U.S. false association or advertising claim.

One Statement, Two Flawed Claims

TAG's legal troubles didn't end at the border. The court also scrutinized the heart of TAG's false association and false advertising claims: a vague allegation that someone told a vendor TAG Dynamics was a joint venture with TAG. However, the court explained that a Lanham Act "false association" claim requires proof of a misleading affiliation, while a "false advertising" claim requires a commercial advertisement that misrepresents a product's qualities. The alleged statement didn't qualify as either. There was no context showing commercial promotion, no factual details about how it influenced buyers, and no examples of actual confusion.

Empty Allegations Don't Equal Injury

Finally, TAG's claims suffered from a common but fatal flaw: failing to plead real-world harm. Vague assertions of lost goodwill and reputational injury weren't backed by evidence of lost customers, canceled deals, or diminished market value. Courts, the opinion makes clear, won't connect those dots for you.

If you have questions about defending your brand, attacking false advertising, or navigating other complex brand disputes, reach out to our Advertising & Marketing or IP Litigation teams.

Related People



Bryan J. Wolin
t 212.775.8735
bwolin@ktslaw.com