CLARIFICATIONS TO THE HAROLD G. FOX MOOT PROBLEM & HAROLD G. FOX MOOT RULES

The Harold G. Fox Moot Committee provides the following clarifications to the Harold G. Fox Moot Problem, and the Harold G. Fox Moot Rules:

1. A generic image of a knife is provided below.



   a. Aside from the "fist" and "foot" located at the **butt end of the knife**, and the material and colour of the handle itself, this should be taken as the template for the knives produced by both Alpha and Omega.
   b. The "fist" and "foot" are immediately recognizable by consumers as being either a fist or a foot, respectively.
2. Both knives are sold in high-end culinary stores and are not available in discount chains or large supermarkets.
3. Both knives are packaged and sold in sturdy, rectangular plastic boxes. The plastic boxes of Alpha and of Omega knives are transparent so that purchasers are able to see all features of the knives.
4. All of the events and/or facts found at paragraph 4 of the trial judgment occurred before the launch of the Sole Slicer into the marketplace.
5. There have been no challenges to the qualifications or acceptance of Dr. Congaz as an "expert". Nor should there be.
6. Images and/or artistic renderings may be used within facta – either as an appendix or within the body of the factum itself.
7. There are no limitations issues that arise in this appeal.
8. Jurisdictionally, the Supreme Moot Court for Intellectual Property Appeals is equivalent to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Moot Court for Intellectual Property Appeals is therefore not bound by any of its own decisions, or any decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada for that matter.
9. Paragraph 7 of the trial judgment is clarified to read: "When shown the handle of the Hand-E-Handle, seventy five percent (75%) of the sixty (60) interviewees identified it as being "from Alpha", being "that cool new 'hand' knife", or being "that orange knife"."